

pacifism." This is simply wrong. In fact, I am later referred to as following a just-war line of analysis. I can't escape the feeling that this is phrased in such a way – referring to the "turn-the-other-cheek pacifism of Mennonites and Quakers" – as to be dismissive of the position. The intent, it seems to me, is to characterize this as a kind of knee-jerk, sectarian point of view that doesn't need to be taken seriously.

Ms. Gray's point that the "just war" analysis which we pursue precluded military action to enforce sanctions, needs comment. The use of military force to enforce the UN sanctions was appropriate. But military enforcement of sanctions is in fact realistic if they enjoy broad support and respect. Enforcement is feasible only if there is broad voluntary adherence to the sanctions (which there was in this case), and if infractions or attempted infractions are the exception. In the event of "wholesale sanctions-busting," attempts at military enforcement would likely be futile.

Ms. Gray put it differently, saying our position precluded military action in the case of "blatant sanction-busting." In fact, our position was and is that in case of clear and blatant violations of sanctions, in a context of general adherence, monitoring and enforcement are both possible and positive. The problem arises when violations are wholesale – in other words when the situation is not one of general adherence, but of general disregard for sanctions. Then enforcement is futile.

This is analogous to police-law enforcement. Police are equipped to deal with "blatant" but isolated or occasional law-breaking, e.g. traffic violations, robberies, smuggling and so on. If, however, you have a situation of general disregard for the law, wholesale violation of laws, it soon becomes clear that the problem is not lack of enforcement capability, but lack of respect for the law. Piling on the firepower at that point does little good.

In the case of drug trafficking, for example, it is broadly understood that the wholesale violations won't be solved by more policing,

but by programmes to deal with demand and the conditions that lead to the wholesale disregard of the law. The point I was making about enforcing sanctions was the same one. As long as sanctions were generally respected and adhered to, as they were, there was a genuine role for military enforcement – dealing with blatant violators. But if the international community acted in general disregard for the sanctions, then clearly there would be no possibility of making them effective through sheer brute force.

Peace & Security was certainly right in wanting to examine the role of the Canadian peace movement in the context of Canada's response to the Gulf crisis – it's a job that still needs to be done. *Ernie Regehr, Project Ploughshares, Waterloo*

A blow to the peace movement

■ "Home Grown Skirmishes" by Charlotte Gray is very disturbing in its denigration of the attempts by the peace movement to provide another way of looking at international affairs in general and of the Gulf War in particular. The author would appear not to have consulted any of the vast literature produced by various peace movement organizations in Canada and in the US. Had she done so she would have seen that much of their focus is on prevention of violence in the resolution of conflict and the need to address problems of poverty, environmental destruction, torture and terror throughout the world.

Most groups want strict control of the arms trade and many would like to see an end to all military production except in very limited situations. The arms trade is seen as wasteful and harmful to all concerned since it is a mis-allocation of scarce resources, especially in the face of such grave human needs.

Nobody in the peace movement feels they have all the answers nor do they pretend to do so. Why should they be unfairly characterized as being unequal to the task of finding alternatives to military actions after they have started? Charlotte Gray's article is a blow to the peace movement. We thought that the dialogue had been elevated to a higher level in the pursuit of a peaceful world. *Jean Smith, Peace Magazine, Toronto*

What does Canada need armed forces for anyway?

■ In "Defence Policy For a Nice Country" (Autumn 1991), Desmond Morton describes the problems of designing a defence policy for Canada on the assumption that we must prepare for future military conflicts. I would ask: why? Do we need a military establishment in Canada to defend against invasion? Hardly. No country would attempt to invade Canada unless they were out for world conquest. And we couldn't stop them anyway.

Do we plan to forestall a possible future invasion of Canada by fighting abroad? If this is so, then

we must believe in fighting a nuclear war, since this is what would inevitably arise in such a scenario. Do we want to defend Canadian interests abroad? Mr. Morton must think so, for he says: "This matters to a Canada that depends utterly on world trade for its standard of living." In other words he is suggesting that we kill people in a war to maintain our living standard.

Do we need a military force to fight for world peace? I would agree that Canada could contribute to a UN police force but it should be strictly under UN command. Canada could contribute personnel or simply money.

Do we want a military force in Canada in case of domestic unrest? Mr. Morton answers: "Canadians are nearly unanimous in rejecting force as an option." If it takes an army to put down an uprising then we are obviously on the wrong track. Maintaining a military for such an eventuality is an admission of political failure.

The pragmatic answer to these five questions is that we don't need a military establishment at all, except as an emergency response team. A trained group of people could deal with all man-made or natural emergencies in a national context. Such a body need not have submarines, tanks, bomber aircraft, long-range naval craft or anything designed to fight a war.

E.P. Wilson, Gabriola, B.C. □

Barton Awards Programme

■ The Institute invites applications for its Awards Programme, designated the Barton Awards in honour of its first Chairman, former UN Ambassador William Barton.

The programme is open to both academics and non-academics who wish to enter or continue studies in the field of international peace and security. The programme is intended to encourage expertise and scholarship in that area by supporting Canadians and permanent residents who wish to pursue their studies at institutions abroad or in Canada.

The Institute expects to make eleven awards: two fellowships valued at up to \$30,000 and nine scholarships at up to \$14,000 each. Applications will be assessed by an independent selection committee and decisions will be announced in May 1992.

Applicants must be Canadian citizens or permanent residents whose experience or academic qualifications enable them to pursue advanced study.

The deadline for applications for the 1992-1993 academic year is 1 February 1992.

For further information and application forms please write to: The Barton Awards Programme, Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, 360 Albert Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1R 7X7

Peace and Security Competitions Fund Procedures and Deadlines

■ For the semi-annual competition with deadline of 30 June 1992, the Fund will be interested in receiving applications to support projects that would make thoughtful contributions to issues related to international peace and security on the 125th anniversary of Confederation in 1992. It is our understanding that Canadians will be invited by Parliament to reflect in their various fields on the record of opportunity and achievement in that record and on challenges for the future.

30 June for an October decision

30 November for a March decision

Write to: Peace and Security Competitions Fund, c/o CIIPS