

2022

American Backlash, Canadian Compromise: Are Canadians and Americans Converging or Diverging? 14th Annual Canada-United States Institute Distinguished Lecture

Michael Adams

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj>

 Part of the [Transnational Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Michael Adams, *American Backlash, Canadian Compromise: Are Canadians and Americans Converging or Diverging? 14th Annual Canada-United States Institute Distinguished Lecture*, 46 Can.-U.S. L.J. 119 (2022)

Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/cuslj/vol46/iss1/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Journals at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Canada-United States Law Journal by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

14TH ANNUAL CANADA-UNITED STATES LAW
INSTITUTE DISTINGUISHED LECTURE –
AMERICAN BACKLASH, CANADIAN
COMPROMISE: ARE CANADIANS AND
AMERICANS CONVERGING OR DIVERGING?

Mr. Michael Adams, C.M.

Chios CARMODY: Good afternoon. For those of you I haven't met, my name is Chi Carmody and I'm an Associate Professor here at Western's Faculty of Law and also the Canadian National Director of the Canada-U.S. Law Institute. The Institute was founded in 1976 as a joint creation of Western Law and the law school at the Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, to examine legal issues relevant in the Canada-U.S. bilateral context. And to that end, the Institute sponsors a number of activities annually including the Canada-U.S. Law Institute Annual Conference, the forty-sixth edition of which is taking place online April 21st22nd on the theme of Supply Chain Challenges for North America, and I want to add that there's free admissions for student to that. Publication also of the Canada-U.S. Law Journal, a copy of which I'm holding in my hands, but it may be a little bit hard for some of you to see, not sure if it's coming through on the screen or not. And period experts' meetings and Distinguished Lectures like this one as well as our student forums. This, however, is the 14th annual Canada-U.S. Law Institute Distinguished Lecture and this year our Distinguished Lecturer is Michael Adams, Founder and President of the Environics Institute for Survey Research. Michael holds an honors BA in political science from Queen's University and an MA in Sociology from the University of Toronto. He's the author of seven books on Canada-U.S. relations including his 2003 book *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada, and the Myth of Converging Values* which won the 2005 Donner Prize as best book on public policy. Michael was also the recipient of an honorary doctorate and in 2016 was awarded the Order of Canada. I was moved to invite Michael to give this year's Canada-U.S. Law Institute Distinguished Lecture while I was reading the newspaper on New Year's Day when he had a lengthy opinion piece in the Globe and Mail on differences between Canada and the United States. Just this week, the standoff with truckers' convoys in several parts of North America emphasized the vast differences in opinion that have emerged on key issues, on both sides of the Canada-U.S. border. And I was interested in where these differences come from and whether they're really in fact so new or if, perhaps, they've just acquired a new prominence and salience in our thinking. Michael is someone who has been examining these issues in various ways for many years, decades even, and he seemed well placed to provide some insightful analysis of what's happening and what its implications might be for the future. Before he does that, however, I'd like to convey a few thanks. First of all, to the faculty of law, and particularly to our Dean, Professor Erika Chamberlain,

for her continuing support of this lecture. To Ashley Wiseman, the faculty's communications officer, for helping to promote and publicize this event. And to Corey Meingarten, the faculty's systems administrator who is ensuring smooth broadcasting of this event. As well as my U.S. counterparts on the Ohio side, Professor Stephen Petras, for his continuing support, and the Institute's Managing Director, Ted Parran, in Cleveland. I'd also like to thank this year's students on the Canada-U.S. Law Institute Student Committee, particularly Piper McGavin, Tanya Soni, and Shurabi Srikaruna, who have been helpful in coordinating and assisting with this Distinguished Lecture. After Michael's Distinguished Lecture today, there's going to be an opportunity for questions from the audience through Zoom. So if anyone would like to send along a question or two during the lecture, or thereafter, via the Q&A function at the bottom of the Webinar screen, that would be appreciated. So without any further ado, over to Michael.

Michael ADAMS: Well thank you for those kind words, Chi, and great to be with you and your colleagues at Western and elsewhere this afternoon. I'm going to, for about half an hour thirty-five minutes, walk you through a PowerPoint, I hope it's an interesting PowerPoint not a boring one, not filled with words but more pictures and concepts, and then I'll look forward to the Q&A afterwards. Well, the U.S. and Canada have always been distinct cultures since their colonial days, their founding by the Europeans several centuries ago, and they have been on unique sociocultural trajectories. As we look at the broad picture over history, we see Americans as being a more risk-taking people and Canadians a more risk-averse. America is a culture of aspiration, and Canada a culture of accommodations. Interestingly, we started out more religious than the Americans, certainly the French-Canadians in Quebec, but these days it's the Americans who are more religious and Canadians more secular. For America, money is everything – it's a bit of a stereotype – for us, money is suspect – did you inherit it or get a government grant? How else could you get money in this country? Americans brag the highest standard of living in the world, we think we have the best quality of life. There, the winner takes all. Here, we distribute the winnings and income redistribution. Americans think they will win the lottery. We think we have won the lottery, we're Canadians, we're in Canada. In America philanthropy – again this is kind of tongue in cheek – is more capricious in the sense that huge bodies of wealth are eventually established foundations and then distributed to do good things, get noticed by Bill and Melinda Gates and you've made it. Our philanthropy is not capricious it's compulsory philanthropy is not capricious it is compulsory philanthropy and it's known as higher levels of taxation which goes to the government and then gets distributed around the country and to various groups in the country. Interestingly American humor tends to be more "put down" humor, more slapstick, more Three Stooges kind of thing where the bad guy gets his comeuppance in the end. We've inherited from the Brits, I think, a self-effacing irony. We tend to say the opposite of what we believe almost as a test to see if the other person is smart to get our drift. In America, the word "liberal" has become an epithet. It's a put-down of someone. In Canada, being a liberal person is actually a compliment and there's even a political party that calls itself the Liberal Party that seems to do pretty well in elections. So here the word "liberal" is normative.

And you all will have your own kind of binaries of U.S., Canada, some stereotypes, some historical, some lessons from history, but these are the ones I've pulled together to kind of spark us at the beginning of my lecture.

