

human security has emerged recently to define "safety from chronic threats such as hunger, disease, and repression, as well as protection from sudden and harmful disruptions in the pattern of daily life."¹

Of course, not all perspectives take such a sanguine view of the future. The 1995 *Strategic Forecast* of the Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies notes that there are a wide range of possible future conflicts and threats to security that must be acknowledged, and that existing institutional mechanisms for coping with them (such as within the UN system) are not really adequate to the challenges they face.² Others emphasize that while the Cold War is over, and the defence and security policies that waged it are obsolete, traditional concerns of world politics such as conflict and war have not vanished.³ All observers, however, agree on the need to reconsider traditional defence and security policies in light of the new international conditions.

Acknowledging that there are a number of concepts available, the Canadian Special Joint Committee noted that it would not be helpful "to argue about security labels such as collective, cooperative and common security". The committee recognized that although there were differences, all the terms could provide a new security formulation from their substantial common features. For, as York University Professor David Dewitt notes:

a common objective runs through most of the proposals over the past five to seven years. The intent has been to replace the cold war security structure...with a multilateral process and framework with the following attributes: it must be geared toward reassurance, rather than deterrence; it must at best replace or at least co-exist with bilateral alliances; and it must promote both military and non-military security.⁴

Whether the broader definition of security is based on a single concept or on a combination of several, it is clear that there is growing consensus on the content of a broader understanding. The Canadian government has acknowledged this in its latest foreign policy statement:

There is consensus that such a broader orientation can best be achieved - at least cost, and to best effect - through approaches that broaden the response to security issues beyond military options and focus on promoting international cooperation, building stability and on preventing conflict. The Government will advance this objective through a more integrated approach, marshalling all our foreign policy instruments.⁵

Among those instruments are revitalized and expanded measures to constrain conventional weapons proliferation.

¹ *Our Global Neighbourhood*, 80. See also the United Nations Development Program, *Human Development Report 1994* (New York: United Nations, 1994).

² Alex Morrison and Susan McNish, ed., *Canadian Strategic Forecast 1995: The Canadian Defence Policy Review* (Toronto: Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies, 1994).

³ Such arguments have been advanced in Canada by the submissions of the Royal Canadian Airforce Association and the Conference of Defence Associations to the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy (June 1994). See also Colin Gray, "Canadians in a Dangerous World," a report prepared for the Atlantic Council of Canada that was also submitted to the committee. See "Need a 'Rainy Day' Policy for Defence Capabilities," *Financial Post*, 1 November 1994.

⁴ Dewitt, 2.

⁵ *Canada in the World*, 25.