

is confrontational rather than conciliatory, and thus that Canadian participation is a dangerous break with our distinguished and valued peacekeeping tradition. The discomfort on both scores is valid, but it misses the significance of this historic turning point. Peacekeeping, valuable and honourable as it has been, was never more than a second-best response by the UN, a means (in a very small proportion of conflicts) of holding a truce, usually after aggression and war had taken place. Peacekeeping was not even dreamt of by the founders of the UN, which was why Lester Pearson and others had to invent it in the case of Suez as a contribution to freezing a conflict which had not been preventable or containable.

The action that the UN is now mandating in the Gulf is much more what the UN Charter had always envisaged, with the exception that the advance arrangements for military planning as spelled out in Articles 43 through 48 have never been acted upon, early victims of the Cold-War freeze. What the international community is now doing, with the opportunity provided by the East-West thaw and under the pressure of a major crisis, is to feel its way through to implementing the UN's basic preventative and enforcement functions. If successful, this would render much peacekeeping unnecessary. In this conflict, the UN has directly branded the aggressor and taken direct action against it. If Canada's future peacekeeping role is affected by involvement in this nation, it is only because the UN's own role has changed.

In these circumstances, did Canada, a Security Council member, which has been the first contributor to the UN's past efforts at action for peace and security in the past, have any option of standing aside when the world body was able to move for the first time to do the full job? Canada lent a certain additional multilateral legitimacy to the effort by virtue of its record, and it was important for us to do so, as it was for significant numbers of Arab and other nations to join and dispel any impression that this might be a "Western imperialist" undertaking.

Have Canada and other such countries accepted other risks in doing so, especially the risk that the United States, Saudi Arabian and other governments most heavily