So, I like arguing from data and I start with data that is derived from surveys, from survey research, and in particular when it comes to comparing cultures I use our social values research. And values are, you know they sometimes say that a bad person has no values, actually a bad person – somebody you think is bad – does have values, you just don't like their values. So, we try to look at the broad range of values, motivations, and mindsets, in other words the things in our heads that inspire us as parents and guide us as consumers, as workers, as investors, as spiritual beings, as voters, and so on. We do this by creating a number of statements that are put together in a questionnaire, anywhere from one to three or four or even five statements, are put together and become a single social value that we track over time. Now we've done this work in Canada and the United States at the same time since 1992, although we began the program in 1983 in Canada, but in the two countries it's been since 1992, and then 96-2000 so it's every four year and of course those of you who pay attention to politics know it's presidential election years so we often then can correlate the values with people's political preferences. In 2020 and 2021, the last couple of years, we've used more than 150 items to track sixty social values in the two countries and we have very large samples, five thousand or more in each country, which allows us to break down by demographic, by age, gender, income, education, region of the country, and so on. So the examples of values that we are tracking, starting with A: acceptance of violence as normal in life; adapting to complexity; the American dream, everyone knows what that is; anomie and aimlessness, two very good sociological concepts; attraction for crowds; authoritarian impulse, one we've added over the last ten years' conspiracism – the belief in conspiracies, they're true or a lot of them are true; doing your duty; ecological concern; flexible families – blended families, same-sex, same-gender families (Adam and Steve as well as Adam and Eve); ethical consumption; global consciousness; modern racism – the belief that there is no more racism, we've solved racist problems and everybody starts from the same starting points; ostentatious consumption, also termed conspicuous consumption; patriarchy – which we'll be talking about a little bit more; penchant for risk, a love of taking risk; rejection, or questioning, of authority; religiosity; sexism; sexual permissiveness; technological anxiety; and, xenophobia, the fear or even hate towards the Other.

So when we, over a number of years putting these studies together and looking at the values and the direction in which they are going, we create a chart like this with two axes, an x and a y axis, with at the top of this sociocultural map are people oriented to traditional authority, people at the bottom of the map are people questioning traditional authority and often questioning it. At the left of the map we have a more Darwinistic place, survival of the fittest, Hobbes' state of nature, nasty, broodish, and short. And on the right side of the map, we have people who are really post-materialists and on the Maslovian hierarchy they're questing spiritual meaning in their lives, they feel fulfilled and now they want to achieve that spiritual peace and tranquility.

When you cross the two it gives you four quadrants and they each describe a mental posture or a way of looking at the world. So, people with a survival of the fittest and a deference to traditional authority find themselves in the upper left-hand quadrant and we label that one the “Status and Security” quadrant. These are people who obey traditional norms and adopt traditional structures. In the upper right-hand side of the map, again people are deferential to traditional authority but they’re more on the fulfillment side. So, for them, the quest is for authenticity and responsibility. This is the area where people are oriented to wellbeing, harmony, and responsibility. You can think of Oprah, Oprah’s quadrant. In the lower right is kind of the “Boomer” quadrant, the Baby Boomer quadrant. These people are oriented towards idealism, that there can be a better world and we ought to be headed in that direction. They are also into individual or personal autonomy. They are into exploration. They like differences, they like travel, they like going to ethnic restaurants, they like meeting different kinds of people, and they’re very flexible and try not to be judgemental about difference. In the lower left, individuality but more in the survival of the fittest quadrant. We have people who feel excluded from the major culture. They feel like they’re outsiders, they quest intensity – they like feeling the lifeblood flowing through their veins. They seek stimulus, constant stimulus, and constant attention. So, with those concepts in your mind, I am now going to show you where the Canadians and the Americans are on this map. So in 1992, the first year we did the studies in both Canada and the United States. So the average American when we did our sample of whatever it was that year, two thousand or three thousand people, the average American we found just above the map just inside the Authenticity and Responsibility quadrant. The average Canadian in 1992 wasn’t too far away, but was distant, and was also to the right, you know, more towards the fulfilment side, but further down the map, further in rejecting or questioning authority and more in the idealism and autonomy quadrant. In the year 2020, the last wave we did in the U.S., we find that the average American has come way down the map, in other words, way down from embracing traditional authority, more into individuality, but rather than continuing in a direction towards fulfilment has actually regressed and has moved more towards a Darwinistic, survival of the fittest orientation, and the average American then is found in the exclusion and intensity quadrant. Whereas Canada, in 2021, which is the last year we did the study here, is again way down the map, moving from a deference to authority to individuality, but is much deeper in the idealism and autonomy quadrant. So the direction of social change in the United States from the point of view of the values of the average American and the direction of social change in Canada for the average Canadian.

So, on what values, then, are Canadians and Americans most different? What distinguishes what Canadians and Americans most value as distinct from what the other culture values? So, number one for Canadians: a sense of duty, doing your duty to others. Questioning or rejection of authority, the automatic authority of deference to authority that used to be characteristic of Canadians. Flexible families, so very open to blended families, gay families, and so on. A post-material mindset, and less oriented on consumption and more on experience-seeking than materialism. A belief in saving on principle, that is, it is a good thing. And, as

consumers they are discriminating consumers, they give thought to whether they actually need the product and then they also are looking at whether, you know, this is something that's consistent with my values that I'm going to purchase. The average American is stronger on religiosity, stronger on patriarchy. We're going to look a little bit more at patriarchy in a minute or two, that is, patriarchy as measured by the father of the family being the master in the house. Traditional family, more than the flexible family. In other words, mom, dad, and 2.5 kids, with the dad on top, mom best actress in a supporting role, and the kids are further down the hierarchy of authority. Confidence in big business. The need for status recognition, stronger for Americans. And, of course, the symbols of your status in the society are shown through ostentatious consumption, whether it's the car you drive, the house you have, whatever you have it's going to be a symbol of your place in the status hierarchy.

