crisis, might also provide clues to the techniques we need to build the durable security systems which will prevent crises from happening at all. The strategic objective is to encourage countries to accept international codes of conduct that can be seen to support national interests — but, as importantly, support the international interest in peace and stability.

In deliberately broadening the traditional definition of security, I do not dismiss military questions, or the notion that war poses the ultimate security threat. But I believe that war is a result of insecurity, rather than a cause. Therefore, the best way to avert war is to address the sources of insecurity. The more we learn about those sources, about the linkages between them, about the way they build towards crisis and conflict, the more we must adjust our security policies and instruments to address them early on.

Allow me to conclude by suggesting a few guidelines which I believe should be considered in the determination of appropriate international action to meet the security challenges of the 1990s.

First, there is the importance of clarity of purpose. If we look at a past success, like South Africa, what is most noteworthy is the clarity about the final objective sought by the international community, which, in turn, permitted tactical compromises along the way because the final goal was so clear.

Second, pragmatic architecture — building from the ground up, winning public support along the way, and expanding the range of those with stakes in making things work. If we think of the forerunners of the European Union, we see that it was practical agreements on steel, coal and atomic energy that provided the tangible foundations for additional steps.

Third, persistence. After decades, in which the Middle East and South Africa represented, in different ways, the most stubborn of problems, they now offer genuine grounds for optimism. This happened because the people who made the breakthroughs had a degree of patience and perseverance that is hard to imagine for those who demand instant solutions and instant results.

Fourth, building as widely as possible around a central focus. In the Middle East peace process, it is clear that the bilateral track holds the key to peace. But we should not overlook the multilateral track, where participating Middle East countries, as well as outside countries including Canada, meet in working groups focussed on specific regional issues. While regional approaches must await bilateral peace agreements, these working groups will discuss the specific proposals which must be the next steps taken towards regional security.