

European NGOs Hold Verification Workshop

Under the aegis of the Peace Research Institute Frankfurt (PRIF), a number of European Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) hosted a unique workshop on Verification in London, England from November 30 to December 2, 1988. Titled "Workshop on Verification of Nuclear and Conventional Arms Reductions," this meeting brought together more than 100 specialists from a dozen European and North American countries. Although technical in their thrust, discussions ranged from an assessment of the experience gained thus far from the implementation of verification provisions of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Force (INF) Treaty to problems likely to be addressed in the development of significant conventional arms agreement in Europe. The co-chairmen of the three-day workshop were Dr. Jurgen Altmann of the PRIF and Dr. Tom Kibble of the Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College, London.

Two Canadians were invited by the hosts to make presentations in areas of particular interest to Canada. Colonel B.A. Goetze, a member of the Delegation of Canada to the North Atlantic Council, provided a retrospective view of conventional arms negotiation in Europe based upon his experience in support of a number of previous negotiations. Colonel Goetze recently completed his doctorate in studies relating to arms control in Europe. Mr. F.R. Cleminson of the Department of External Affairs undertook a preliminary assessment of verification methods likely to be evolved as part of a verification model designed to meet the requirements under a new negotiating mandate. That mandate was finally agreed to by the 35 nations of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe at their Follow-Up Meeting which concluded in Vienna on January 19, 1989.

The workshop heard from a large number of arms control specialists representing a variety of views from both East and West. To many who took part in the event, the most significant aspect of the three days was the lack of acrimony during discussions on a broad-

based set of significant issues. To a large degree, this apparent agreement can be said to be a product of the new Soviet policy which, by and large, now parallels the Western approach to arms control negotiations in general and verification in particular. Glasnost notwithstanding, however, it will be at the negotiating table that words will have to be translated into definitive deeds.

The organizers of this workshop can be jointly proud of its results. The meeting succeeded in bringing together

governmental, NGO and private sector representatives from East and West in a common dialogue bereft of the histrionics and preconceptions sometimes associated with such ventures. The published results of the workshop will constitute a significant contribution to a deeper understanding of the issues involved in effective verification. This workshop itself serves as a very positive example of the useful role which NGOs can play in the overall process of arms control and disarmament. ■

Clark Addresses Security and Cooperation Conference

The following are excerpts from a speech by The Right Honourable Joe Clark, Secretary of State for External Affairs, on conclusion of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) Follow-up meeting, Vienna, Austria, January 19, 1989.

"...From the beginning of the Vienna Meeting, Canada raised the fundamental issue of compliance with CSCE commitments. Candidly, but factually and fairly, we called attention to shortcomings, because we were convinced that unless there were better compliance, or a demonstrated willingness to improve it, further promises were unlikely to be meaningful. Far from building a climate of confidence, they would have eroded it.

We firmly believed that this Conference should produce real progress on the whole range of issues covered by the Helsinki Final Act. Canada played an active role in all three Baskets in sponsoring and supporting measures that addressed the most serious issues. We pursued these goals patiently, constructively, and at times stubbornly. We were convinced that we would deserve to be judged harshly by future generations if we failed to make the most of the Vienna Meeting. That was a common purpose of the Canadian government and of the non-governmental organizations, here and at home, with whom we were able to work so constructively.

Incrementally, and by hard bargaining, the Vienna Concluding Document took shape. Subjects whose introduction into a CSCE forum would earlier have been denounced as 'confrontational' or 'interference in internal affairs' were considered openly and debated freely. We could begin to see that the opportunity open to us was even greater than we had thought, if we had the will and the patience to exploit it to its fullest extent.

Our efforts have now been rewarded with success. The Vienna Concluding Document is a welcome milestone in East/West relations and in the evolution of Europe. It reflects and builds on recent changes. It makes significant strides in all the areas covered by the Helsinki Final Act. Canada is proud to have played a role in formulating some of its key elements.

When the Vienna Meeting opened, we had just succeeded in the Stockholm Conference in establishing a set of confidence- and security-building measures that carried considerable political and military significance. But what we did not know then was how these measures would work in practice. Since 1986, we have seen gratifying progress in adherence to both the letter and the spirit of Stockholm. We now have the confidence to believe that we can further increase transparency and predictability in military affairs. We wholeheartedly support the establishment of negotiations on confidence- and security-building measures to build upon the work of the Stockholm Conference.