

ment that the new Institute strive, in all its activities, to discern the specific part that Canada could play in reducing tensions and restoring stability.

All the witnesses who appeared before the Standing Committee took as their starting point the question of how to identify the most promising route leading to international peace and security, since the general direction that the Institute should take would depend upon how one answered that question. An analysis of the testimony reveals three distinct trends:

- 1) some pleaded the need to maintain a credible deterrent without thereby excluding simultaneous action in other areas, such as arms control or even disarmament;
- 2) others emphasized the necessity to strive relentlessly for complete, radical and unconditional disarmament, in the belief that the mere possession of weapons elicited an irresistible temptation to use them;
- 3) a third group argued that acting, whether negatively or positively, upon the armaments equation alone could produce nothing more than a simple absence of war and that for the world to attain real peace, one must try to understand the underlying causes of international conflict.

It will be seen from the above that whereas the participants in groups 1 and 2 placed great importance on the question of security, whether they believed that this could be achieved by maintaining a plausible deterrent or by pursuing a policy of total disarmament, the third group emphasized the need to deal with the underlying cause of all conflict, namely injustice. It was only by doing this, in their opinion, that "peace" in any real sense could be attained. The fact that both words "peace" and "security" were used to identify the Institute gave expression to the extent to which the discussion in the committee centred on those two ideas.

The committee also considered whether the Institute should play an activist or "interventionist" role on either the national or the international scene. Should it promote specific policies or should it confine itself to disseminating the results of its research? A number of suggestions were made on this subject which are discussed later in this paper.

SECURITY

a) *Security Through Deterrence*

None of those who provided the committee with either oral or written testimony advocated unlimited expenditure on defence.

Admiral Robert Falls, former Chairman of the NATO Military Committee declared himself to be "a very firm believer in deterrence" because "at the

moment, there does not seem to be any answer or any alternative that would keep the peace in the world." He was concerned, however, about the risks involved in pursuing this policy beyond certain limits — "how many times does one need to have overkill?" In his view it was sufficient to have at one's disposal the nuclear retaliatory strike capability provided by an undetectable strategic submarine force. He wondered whether other nuclear systems were not superfluous and could be disposed of without significant risk, unilaterally if necessary. He believed that the Canadian military took "an objective view" of such issues, unlike the military of some other nations who were "automatically" against "anything that had to do with the lessening or trade-offs" in weapons systems.

In the same vein, General George Bell, President of the Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies spoke of "the need for comprehensive political, economic and military security Contemporary strategy in the international debate has, for some time, been centered on strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons and conventional forces and the military balance between East and West We are becoming increasingly aware of the need for a comprehensive Western Alliance Strategy, comprising the political and economic dimensions, as well as the military dimension."

Mr. Arthur Menzies, formerly Canada's Ambassador to NATO and Ambassador for Disarmament, also underlined the need for deterrence; in addition, he spoke in favour of arms control measures and of policies aimed at disarmament and the settlement of conflicts. He summarized his views as follows:

" . . . the Canadian security policy is (was) based on three foundations of peace: first, deterrence of war through the collective security arrangements of NATO and NORAD; second, a persistent search for equitable and verifiable arms control and disarmament agreements; and thirdly, active participation in and support for the peaceful settlement of disputes and peacekeeping supporting that, and a collective effort to resolve the underlying economic and social causes of international tensions and disputes."

Mr. Menzies also spoke of bringing out:

" . . . the Canadian dimension of international peace."

In reply to a question on unilateral disarmament he emphasized that Canada would have to go