So, let's have a look patriarchy. The first institution that any of us experiences in this life is the family, so it is important that we understand what people think is the natural structure of authority in the family because they are going to carry that model through to other institutions. Whether it's political institutions, or at the workplace, or wherever, that model is a model that is going to be applied in other settings. That's why we put so much emphasis on the structure of authority in the family. So, in 1992 when we did our survey, we found that 42% of Americans felt the father of the family must be master in the house. Now I guess our hypothesis was "why would there be any difference between Canada and the United States?" I mean, we'd all been exposed to Father Knows Best, you'd think patriarchy would be one of those international things and the people in Canada, the U.S., and the North American continent with so much similarity in their cultures would have a very similar orientation to the structure of authority in the family. Well in 1992, we found that 25% of Canadians, and I remember presenting this and people said, "your surveys have a margin of error, you better check this out." So, four years later, we checked it out again and the proportion of Americans thinking father must be master had actually gone up, in Canada it had actually receded and gone down, so the gap was even wider. Well, two observations are terrific, but you really need three to know really if it's a systematic change where you can actually put a vector on a map and say okay, that's the direction it's going. So now we're in the year 2000, we have George Bush taking on Al Gore. Americans are up at 48% father-is-master and the Canadians are now at eighteen, so it's getting wider. So, you can imagine, after nearly a decade of seeing this kind of thing, I am inspired to say I've got to dig deeper, what does this correlate with, what does this mean about the two cultures. That 48%, by the way, highly correlated with voting republican, voting for George Bush in that election of 2000. And then we've asked the question in subsequent years after 2004 it goes up to 52% in the United States. America, of course, has gone through 9/11. America's gone through the war in Iraq, and so on. These could be factors in explaining why you get even a higher proportion for patriarchy. Canada is now a bit up from the 18% in 21%. And then we continued it on, '07, '12, '16, and '20. There's actually an interesting low-point here, 2012, which correlates, of course, with Obama, first Canadian president of the United States being in power. But, when you're soon back up to 2016—U.S. is back to its

normal position of being about half the electorate. This is the election which Trump won. And then 2020, down one point in the U.S., statistically insignificant. The Canadian numbers are hovering at, you know, twenty, twenty-three, twenty-four, and so on, and we attribute this to immigration. We have 2-20% foreign-born, 40% first- or second-generation people. People coming to Canada tend to come from more religious countries and more patriarchal countries. It takes, you know, a generational change before immigrant kids have the values the same as a native-born in Canada.

So, looking a little deeper, this is the 2020 survey in the U.S. 58% of American men think father must be master, 41% of women. When we compare that to Canada, 32% of Canadian men think father must be master, which is lower than the proportion of American women who think father should be master and look at Canadian women at only 16% believing that the father of the family should be the boss in the household.

We look at religion, and we look at religion because the hypothesis would be that religion should trump country as helping to form your social values of things you think are right and wrong and how to live your life and so on. So, we thought, wouldn't it be interesting to compare people of various religious denominations in the two countries? So, conservative Protestants in the United States find themselves up in the authority quadrant, the Status and Security sector. Mainline Protestants in the U.S. are again up the map, more towards authority, but they are in the Authenticity and Responsibility quadrant. Catholics in the U.S., interestingly, more towards the survival of the fittest, this probably has something to do with racial and ethnic composition of the Catholic population. Non-Christians, so we're looking at Muslims, and Hindus and Sikhs in the United States, down the map, interestingly. People with no religion are right down in the Idealism & Autonomy quadrant, the Canadian quadrant, interestingly. When we look at Canadian conservative Protestants, and these are, you know, evangelicals, born-again Christians, and so on, our hypothesis was going to be that they would be very similar to conservative Protestants in the United States. You would think that religious ideology or belief system would be stronger than the country in which people live, and we were quite astounded to see that conservative Protestants in Canada are quite different in social values from their co-religionists in the United States. Mainline Protestants, right in the middle of the Idealism and Autonomy quadrant. Catholics, interestingly, in Canada, very similar to mainline Protestants whereas, again, Catholics in the U.S. and mainline Protestants are quite different in social values profiles. Muslims, Sikhs, and Hindus and others in Canada, further down the map. And people with no religion are off the map, they're so far down in questioning traditional authority in this Idealism and Autonomy quadrant in Canada.

So, we look at values, of course, but there are other concepts in our mind: there are opinions and attitudes and so on that we do. Here, we look at a bunch of statements that kind of express the mental posture of what people are thinking about their country today in each, and you'll see that they do reflect the values differences that we've seen earlier. So, here's a statement to which people have to agree strongly, or somewhat, or disagree strongly, or somewhat. Agreement, that's

the state of the country, in this case, the state of the United States in moral collapse. “The country is in more collapse,” three-quarters of Americans believe that. Canada is still pretty high, it’s 47%, but quite a difference. Things are going in the right direction in the country, a positive statement to which only 28% of Americans agree that the country’s going in the right direction. Whereas, you know, a majority of Canadians think the country is going in the right direction, and this is in 2021, in which the Canadians are actually in the right in the middle of the pandemic. “Our country is on the edge of bankruptcy,” 60% of Americans think that, only 40% of Canadians do. Interesting given the amount of money that the Canadian government is spending and borrowing and so on, to get them, to get the country, out of this pandemic. “Abortion should be safe and legal” this is interesting in the context of the decision that’s going to come down from the Supreme Court in the next week or two. 66% of Americans agree with that statement, 81% of Canadians agree that abortion should be safe and legal, which is the case in most of Canada and in large areas of the U.S. Currently, “Black Lives Matter movement is bad,” of course, it started in the United States after George Floyd was murdered. 46% Americans actually think Black Lives Matter is bad for America, but only 31% think Black Lives Matter is bad for Canada. Again, it’s a significant— statistically significant difference. And then conspiracism, or the idea that most so-called conspiracy theories you read about are true: 33% of Americans believe that and 19% of Canadians. So, as you can see, these attitudes in Canada— you’ll find these attitudes in Canada, it’s just that a larger number of Americans have a lot of more negative attitudes about their country and the direction it’s going.

So, this does lead Canadians to have a rather, well lately, a rather ambivalent attitude to the U.S., but, this is one of the questions that has the longest time series in our surveys. Ronald Reagan was president in 1982, and Pierre Trudeau in this country, and, at the time, 72% in ‘82 had a favorable, of Canadians, had a favorable view of the United States as a country and only 17% had an unfavorable view. And that obtained, as you can see, right up until the turn of the century, the new millennium when, and you could— I would think it’s the election of George Bush, it’s the Iraq war, and Canada not joining, not believing the evidence that there were weapons of mass destruction, kind of seeing America becoming more militaristic getting itself involved in wars like Iraq, and then Afghanistan and so on. To the point where by 2006, Canada, Canadians were divided on whether or not they had admired or didn’t admire the United States. Well, then Obama gets elected, and I guess Canadians are feeling that Americans can get on a good track. And then, of course, we see the effect of Trump being elected: the deep divisions between Republicans and Democrats, the Culture Wars become greater to the point where in October of ‘20, we were down at only 29% with a positive view and 63% with a negative view. Well, then Biden squeaks out a victory, and we think, “okay they’re coming back to their senses.” But, we’re nowhere near the kinds of numbers that we had in the ‘80s and ‘90s in terms of admiring America. Now the country is— Canada— Canadians are split 50/50 on whether they have a favorable or unfavorable attitude to the United States.

