

- Arms control has to apply to everyone, and the effect of the RMA is to render much easier the decision to go to war.
- Iraq will be key to the future tenability of NACD, for it is not enough just to be able to detect WMD, they have to be destroyed.
- If we are serious about intervening in the affairs of others to get them to treat their own population the way we treat ours (viz., the thrust of "human security"), should we not applaud the RMA precisely because it makes it easier to achieve the goals of war with fewer casualties?
- We do not need nuclear weapons to destroy WMD in the hands of terrorists, and we should not use them to do so.
- Arms controllers should go after "irresponsible" regimes, but more than that, they should also seek to establish greater predictability and thus help to resolve the security dilemma.
- Why, exactly, is the weaponization of space thought to be dangerous?

PANEL FIVE: THE TRANSATLANTIC LINK AND BILATERAL RELATIONS

In many ways this panel was the capstone session of the seminar, with the principal speakers being the ambassadors from the two countries, and the moderator being Ms. Cartwright. The presenter was His Excellency Como van Hellenberg Hubar (Ambassador of the Netherlands to Canada). The respondent was His Excellency Serge April (Ambassador of Canada to the Netherlands).

Amb. van Hellenberg Hubar began by stating how central transatlantic links are for the Europeans, and emphasized that these connections could not and should not be reduced to those between Europe and the US, as seems often to be the case. Canada had an important role to play as a "political force-multiplier," helping in the process to minimize the pressures that would drive the Atlantic Allies apart. But the bilateral (Canada-Netherlands) relationship had to be understood as one between countries each of which was growing ever more integrated with its own continental partners. This trend, while necessary to recognize, did not need to be deplored.