IN THIS ISSUE

For the first time in decades Canadians are engaging in a serious debate about international affairs and national security. Important questions have been raised about Canada's place in world affairs and the ends and means of national defence. This is all to the good; for far too long in Canada, defence has been treated like a skeleton in a closet of which the family no longer wishes to speak. More than a decade has passed since the last defence policy review. As a result public opinion got ahead of the government and the government has been playing catch-up ball ever since. The Canadian public demanded answers to the important but neglected questions—what are we getting for our defence dollars? And more important, it demanded to know why we spend those dollars in the first place; what are we defending; against whom; and to what end?

Attention currently is focused, at least in part, on the Navy. The government has just embarked on a major shipbuilding program. Long before any of the new frigates is launched, Canadians deserve an adequate explanation of how those ships are to be used. This, in turn, demands a thorough explanation of the Navy's place in national strategy. The Senate Sub-committee on National Defence has already completed a major investigation of the subject, but the debate is far from over. In this issue Joel Sokolsky examines the Canadian Navy's role in NATO, within the context of NATO as a maritime alliance. He concludes that the Canadian Navy retains a significant, if traditional, importance in the alliance in its convoy escort/anti-submarine roles. He urges the government to expand the frigate building program three-fold and to double the size of the maritime patrol aircraft fleet.

Meanwhile, in western Canada a debate of an entirely different sort is underway in the educational system and in the Ukrainian Canadian community. More than fifty years have passed since the great famine in the Ukraine, and the memory of that event continues to haunt its survivors and their descendants. The current debate is about the way the history of the famine should be taught. Bohdan Krawchenko's contribution to the debate places the responsibility for the famine squarely in the lap of Stalinist economic policy—the forced collectivization of agriculture in the region. This is hardly likely to be the last word on so emotive a subject, but it should provide a thought-provoking contribution to the ongoing debate.

In May of this year the New Ireland Forum recommended that political development in Ulster and the Irish Republic be pursued in the direction of peaceful evolution towards a unitary Irish state. The recommendation was probably the easiest part of the process. Norman Frankel's essay on electoral politics in Ulster suggests that taking the recommendation any further might be nearly impossible in the po-

larised community. Indeed, he sees little hope for the kind of bipartisan consensus-building that would be a prerequisite to any peaceful resolution of the Irish problem.

Finally, Efraim Inbar explores the "special" relationship between a superpower and a small ally, a subject of obvious interest to Canadians. In this case, he looks at recent trends in U.S.-Israeli relations which, until 1973, were almost universally assumed to be satisfactory and unshakable. Events since have shown otherwise, and Inbar identifies the sensitive points of tension between the two. He concludes that neither country is interested in abandoning the relationship, but also that skilful diplomacy, on Israel's part especially, will be required to minimize tensions in the future.