We asked Canadians – we don’t ask Americans how they would vote in a Canadian election; they would not know how to answer that question – but you

can sure ask Canadians how they would vote in an American election. This is kind of interesting, I put up all the elections that we have data from '88 on and it's interesting. Back in '88 we were, when it was Dukakis versus George Bush, George H.W Bush, we were kind of split, you know, 33-31. But by 1992, when Bush– Bill Clinton, took on Bush, we actually favored George Bush, the president we knew, over Bill Clinton, the Democrat. But, after 4 years in office and with America then starting to have early evidence of quite severe divide politically, we were overwhelmingly in favor of Clinton over Dole, favored Al Gore over George W. Bush, 48-29, and then Kerry over Bush in the '04 election. Obama, of course, was overwhelmingly supported by Canadians in 2008 and 2012. Then Hillary, again a big margin over Donald Trump, and Biden over Trump. 15% of Canadians would have voted for Donald Trump, versus 67% voting, would have voted Democrat. This is fascinating, and for people in Alberta, may find it even more fascinating that all Canadian provinces would have voted Democrat. And in fact, other than Alberta, the Canadian provinces are more Democrat than any state in the United States. The only region of the U.S. that is more Democrat than the Canadian provinces is the District of Columbia, which they may or may not make a state. Even Alberta is up there in the states that are the most strongly Democratic and that's astounding because Trump said he would keep the Keystone Pipeline and Biden said he would get rid of it. So, it was clearly in the economic interest for Albertans to have Trump elected. But even so, Biden was the overwhelming favorite, even in Alberta.

If you compare Canadians, Americans, where they are on an ideological divide. So, this in the U.S., we don't use Liberal, and we use Liberal and Conservative in Canada. You don't use "Liberal" and "Conservative" because that's the name of political parties you use left and right on the spectrum. This we did just recently and we find Canadians lumping in the middle, you know, the old joke, "Why does the Canadian cross the street? To get to the middle of the road." Only 4% of Canadians put themselves on the extreme left of the ideological spectrum, and only 4% put themselves on the extreme right of the ideological spectrum. The large plurality of Canadians are in the middle. In the U.S., you can see far more self-identification, ideologically, with the extremes. 12% on the left, on the extreme left in the U.S., 17% on the extreme right in the United States, with only 18% in the middle, barely one point more than the people on the extreme right. So, this gives an example of the ideological orientation of Americans versus Canadians, with Canadians again showing the stereotype of being people who hover toward the center of the map. And this is expressed in the ideology of the various supporters of political parties.

So, looking in Canada, when we ask Canadian Conservative voters, "Where are you on the political spectrum?" or where does the analysis show they are, obviously, very few are going to be on the left, ranked one, two, or three on the ideological spectrum. The majority, 62%, are in the center and 35% on the right. Twice as many self-identified Conservatives are in the centre, and, of course, this is obviously led us to think, as the Conservatives are choosing a new leader. If they choose a new leader who represents the right of the party, that person will have the challenge of holding on to the right, but also appealing to the 62% who see

themselves in the center of the spectrum. Among Liberals, it's as expected. 63% are in the middle, with 21% on the left, 16% on the right, that's classic profile of the Liberal Party. New Democrats, more likely to be on the extreme left. But even there, the majority of new democrats are centrist, 58%, and only 9% on the right. In the U.S., of course, it's much different. The Republican Party 85%, the sorting of ideological sorting there, has put 85% of people who consider themselves to the far right. That's a profile of the Republicans. Independents, as you would expect, are more centrists in the United States. And then Democrats, interestingly, seeing themselves on the liberal left, 60% versus 35%. And of course, that's how Biden gets himself, he's ruling from the center, doing well to represent the 35% and he often has trouble with the 60% who see themselves on the extreme left of his party. So, all of these values and politics add up to very different orientations to satisfaction with democracy in their country. So, these are the numbers for Canada. As you can see, it's varied a bit, but generally it's, you know, in the 70s who are satisfied with the way democracy runs in our country. In America, about half of the population are satisfied with the way their democracy works, and these are the proportions: about one and four who are dissatisfied with the way democracy is running in Canada, but in the U.S., it's nearly half of the population. This has again been consistent, you know, throughout the decade or so that we've been asking this question, it does correlate with partisanship in the United States. If your party gets in then you're satisfied with the way democracy works and the way elections work, and if your party doesn't win, more and more you're thinking, "well the election was rigged," and, as we know, the majority of Republicans now think that Trump actually won the election of 2020. This is not the case in Canada. When Liberals win, Conservatives say—they don't say the election was stolen, they say, you know it, they don't like it, but they don't blame the political system for the fact their party didn't win.

And then finally, Americans' and Canadians' orientation to self-society and authority, which I presented here, is reflected in people's willingness to be vaccinated against COVID-19. 64% are fully vaccinated, that's two shots, in the United States, and in Canada, it's 80% who have their two shots. And again, a lot of it has to do with orientation to authority, orientation to the political institutions, political leaders, science. Put it all together, and you get significant differences, and of course, there are significant differences on such dimensions, as people getting COVID, people having to go to the hospital, and of course, people dying from COVID. The proportions are reflected in the proportions of people who've actually been vaccinated.

So, that's the PowerPoint version, but there are books and you are students, and so you know all about books. As Chi referred to my *Fire & Ice* book, I then did a book on *American Backlash*, try to explain why you were seeing this backlash toward the progressive era of the '50s, '60s, and '70s in the United States. Then, of course, after the election of Trump, I knew Canadians would wonder, "could it happen here?" So, that morning, we went to bed, not really knowing that Trump had beaten Clinton. But, the next morning, we knew it and I banged out a book proposal and the publisher told me to write a book in three months, which is hard to do, but I did it and that one was published in 2017. Then Chi and I are both

writing chapters for the Canada and United States book, *Differences That Count*, that will be published later this year. Each of us will have an essay in that book. Then the article that Chi referred to, that I published in the *Globe and Mail* on January 1st. So, you can Google that and that's a nice, I don't know, 1200 words summary of a lot of this. Then, there's our website with survey after survey and study after study, and chart after chart, telling us all where we are on the spectrum, where our country is going and for our comparative stuff, where we are vis a vis the United States. We do compare ourselves to Europeans and other countries, OECD countries, etc., in our research, but for today's discussion, it was a Canada-U.S. comparison. So, I think that's the formal part of the presentation, now, the fun begins with a Q&A. So, I look forward to hearing from Chi and others who are listening in. Thank you very much.

