

direct or indirect aggression to extend their police states beyond their present bounds by subduing any more free nations, they will not succeed unless they can overcome us all."

VALUE OF NATO

All this was 20 years ago, and perhaps the most telling answer to the question of whether NATO has been worthwhile is to be found in the simple fact that, since its establishment, no further European countries have fallen under Soviet domination — either through direct military intervention or by subversion. The nations of Western Europe have grown and prospered. In a period marked by violence and conflict in other parts of the world, Europe has enjoyed a unique degree of stability. NATO's success is often taken for granted these days, but this fact should not be allowed to detract from its achievements. Paradoxically, it is the fact of NATO's success that permits the luxury of questioning the need for it. I am often asked how one can be sure that the 20 years of peace Europe has enjoyed are due to the existence of NATO. I suppose in the end there is no substantive proof, but I can tell you this: the question is one which is easily asked in Calgary, 6,000 miles from the Iron Curtain. but it is a question that simply is not asked by those who live their daily lives in the shadow of massive Soviet forces.

NATO is unique in the sense that it is the only example of a formal alliance that operates effectively in peace-time. Fifteen countries, despite their inevitable conflicts in national interest, have been able to continue to co-operate for two decades. This is a major accomplishment and something to celebrate. It also bears on the contention that the members of NATO have not, in fact, faced a real threat from the Soviet Union — that the danger they see is imaginary. If 15 independent states have been prepared to make the effort required to maintain an effective alliance arrangement for 20 years, there must be a commonly perceived danger to which they consider a collective response the best answer. The danger is quite clear. The Soviet Union continues to increase and streamline its enormous military potential; its intentions remain uncertain; and there are unsolved problems in Europe which could ignite a nuclear war because they involve the vital interests of the super-powers. Canada cannot remain indifferent to this danger...

While NATO brings important advantages to its members, the alliance approach also involves both military and political obligations. On the military side, in addition to the guarantee of mutual assistance under the Treaty, there is an implicit understanding that each member will make an appropriate contribution to the overall military resources of the alliance. In the political sphere, just as there is an opportunity to advance ideas and influence the actions of others in the alliance, so there is a requirement to take views and interests of others

into account. NATO operates by consensus and there is an expectation that, except in special circumstances, agreement will be reached...

In an organization made up of 15 governments, there can at times be some difficulty and delay in co-ordinating views. At the same time, to the extent that there is a braking influence, it can have a positive value in restraining a member country from taking precipitate action which could have an adverse effect on the alliance as a whole. When one is dealing with issues of war and peace (and particularly nuclear war), this could be vital. Secondly, while progress toward political solutions may appear slow when approached on a collective basis, otherwise there might well be no progress at all.

NATO, like any large and complex organization, has its imperfections. For each member the question is simple — do the advantages of belonging to NATO outweigh the disadvantages? Unlike the members of the Warsaw Pact, the members of NATO are free to withdraw if they should wish, but the fact that after 20 years none of them has so far chosen to do so suggests clearly where the balance of advantage or disadvantage lies.

CANADA AND NATO

Looking at NATO in today's world, we must ask ourselves — what is its role in the immediate future and where does Canada fit in?

It seems to me that a durable solution to the problems which continue to plague Europe and threaten world peace must contain two elements: a lasting settlement, on a generally acceptable basis, of the political issues of Central Europe, including the division of Germany; and the creation of some type of European security arrangement which would adequately meet the needs of all the countries concerned, both East and West.

The issues involved are complex and this goal will not be achieved quickly or easily. If any progress is to be made, there must be some mechanism to keep the peace and at the same time contribute to the creation of a climate in which movement toward a durable solution is possible. Does NATO satisfy these dual requirements?

NATO's main emphasis in the early years was on providing a defensive shield against possible Soviet aggression in Western Europe. This continues to be a fundamental purpose of the alliance, but the emphasis is shifting as Europe's political and military circumstances change. The alliance is now devoting its energies and attention to the twin objectives of deterrence, which is the prevention of war, and of *détente*, which is concerned with improving relations between the Eastern and Western nations.

The objective of deterrence is to prevent war. To do this, the alliance must try to maintain a situation in which Soviet military adventure is obviously unrewarding and the likelihood of war breaking out in Europe is minimized. At the same time, if a conflict