

through some complicated issues, shedding light and judicious comment as he goes.

It is perhaps a matter of regret that his judgment and wise perspective has been lost to the inner circles of power for the last twenty years, but the policy approach he stands for can be studied and reconsidered here.

---

*Christopher Young is Senior Correspondent for Southam News based in London. He was formerly Editor of The Citizen of Ottawa.*

---

## Comparative defence

by James Eayrs

*The Defense Policies of Nations: A Comparative Study, by Douglas J. Murray and Paul R. Viotti (eds.). The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London, 525 pages, \$35.00 (US).*

Here is a sprawling and exceptionally complicated assemblage of material of several kinds, compiled by two members of the department of political science at the US Air Force Academy to promote and facilitate the comparative study of national security policies. It is both a book of readings from previously-published articles and a symposium of specially-commissioned chapters that (with the exception of the introductory and concluding chapters by the co-editors) are all the work of different authors. To distinguish the material especially written for the book from that reprinted in it the former is printed in serif type, best read under an arc lamp with the aid of an electron microscope. Of the original chapters, ten deal with the defence policy of different countries — the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Sweden, Romania, Israel, the People's Republic of China and Japan — "selected because of their dominant or unique position within the international milieu." Bibliographical essays by other authors accompany the chapters on the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, France and West Germany; a bibliographic essay on defence policies in the Middle East notes "a need for more scholarly research on the defense policy processes of the Arab states." The tome winds up with a ten-page glossary of both defence jargon (e.g., "COLD LAUNCH: The technique of ejecting a missile from a silo before ignition of the main engine") and terminology with which any reader of *International Perspectives* will be familiar (e.g., "COLD WAR: A state of tension between adversaries in which measures short of sustained combat by regular forces are used to achieve national objectives").

To provide the cherished objective of comparability, the co-editors have required each contributor to employ a common framework of analysis. The defence policy of each of the ten selected states is accordingly examined with reference to its international environment, its national objectives (including, where relevant, national strategy and military doctrine), its defence decision-making process, and a catch-all category entitled "Recurring Issues: De-

fense Policy Outputs," embracing civil-military relations, weapons acquisition, force posture, arms control, the use of force and "other issues." These four fundamental factors are further subdivided in the framework, sometimes elaborately. Thus, the defence decision-making process is held to be conditioned by five forces, the fifth comprising "constraints on defense decision makers," such constraints being of ten types, for example, that exerted by manpower which, in its turn, is analyzed with reference to the variables of a) number, age sex, b) conscripted or volunteer forces, c) reserves, and d) capability for mobilization of reserves.

Some adhere to this schema more rigorously than others, but all have paid it heed. In consequence, it becomes possible to compare, say, the domestic constraints on the use of force and, by using the authors' qualitative judgments, to rank each state on the scale made famous by Bo Derek: the Soviet Union ("military instrumentalities are likely to be called upon to play a larger and larger role in the promotion of Soviet interests abroad") emerges as a "10," Japan ("national opinion is still probably far from permitting [overseas] use of the Self-Defense Forces") as a "1" or "2," the United States ("increasingly reluctant to employ military force for political purposes") as perhaps a "6." It is to the credit of the contributors and co-editors alike that they refrain from such spurious quantification.

Only a polymath could usefully evaluate chapters as disparate as those of William R. Heaton, Jr., on China (which sensibly begins by recalling the "Middle Kingdom's" time-honored sense of cultural superiority to other countries) and of David P. Burke on Romania (contending "that Romanian policy and the situation of Romania within the Eastern European political system are even more complex and more deviant than generally supposed"). All ten country studies are informative, several authoritative, David Greenwood's piece on British defence policy the sprightliest. Searching poetry for advice for Whitehall planners, Greenwood alights on "Dryden's perceptive lines":

*Not heav'n itself upon the past has pow'r  
But what has been has been and I have had my hour.*

Not quite yet.

Canada is evidently neither sufficiently dominant nor unique to warrant a chapter, but the co-editors, neighbors of the Canadian armed forces stationed in Colorado Springs, take note of our strategic situation in their summing-up. They appear to subscribe to the doctrine of the involuntary American guarantee, for they write: "In North American air defense . . . Ottawa can be sure that the United States will provide for its own defense, even if Canada chooses not to participate in the arrangement." If they mean by this that the United States is bound by geography to deter attack on prime Canadian targets, their view (as David Cox and more recently Douglas A. Ross have argued) may already have been overtaken by technological developments. If Halifax were to suffer the fate of Nagasaki — a city its size when destroyed, but with far less inviting military targets — what would be the United States's response? Cold war, yes; cold launch, almost assuredly, no.

---

*James Eayrs is Professor of Political Science at Dalhousie University in Halifax, and the author of a multi-volume work on Canadian defence.*

---