Dr. CARMODY: Thanks very much, Michael. As I said at the beginning of this session, there's an opportunity for questions from the audience through zoom. So, if anybody would like to send along to after in the Q&A function at the bottom of the webinar screen, please feel free to do so. I guess, to begin with, Michael, a couple of questions. I mean as a Canadian, but also as an American who has lived in Canada for most of his life, I think it's certainly true that while there are a lot of differences between us, there are also a lot of similarities and if anything serious were to happen in the U.S., like a disruption of government, like an insurrection, like a secession, Canadians would have a really tough time. We saw that just last week, with the blockades at key bridges and the fear that these blockades, that if they continue, are going to lead to layoffs, and higher prices, and the importation of extremism. So, I guess, a question that I think many people might have is whether or not there's anything in your view that Canada can offer to an increasingly inward-looking, preoccupied and internally divided United States.

Mr. ADAMS: Not much. Americans are going to have to solve their own problems. They have their own unique problems, they have their own unique history, their unique Constitution, their unique history with slavery, and, subsequently, Jim Crow and so on, which is a lot to do with the divisions in that country now. I would suggest that Americans are going to have to work this out themselves, and I am unlike some Canadians, I'm not so pessimistic to believe that America's going to have another civil war. It's going to be a very low-grade civil war. Of course, there will be killing. You can't not have killing when you've got 400 million guns and 300 million people, highly armed, you know, who have got the right to carry arms in public. They can go to demonstrations with guns, you know, and so the chances, then, of violence happening and violence even in the election of '20, well I don't know this, in the midterms, whether we'll see it but in the presidential election, I suspect it'll happen. And then I guess what we're really going to be looking at is will there be a backlash to the backlash. Will the minorities, and the liberals, and all the other members of the Democrat Coalition be able to appeal to the Independents and to Republicans, who reject— who are traditional Republicans with traditional values and are not populists. And so, will the country go through some form of civil war, but without it being, you know, what we saw in the 1860s, with, you know, three-quarters of a million people dying in that civil war.

So, Americans, it's a joke, they tend to be benignly ignorant of Canada. Of course, Rick Mercer showed that with his comedy series, *Talking to Americans*, and, yeah, and there are, but there are Americans who dislike Canada, for you know, the Soviet Republic of Canada and so on. We've been teased by people on Fox News and so on. Trump has ridiculed our Prime Minister and ridiculed country itself. So, I would say then that Canada, really given that we're not really on the radar, really doesn't represent a model. You will find editorialists in the New York Times and the Washington Post, point out, you know, that Canadians have gun laws and that serves them well, and they have universal health care and that leads them to live five years longer than the average American and so on. But it doesn't really inform Americans and give them a model that they say, "we want to emulate." If anything, they may, they may have a view of Europe and the social democracies of Germany, and France, and Britain that may be more of a model for them even than Canada. But they do know we exist but I don't think that, in fact, we have an impact on how they vote. I don't recommend getting in your car and driving onto Ohio and knocking on the door of a Republican and saying, "I'm a Canadian and I think you ought to vote for, you know, Biden." You'll probably get a punch in the nose and say, "you people have enough trouble with your truckers, why don't you go back and talk to them and leave us alone?" So, I'm not optimistic that Canada offers a model that an American politician could put in the windows and say, "okay, here's the model, let's be more like Canada." There will be some people like that. Certainly, I have business interests in the United States, and of course, you know, my business partners there are people, you know, are saying that they admire the country, but they're not going to leave America, they're going to stay there and stay politically engaged and try to be part of the backlash against the backlash.

Dr. CARMODY: Another way perhaps asking a slightly different question is that, on a lot of metrics, as you pointed out, like quality of life, or general education, or life spans, Canada actually outranks the United States. What do you think the secret sauce of Canada's success is? Is there any way to sort of, you know, package this and export it? Or should we just take pride in a successful social model?

Mr. ADAMS: Well, in this course, I could give you a book as an answer, but you don't want to hear me read a book. But that's when I write *Fire and Ice* and when I write *American Backlash* and so on, *Sex In The Snow* earlier. I mean I start—you do polling, but you must go beyond the polling and look at the history and how these countries behaved in the past. So, let's start with the Canadians and their story. Their colonial story is that when the British beat the French, in 1759, on the Plains of Abraham, they couldn't really inflict their values on the country, because there weren't many Englishmen there. They were French. And so, the first thing that the British did was accommodate Quebecers, and they said, "you could keep your language, you can keep your culture, you can keep your religion, and just be good Canadians." And it actually—the British compromise with the French Canadians was a big factor in not joining the 13 American colonies, because they had a pretty good deal from the Brits and why would they join a Protestant country when they could still be a Catholic region under British rule. So, they stuck with

the British Crown and did not join the 13 colonies even though Ben Franklin actually came up to Montreal and tried to sweet talk them into joining them. So that history, then, and that's just between the colonial powers, the French, and the English, of mutual accommodation, that then starts to then become part of the Canadian DNA. And I then, you know, race forward to the period where we are bringing in people from all over Europe, starting in the 1890s and then to the early part of the 20th century. To fill up the vast expanse of the Canadian West. And we needed Europeans, and not just Brits but Eastern Europeans, and of course, those people came to fill up Western Canada: Ukrainians, Poles, and other Eastern Europeans. When Quebec, the Quiet Revolution happens in the late 50s and early 60s, and French Canadians assert themselves and say they don't want to be second-class citizens in Canada anymore, the mutual accommodation continued. We had a Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, and we brought in a number of policies that kept Quebec in Canada. At the same time, the ethnic groups that were neither English nor French said, "Well, we're Canadians too and we thought you're right, it's not biculturalism, it's multiculturalism." Multiculturalism is mutual accommodation between all of the cultures of Canada, not just the French and the British background, but people of other backgrounds. Therefore, we extend the policy of multiculturalism. And then, I'll just end with, finally, I've obviously left out in my tale here of the colonial period, the Indigenous people. And there is a different history of the relationship between the Canadians and the Indigenous people, compared to the Americans and their Indigenous people. That's a chapter in a book. But, just looking at the Canadian story is that belatedly, and fittingly, and fitfully, we are coming up with a policy of mutual accommodation between the Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians: the Métis, the Inuit, and the First Nations people. A lot of it is very good court decisions, but a lot of it is the evolution of social values in which we're starting to show the kind of respect to Indigenous people that we have been showing for the Europeans who came to this country. So that, to me, is kind of the story of Canada, you know, it used to be moose, mountains, and Mounties and now it's, you know, multiculturalism, mutual accommodation. A petri dish in which we're trying to see if we can bring all these people together, and to getting along with each other, and even better than getting along with each other, like forming friendships with each other, and intermarriage. You know, give me a call back in a couple of hundred years and we'll see what a Canadian looks like.

