

CONCLUSION

Disarmament could contribute to security, so could development. However, nations cannot agree on a common understanding of security. Lack of such an understanding and agreement, as expressed at the 1987 international conference, and even within the Canadian Cabinet and government, is unlikely to change in the short term. Like beauty, security is in the eye of the beholder.

Nevertheless, the promotion of an understanding of security that includes non-military elements such as economic well-being, environment protection, sustainable development, social justice and the strengthening of human rights is useful. A broader understanding of security will help change and shape the spending decisions of governments and the conduct of international affairs. The international conference was an important step in that evolution. The Final Document is a milestone response to the call of the Brandt Commission,⁷⁹ and others for efforts to enlarge and popularize a broader understanding of security.

Governments must now do more. There is a need for new politics in West and East, North and South. Governments must be convinced that national security, domestic power and international influence can be maintained through disarmament, rather than armament, and through change, rather than maintenance of the present military and economic status quo. Prime Minister Michael Manley of Jamaica has put it simply: "Survival requires change."⁸⁰

Such change must include new forms of international political cooperation and organization. This need is increasingly being recognized in Eastern Europe:

⁷⁹ North-South: a Programme for Survival, Independent Commission on International Development Issues, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1980, p.284.

⁸⁰ Global Challenge, report of the Socialist International Committee on Economic Policy, p.199.