

We, in this Alliance, have been able to preserve peace until now because we have maintained a credible deterrent capability and the transatlantic bridge on which the essential solidarity of this Alliance rests. These ingredients of success in the past will continue to be the keys to the success of our enterprise in the future.

All this is cause for justified satisfaction but not for complacency at a time when segments of the public have lost sight of the Alliance's role. It is not enough to recall the past. Today, we must get across the message that we in this Alliance stand for peace. We must get across the message that the purpose of our weapons, nuclear and conventional, is to prevent a war, whether it arises by miscalculation or design, not to fight one.

The East-West situation has been perceived by many as more or less stable over the past decade. For a while, we seemed to be building bridges with the East. We lived in the decade of *détente* — the superpowers were talking to each other about limiting strategic arms, and negotiations began on the mutual and balanced reduction of conventional forces.

However, during this same period, the Soviet Union has been quietly but resolutely building up its nuclear and conventional forces. It has shown by its invasion and continued occupation of Afghanistan that it is prepared to resort to military force in pursuit of what it considers to be its national interests. Unfortunately, the serious implications of these developments were not perceived among large segments of our people. To them, *détente* gave the promise of reversing the nuclear arms race. Now they mistakenly imagine that it is our modernization decision which threatens *détente*, rather than Soviet missiles, the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, and Soviet pressure on Poland. In truth, the peace movement is more a product of fear than of logic.

**Disarmament a  
matter of  
bargaining**

We must do a better job of addressing these fears. We must convince our publics that unilateral disarmament increases rather than reduces the risk of war. We agree with the peace movement that the nuclear arms race can and must be arrested. They should be assured that we are not trying to match the other side one for one and that we are not seeking military superiority but greater security at the lowest possible level of armaments, nuclear and non-nuclear. We should do all we can in our communiqués and with the communication resources of the Alliance to show that this is an essential purpose for us. The fears of the peace movement need to be addressed, but the real campaign for nuclear disarmament has to be waged at the bargaining table.

All of us warmly welcomed President Reagan's statement on November 18. Canadians were impressed by the comprehensive approach taken by the President on the broad range of arms-control issues, including his announcement that the United States was prepared to resume negotiations on strategic weapons early in the new year. They also welcomed the opening of negotiations in Geneva last week. The President's statement went a long way towards removing the unease and anxiety about the Alliance's commitment to arms control.

As leaders of the Alliance, we all need to exercise great care lest there be misunder-

---