Dr. CARMODY: I have a question from the audience about the respective countries' disparate approaches to public health measures—vaccine certifications, masking, and so on and so forth. One of your slides suggests that in both countries, there's low deference, increasingly low deference, to state authority. The question asks, is it a story of higher deference to civil service expertise in Canada, compared to the U.S. and a story, of a sort of general lack of deference to elected politicians in both countries? So, where is the difference stemming from in your view? If there's any, is it detectable? And are, in addition, there any political institutions that attract comparatively higher or lower degrees of respect in the two countries?

Mr. ADAMS: I will be publishing something on this actually soon. So, probably within a week or two, because we've got some updated research. But, if

I had to make it, kind of simple, like my quadrants, I would say that in the United States, there has been a declining respect for politicians and a declining respect for political institutions. The Supreme Court gets into trouble in the United States, with *Roe v Wade*, and there are arguments that would suggest that it might have been better if that had been a decision taken by the house and the senate if the elected representatives had actually made that decision. But, with the Supreme Court making a decision, it really puts the Supreme Court under a question in the United States. We don't have Supreme Court decisions that have deeply divided the Canadian people. So, the Supreme Court remains very high in respect in this country, whereas much more suspect by people who feel that they're on the wrong end of a Supreme Court decision in the U.S. So, in each country, there's a lot of decline of respect for politicians and the scoundrels that are in there and making stupid decisions and so on. And the same thing in this country, in Canada, you know, a Prime Minister is never more popular than before he or she is elected prime minister. After then, it's sort of downhill until we finally defeat them and then put another person in who's going to go through the same sort of thing. But what we haven't found in Canada is a decline in respect for political institutions. Federalism, our strong federal system and the division of powers between the federal government and the provinces, is something that the Canadians support. A program called Equalization, in which money from wealthy people in wealthy regions, goes to Ottawa and is distributed to the other regions of the country is supported by the majority across the country, even in Alberta. That feels a bit hard done by, especially at times when the oil and gas prices are down. So, it's a pretty arcane concept, but the concept of equalization allows for similar levels of education and health care across the country in all the provinces. If you look at the wealthy states in the United States (Massachusetts, New York, California) and then look at the performance of people in on education tests and so on, you see a huge difference in the performance on the PISA test, the Program of International Student Assessment, of students in the poorest states in the United States, particularly in the Deep South, and those who are in the wealthier states. We don't find that in Canada. The performance is going to be the same across the country and it's the way because we are a more egalitarian country, we believe in spreading the wealth, having a similar standard of health care across the country. Some would say a similar mediocre standard across the country, that is probably true, but still, a standard that, in the end, if you look at a number of indicators, I guess wait times as an indicator, but the ultimate indicator is how long people live, mortality. Canadians live about 4 or 5 years longer than Americans. Canadian men and Canadian women live longer than Americans. And that's kind of a part of the outcome of having a universal, you know, accessible health care system. Where it isn't a function of how wealthy you are, it's a function of just your citizenship, and you don't actually have to be a Canadian citizen to access Canadian health care. So, that would be, I think, I've partially answered your question.

Dr. CARMODY: Another question that we have from the audience is around how the two countries view each other as neighbors. Have your polling data assessed whether or not each country, or people in each country, consider the other

to be a good neighbor? Do people in each country think that the other would, in a time of difficulty, come to its aid?

Mr. ADAMS: Okay, you've seen, here's what Canadians are thinking about the United States overall. If I'm sure I wrote a chapter about this, I would have started out by saying Canadians have been ambivalent about the United States. Obviously, we formed our country in 1867, because we were a bit afraid that a militarized North, after having defeated the South and where the British were more tilting toward the South, would want to get even with the British empire, and the place they could get even with was north of the border. They were militarized, they could have invaded the country and taken it over in two weeks, probably. But they did not. But it certainly scared the Canadians, the colonies that were here. Inspired John A. Macdonald, and Cartier, and the other Fathers of Confederation to get together and form a country, because, they said we better get together and form a country. Of course, for John A we better form a country and we better start moving west or the Americans are going to move west, and we're going to have a very small country of Ontario, and Quebec and the Atlantic provinces. So, Canada actually was formed as not being the United States. We want to form another country, and I think our attitudes to the U.S., you know, waxes and wanes. But I certainly remember my parents' generation, the generation of people who, let's say after the First World War, and going into the Second World War, and up to the Korean War, and so on, would have admired the incredible consumer society that Americans created. The automobile, which we love, those cars rolling off the Detroit assembly line every September. American popular culture, everything from jazz to rock and roll, to, I guess, rap today. The, you know, the American movies coming out of Los Angeles, the tv shows coming out of New York. There's just so much of the materialism and hedonism of America, was something the Canadians were very enamored of, and that would have been these numbers up here in the '80s; we admire the Americans for their enterprise, their innovation, and the wonderful products, and products that they create. But, as time has gone on, and you see in this more recent period, the politics of America has become to dominate our thinking about America. And so, we kind of are dismissing, you know, the movies and the T.V., and even though we're all on the Netflix during this pandemic and we're looking at America and its culture war, its low-grade civil war that's going on between Democrats and Republicans, between Trump States and liberal States and so on. Then, of course, this huge proportion of Americans who are anti-vax, or questioning vaccination and questioning the science behind it, even though it was the Americans who actually create a lot of these vaccines and we benefit from that. So, that's where you get the Canadians today, 48-46, a mixture of so many positives, and now, so many negatives that we're ambivalent. I don't think Americans are informed enough about Canada to really have a large number, 10 or 20% might have a view about Canada, but for the vast majority, again, trying to figure out their own country is difficult enough, let alone to try to figure it. Now, we will be famous for our truckers in Ottawa, and they're going to wonder what's going on in the land, you know, the Great White North. We could talk about that. I mean, is this all an American conspiracy? Well, that's not true, mainly our Canadians there, maybe a lot of our American money and

