

because of the unique Canadian situation vis-à-vis the U.S. a need exists to trust American leadership* because no other alternative exists, since "Canadians can not disengage themselves from the consequences of United States decisions."³¹ But at the same time there is no question of complete unity of policy within the alliance or with U.S. policy. If unity becomes an end in itself paralysis will be the result. Therefore, diversity must be allowed to flourish within NATO, and the Canadian role should be one of "support without satellitism."³² In looking at the Canadian foreign policy experience it should be apparent that room for diversity obviously exists, and on top of this the "NATO alliance has always been counterbalanced by our other associations, especially the Commonwealth."³³ However, if "our real fear is of gradual, semi-conscious absorption into the much more populous, wealthy, and dynamic society to the south"³⁴ opting out of NATO will not solve the problem. In fact it would cut important multi-lateral ties which serve to counterbalance the dominant U.S. position. But what of the second category of arguments which support continuation of the alliance system?

NATO performs a special role of assuring the continuation, in some form, of a "security community" in the Atlantic area.³⁵ A security community is one in which members are agreed conflict shall be resolved by the processes of peaceful change, and this entails resolution of disputes without resort to the use of force. Therefore, one of the main benefits of such a community is that the threat of war among members no longer exists. NATO has not yet succeeded in producing a true security community - for example the possibility of armed conflict between Greece and Turkey - but it has certainly increased stability, and greatly diminished the threat of war within the alliance. This in itself is a meaningful step forward from traditional bi-lateral alliances.

A second task is the function of 'control'. NATO has often been considered as a means of controlling and funneling the aspirations of the German nation, and within the last several years this has assumed increased importance. According to Peyton Lyon "the principal purpose of NATO has now become the meeting of Germany's legitimate security needs without recreating the independent German forces whose very existence would reverse the present trend towards détente and stability in the heart of Europe."³⁶ It seems reasonable to expect the Russians to react to any agreement to create independent German forces, and here NATO performs a valuable role in controlling any change in existing military force levels. A further aspect of the control function sees alliances as "one of the principal tools available to superpowers in their anti-proliferation crusade."³⁷ The case of France indicates NATO has not been entirely successful in this area, but for both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. the alliance system offers greater opportunity to control any expansion of the nuclear club than a traditional alliance system.

The third argument is related to the strategy of flexible response since acceptance of the strategy increases the range of options available if war should occur. Needless to say in any bi-lateral series of agreements the

* The Vietnam conflict has caused a fair number of academics (and other Canadians) to question American leadership.