

into two categories: i) those aimed at primarily counter-acting or off-balancing the anti-NATO arguments;¹⁹ and ii) those advocating functions for NATO which are unique to a policy of interdependence, and have not been taken into account by the revisionists.

The first category includes those arguments which purport to show that the threat to peace and security in Europe is not extinct, and that Canada's security remains closely linked with NATO. Admittedly, the relative strength of the Canadian participation has decreased; but, the forces in Europe are performing a function deemed essential by NATO, and unilateral withdrawal would have an adverse effect on the alliance. Furthermore, the political aspects of the contribution are just as important as the military since it gives Canada a say in the formation of policy. It is at this point that interdependence proves to be essential. Rather than limiting Canadian influence, interdependence enhances our ability to mediate in conflict situations, and the Canadian role in peacekeeping has not been adversely affected by participation in NATO. Interdependence serves to increase international co-operation, and gives Canada a voice in many centres of the world which would normally be closed to a middle power. Subservience to the U.S. is greatly exaggerated by the anti-NATO group, and there is no need for unity of policy on all questions. In fact to demand unity would be harmful to the alliance, and to argue unity is necessary on all questions is to misunderstand the difference between unity of purpose (objectives), and how these objectives should best be attained. Because of the alliance system the U.S. understands that disagreement over certain types of policy does not mean disagreement over fundamental objectives. Thus, there is no real question of Canada being subservient to the U.S. and agreement on common objectives should not be mistaken for subservience.

Above and beyond the arguments refuting the revisionists are those which give NATO a special role in the international system, and there are at least four worth mentioning:

- i) NATO helps to ensure the continuation of a 'security community' in at least embryo form among alliance members.
- ii) There is an important 'control' function which takes the form of helping to control any expansionist tendencies on the part of West Germany, and secondly, helping to control proliferation of nuclear weapons. This adds stability to both Eastern and Western Europe.
- iii) In the case of war the alliance system increases the option for a conventional response.
- iv) NATO can serve as an agent for East-West détente, as well as increasing contacts between East and West. (This is not the same as the McWhinney argument which asks for immediate mutual disengagement).

The remainder of the section will expand on the above mentioned arguments of the pro-NATO group.