there may be a lot of American ideas behind this, but it is a Canadian experience we're going through. Does it prove that our democracy doesn't work? Not at all. We're kind of doing it the Canadian way, we're trying to, I don't know, we're trying to take it step by step and make sure there's no violence. We don't, you know, we don't want any collateral damage in doing this, but we are, you know, sick of COVID, we are sick of the restrictions, but we're now sick of the truckers, particularly ones blocking, you know, Detroit. So the Canadians, I think, again the joke is that we're kind of malevolently informed about the United States, whereas Americans are kind of benignly ignorant of Canada. I think that's— it's a bit of a joke about being malevolently informed of the U.S. because I think there are a lot of us, even those of us, who are ambivalent, who still have a lot of admiration. We have friends, business associates in the United States and so there's going to be a lot of empathy for what is it like for those 75 million Americans who are just like us Canadians. It must be kind of lonely.

Dr. CARMODY: So another question that comes to us from the audience is posed about the role of religion in our national fabric. One of your slides points out that the United States began as a secular Republic and now has transitioned to become very religious, whereas, in early Canada, we were religious, certainly in Quebec. But today that religiosity has become deluded and is perhaps on the wane. So, the question is about that transition. Why have the two countries, or religion in the two countries, gone in opposite directions? But at the same time, the questioner asks, why the relationship between the different religions seems to be about the same on each side of the borders? So, they're seeing the divide according to your four-box scheme seems to be about the same, but just in the slightly different registers if you will.

Mr. ADAMS: Okay, religion, I think Tocqueville when he came to visit Canada and the United States, I think he was looking at the prisons or there was some reason for him looking at America, observed, that I mean, this is a country that does not want government to be intrusive in the lives of Americans. It's life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness with minimal government, and as for things like, you know, social solidarity and cohesion and meaning in life, well that's the role of religion. And so, he felt that the religion was very strong in holding Americans together. Now, as time has gone on, the theory about the decline of religion in Europe and in Canada is that the State has replaced the role of religion in taking care of people. So, providing programs for people to take care of them, in hard times or to alleviate poverty and so on. We're not leaving it up to civil society in this country. The state is activist and religion is in relative decline, and you know, I guess as education increases, as questioning of traditional authority, patriarchy, religious authority is going on in both countries, but it has gone on in at an accelerated pace in Canada, and again, people would say that's because, in the 1960s, Canadians then became progressive and found a very large role for government in this country. Certainly, the change, the sea change in Quebec in 1955, you go to Quebec and everybody's in church, and in 1965 on Sunday, they're all well in the summer at least they're on the golf course. It's really tough to get a tee time now, it's one of the problems with this. And then English Canada similarly has seen the baby boomers questioning the traditional values of their

parents. So, Canada then has become quite secular, as secular as Western Europe. The same trend is happening in the United States, that it is becoming increasingly secular, the Pew Research center is showing this, and in particular, among young people are starting to question. So you're seeing a higher proportion of you people saying they're either agnostic, or atheist, or have no religion; it is actually the fastest growing religion in the United States. But, it's among young people and it's older people who are clinging to religion. The Boomers and the elders are clean to religion, but it is happening there as well. The distance, if you look, I've got this map up, the distance, be in terms of social values, between Americans with no religion and Conservative Protestants way up the map, is a very large chasm in that country. The Conservative Protestants and Mainline Protestants in Canada, it's less of a deep divide between social values. These people can sit around the dinner table together and get along civilly. It's more difficult in the U.S. to have that kind of thanksgiving dinner like in the 1950s if you have somebody with no religion, versus somebody who is a born-again or a Christian fundamentalist. Of course, on the political debate, you know, Trump supporters don't have too many dinners with Biden supporters in the same family, that's for sure.

Dr. CARMODY: Well one question that comes to us from an interested participant is whether or not the rural-urban divide that exists in the United States might have something to do with this. The question that this person put is, is the rural-urban divide that exists in the U.S. as deep or as wide, or perhaps deeper or wider than it is here in Canada? Do you have any thoughts about that?

Mr. ADAMS: We've had data on this, there is a difference, but it is not nearly as big a difference as it is in the United States. The rural-urban or the small-town rural versus the urban. It's true that urban areas are more multicultural in Canada and multiculturalism, rather than leading to the war of all against all, actually leads to mutual accommodation and the celebration of diversity. But, there's diversity in Canada as well. So, you look at voting patterns, they tend to see the conservative party doing better in rural small-town Canada, but liberals can do well there as well. And I think my example is Atlantic Canada, which is, and I hope I'm not offending anybody from that region, but it's a less wealthy region, it's a less, you know, less prosperous, less manufacturing and so on. But, it is a region which has a very, very liberal orientation and a progressive orientation and an orientation to immigration and refugees. If Atlantic Canada is the equivalent in Canada of Appalachia in the United States, the mental postures of the people in those two regions could hardly be opposite. With the Atlantic Canadians having openness, almost a xenophilia, toward other people. Wanting immigration, wanting diversity in their culture. It's again a more rural, and with you know, the largest city, I don't know, perhaps a million. I don't even know what Halifax is, but it wouldn't be anything more than that. So, the divide, there are divides between urban and rural Canada, but they're not as extreme as the difference between, you know New York, Massachusetts, you know, L.A., and San Francisco, versus the Deep South, where the values divides are a huge chasm of difference.

Dr. CARMODY: One question that I think intrigues a number of individuals is with respect to demography and immigration. Demography in both countries is undergoing enormous shifts. In the U.S., the population now, I think, most recently

under the most recent statistics from the U.S. sentence census reveal that the population there is barely growing at all. Immigration was way down during the Trump years. In Canada, we continue to rely on large numbers of immigrants to grow at all. So, our demography is also something that has experienced a hiccup. What's your research revealed about different approaches and attitudes to demography and immigration?

