



Much of the new wisdom is to be welcomed. It is clear, for example, that the terms 'National Security' and 'Mutual Security' have lost their separate meanings. The search for either at the expense of the other is futile.

Certainly, the old Roman maxim 'if you wish peace, prepare for war' is a far less adequate guide for action than it was in its time. In the nuclear age, something more sophisticated needs to be added, whether it be labelled arms control, disarmament, confidence-building or conflict resolution. As the Prime Minister said before this Group last year, 'the world at large should recognize that arms control is a component of, not a substitute for, a healthy national security policy.'

It is not surprising that people are generally reluctant and slow to recognize the new circumstances. After all, we have given governments the responsibility of protecting our physical well-being. Such responsibility requires neither blithe experimentation nor neglect of the lessons of history. Given the stakes, no one would wish his government to approach security with a gambler's abandon, playing the odds — double or nothing.

In the rush to invent new ways to order our affairs, we must neither turn our backs on the past, nor confuse what we seek to create with what we must learn to control. Proponents of a strong national defence often consider supporters of arms control to be misguided idealists at best, or at worst, the enemy within. Equally, advocates of arms control sometimes regard those who spend and offer their lives to preserve and protect our freedom as hangers-on from another time, yearning for battle and fearful that peace might break out at any moment.

Our country, and indeed our world, cannot afford to perpetuate either of these simplistic fantasies.

Surely, a prudent defence policy must provide a measure of physical protection and order so as to permit the pursuit of additional, and more durable, means of ensuring our security. While change

*per se* does not require order, predictable, desirable and controllable change certainly does.

You will recall the often brilliant and compelling essays of Jonathan Schell, which first appeared a couple of years ago in *The New Yorker*. He concluded that the only way out of the terrible dilemmas posed by nuclear weapons is the transformation of politics, the creation of a world government which would relieve us of the burden of our own invention.

Some of you may agree with him and perhaps history will judge him correct. But for those who must cope with today's problems, today's challenges and today's world, Mr. Schell's prescription is of little immediate assistance.

The world, for all its interdependence, remains a society of nation states. Each is, at least in part, an expression of its people's wish to be safe and protected in order not simply to survive (or, indeed, prevail) but also to pursue other ends. In some cases, those ends are aggressive and threaten the security and sometimes the very existence of other states. Such threats are not simply the stuff of bad dreams or paranoid personalities. They are real and palpable: the enormous number of tanks and ships and guns and aircraft of the Warsaw Pact exist and cannot be wished away.

Against such threats, those few states which choose not to provide for their own protection must accept the implications and the price of protection supplied by others. Indeed, far from challenging the legitimacy of national defence, the fact that some states choose to abandon their defences is an implicit acknowledgement of the vital importance of the defence efforts and sacrifice of others.

Such a decision presents a moral, and not simply a practical, choice. It is conceivable, for example, that Canada could abandon its efforts at national defence. We face little likelihood of invasion, and certainly none that we could successfully resist by ourselves or which could be viewed with equanimity by the United States.

We also benefit from the protection of others. But does this reality relieve us of doing our fair share to maintain the peace, to provide for our security, to achieve stability and order in the international system, and to preserve social justice and the democratic way of life?

We Canadians must accept the costs, risks and responsibilities which are part and parcel of the security system on which we rely so heavily. Rather than simply exploit the contributions of others, surely we must recognize that security is not a right to be enjoyed, but a status to be earned, involving an obligation to be fulfilled. If our efforts to provide for our own defence are inadequate, others, if only to protect themselves, will assume the task in our stead, and do it in a manner over which we will have little control.

Some Canadians insist that we ought to maintain a prudent national defence, but that Canada should do so in isolation, shunning alliances of our own making. They suggest that we should withdraw from Europe, that we should close our ports to the foreign vessels which guarantee our security, that we should deny our allies the facilities provided by our vast territory and open skies for military training.

Such arguments are most often made in an effort to cleanse Canada of any connection, however remote, with the nuclear deterrent on which we rely, as if ending all such reliance would increase the safety of Canadians or the possibility of our surviving global war. We cannot afford to insulate ourselves from reality; we live in a world where nuclear weapons exist, and we are willing members of an alliance which faces an opponent with vast conventional and nuclear forces so near the East-West divide. We cannot allow ourselves to slip into a false and selfish posture. To do so would affront reality, our own proud heritage, and our friends and allies. Our security will continue to depend for the foreseeable future on the collective strength and the collective influence of our alliances.

Some who argue for military isolationism state that nothing in our alliance