Therefore, the issue is not whether we should retreat to isolationism but how we should respond to changing threats to international peace and security, perceived and real. It is in that context that we must define and address the security needs of the 1990s. What are the new tasks we face as policy-makers?

I would suggest that we must be clear not only about the sources of insecurity, but especially, about how to distinguish between local, regional and global problems. These are not hard and fast categories. Bosnia may be a local problem, but its capacity for spill-over into neighbouring states makes it a regional issue. Issues of global proportions, like nuclear proliferation, are often being played out in the context of addressing local security problems. The Korean Peninsula, which I discussed extensively this past summer with other foreign ministers during my visit to Asia, is a case in point, as is the situation on the Indian subcontinent. By contrast, underdevelopment and environmental degradation are global problems requiring both local and global action.

In addition, we need to consider carefully the policy instruments best able to address these problems. Again, some of these instruments may be global in nature, and take the form of international legal regimes. Others may be regional, local or bilateral, designed to address security concerns at the most appropriate level. Sensitivity to local dynamics is paramount in our considerations. In both South Asia and the Korean peninsula there are nuclear risks. But their political dynamics differ markedly, and our approaches must take this into account.

I view the United Nations as the essential cornerstone of global security. Despite its imperfections, no other international body can establish global norms for dealing with the new security environment. We have no choice but to try to make it better. But a reformed UN is only part of the global security picture. Many local and regional agreements lie outside its structures, but they may be instrumental in helping to moderate international conduct. I do not suggest that an agreement regulating surface transport between two countries is a "security" arrangement or institution. But I would argue that such an arrangement is the building block of the kind of understanding that sees our collective futures as inextricably linked. That is a real contribution to international security, regardless of how you would categorize it.

This framework for addressing the new security issues of the 1990s stretches the definition of "security," perhaps, to embrace areas far removed from the concerns of strategists only a few years ago. But let me go even further and emphasize the increasing importance of defining security in economic terms.

Although international economic policy is one of the central tasks of government, it is also an integral part of foreign policy. In the post-Cold War years, Canadians addressed security by building a