

NATO; but many of the revisionists only use this as a secondary argument to the third theme, and are more explicit than Eayrs on the question of withdrawal.⁷ For example McPherson refers to "Canada's possible military contribution to the Western deterrent" as one "of rapidly decreasing importance," but this point is not central to his argument. Furthermore, while Eayrs is critical of the subordination of the military function of NATO to the political, McPherson comes to the opposite conclusion since it is only logical that "the military part of Canada's defence policy should be subordinated to the political part."⁸

A variation of the military participation theme is presented by the writings of Kenneth McNaught, who has always been opposed to nuclear weapons. Canadian acceptance of nuclear weapons means that "we contribute to an alliance which every hour of every day is prepared to obliterate civilization in circumstances which cannot be precisely defined...."

Nuclear weapons offer no real security and Canadian political parties have been avoiding the real alternatives: "namely continued endorsement of the nuclear arms race, or rejection of the nuclear alliance in favour of a militarily non-aligned role in the United Nations." Continued support of NATO offers no security to ourselves or our allies, and it tends to encourage proliferation.⁹ (One of the arguments of the traditionalists sees NATO restricting proliferation). Both Alistair Taylor of Queens University, who wants Canada out of the nuclear role and with it a phasing out of all regional commitments,¹⁰ and C.B. McPherson agree with McNaught on this point. However, the McNaught thesis presents the case in its most radical form. It should be mentioned that some of the traditionalists are also skeptical of the nuclear role, but do not take the argument to the point of withdrawal from NATO.

The main argument of the anti-NATO group, however, is the need to have an independent foreign policy, and the major premise for such a policy is freedom of action vis-a-vis the United States. Utilizing an independent foreign policy would "maximize the effectiveness of a realistic Canadian defence policy and Canada must above all make clear her independence of U.S. policy" according to C.B. McPherson. His discussion on this point is worth quoting at some length:

It is sometimes argued that by becoming a faithful and co-operative supporter of U.S. policies, taking our expected place in NATO and in any other arrangements that might be proposed by the U.S., we would gain significant influence with the U.S. It should now be apparent that this is not so. For a blanket endorsement of U.S. policy, or anything that appeared to be such endorsement, could only harm us with the other western and non-aligned nations, and so directly diminish our possible influence in the desired direction within the U.S. government itself.¹¹

While the McPherson argument is quite sophisticated others are not quite in the same category. John Warnock (University of Saskatchewan) sees the military alliance as being almost completely dominated by the U.S., and therefore Canada must withdraw since it "has no influence in international