Mr. ADAMS: Well, I'm most intimately aware of Canadian because I've been tracking it now for about four decades. Canadians continue to believe that the population should grow. They continue to believe that immigration is important. Their attitudes towards immigrants are that they don't take away jobs, they're good for the country, they don't go on to welfare, they actually probably work harder than the average Canadian does. The concern about immigrants is that they're not adopting Canadian values quickly enough, but even that attitude has diminished somewhat over time, as people's experience with immigrants. Now, remember, we have 20%, what 22%, foreign-born, 40% plus first or second generation, people not just coming from Europe, but coming from around the world. Huge numbers of people from South Asia – that's you know, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka, and so on – China and Southeast Asia. Great diversity of people coming here and our attitudes are that they should come, and they should come in numbers like 400 000 a year, which is roughly 1% of the population. That has not diminished, even with the pandemic. If anything, attitudes becoming more open, more liberal, more tolerant, and of course, we need this, because, without it, the population would be static. We are below replacement, and America is not much above replacement, I think it might only be 2.1 or 2.2 and Canada's, you know, like 1.8 or 9 or something, so we need immigration. Canadians realize that, and it's both a pragmatic view of the Canadians that we need these people in order to have a robust economy, but we also think it's making a better country. It's the diversity actually making us more interesting, stronger, and a better country. Americans are much more ambivalent about immigration. Now, here you would say part of it is just luck. In the Canadian case, our good luck, our good fortune is to have three oceans and the United States next door. We get a few, you know, there are some Americans coming to Canada, but there's not a deluge. They all say after they elect somebody like Trump, they're all going to move to Canada. Mom and dad say that and then the kids say, "Well, you guys can go to Canada, we're staying here." Then you've got one partner wants to come, but then they, you know, both have to get jobs, so they dream about it. They can send me an email and I can tell them where they can live in Canada, where the values will be exactly the same as theirs just to make them feel comfortable. I can match their values with the values of places in Canada. But, so you know, Canadians are, well, we're open, it's in self-interest, but we also have the experience of people coming, coming to our schools, coming to our workplaces and the direct experiences that these people are, boy, these people are great. They're, in many ways, you know, they're more hard-working and duty-bound than the Canadians, but the people who've been here for three or four generations, they actually are helping the values of the country. So, America unfortunately, is living next door to Mexico, Central/South America, with huge numbers of terribly destitute people migrating, coming to your border, what

we would call irregular immigrants. But, you know, it's been estimated like 11 million irregular immigrants in the United States. It's a terrible debate you've been having. You've got Obama wanted to help, what do you call it, the kids who were illegals, who had kids in the United States to make them citizens. That's a big debate. So, when you've got a lot of people kind of coming in, who haven't gone through normal procedures, which is the case in Canada. We only get a few thousand people coming in illegally into Canada. In America, again, it's huge numbers of people. So, were we to be in a situation like the United States with a lot of irregular immigrants coming into the country, I think our attitudes would be, we have a far larger number of people with negative attitudes towards people coming to the country who haven't gone through the regular immigration and refugee procedures.

Dr. CARMODY: Ok, I have, I think, time for one last question. It comes to us from the floor. One of the points, and I put this question to you gently, Michael because I know that you're not a trained lawyer. So, any observations that you might have, might not come from a strictly legal perspective, but the question is that during the pandemic, we've seen many civil juries being struck and civil litigation trials are then being heard by judge alone. Having a trial heard by a judge instead of a jury seems to be in conflict with the current view of Canadians, that you surveyed, who tend to favor individuality over authority. This question asks, and is curious about, whether or not, or how can, we ensure that the civil litigation system in Canada continues to reflect the values of Canadians in this age of pandemic.

Mr. ADAMS: Wow, so 1970, when I graduated from, no '69, from Queen's University in political studies, I should have gone to Osgoode Hall or the University of Toronto law school. They let me in and the worst decision I ever made in my life was to study sociology. No, that's not true, all my friends went to law school. A lot of them became politicians, we're still friends today, but I went and studied sociology. Yes, that is my career and I don't regret it one bit. The law, we don't do very much research on attitudes towards the law in Canada. I think the person who's put this question to me, this is going to inspire me to want to read more about what would be behind this. So that I could actually put some questions on a survey and put it into context. I mean, we ask about confidence in, you know, the criminal justice system and maybe confidence in the Supreme Court and so on. I can give you those numbers. Generally, Canadians do have confidence, they have confidence in the police, they have confidence in the RCMP, generally. In spite of the fact that there are, you know, bad things going on in these institutions sometimes. But generally, the Canadians, it's interesting, again, we've got rid of our deference to our betters, to people with a social status higher than us, like you know a priest, or a minister, or a member of parliament, or somebody who's in the Royal Family, or something like that. But, we haven't lost our confidence in our institutions. So, I would be interested in like, I've never asked like, do you think that in these kinds of trials, should it be a judge making the decision or should this be a trial in which there is a jury of a representative number of people from the community making the decision. There may be research on this, I think it would be very interesting, and I imagine that the Canadians, I can see them tilting toward

having more juries. To have, rather than just deferring to a judge, a judge who, you know, and especially, let's say because we've had these, you know, there are always these cases, right, the cases of judges, cases in which women have been sexually abused, they've even raped, and so on. With judges with anachronistic stereotypes of that woman, and these have come to light. I think, you know, a lot of Canadians would say, "what are these older gentlemen doing? Making a judgement on something where their stereotypes are a hundred years out of date?" They would say, you know, "this is a case where there should be a jury, where we should and half of the jury should be women who can bring a judgment to what a person who's in that situation. But, I'm going on and the longer the answer is an indication that I don't really have, I haven't given it a lot of thought and I don't have a lot of data on it. But, maybe with your help Chi, you can inspire me to think of a way in which I can oppose a scenario to a random sample of Canadians and report back.

Dr. CARMODY: Alright, well Michael, thank you so much for your presentation today, which was a brilliant synthesis of so many things that are happening on both sides of the border, between our two countries. Really helps to sort of encapsulate it all in a nutshell. We put you on the spot and in this format that we have during this time of pandemic, it's of course perhaps not possible for us to have the same set of to and from that we would normally in person. But, on behalf of the audience and behalf of the institute I wanted to thank you today. Both the questions and the answers that were posed and answered have been saved, and we would like to thank you and I would like to thank the audience for its attendance today. This has been a brilliant session, helping us to get right to the core of issues that divide our two countries in the current moment, so thank you very much and good luck to you and to your future endeavors.

Mr. ADAMS: Well, I look forward to meeting you and others face to face over a glass of Chardonnay, that's the best way to do a Q&A. Dr. CARMODY: Thank you again, bye now.

Mr. ADAMS: Thank you, bye-bye.