

There seems to be a certain randomness about the selection of subjects. Obviously there has to be a chapter on arms control and East-West relations, and all Fen Osler Hampson's valiant efforts to paint Canada's part in bright colors only emphasizes what a bit-actor we are in that drama. Ted English had a good idea to contrast Canadian and US interests around the Pacific Rim. But Michael Dolan's chapter on South-South trade is an odd

choice. He has to pull harder than a Newfoundland fisherman to bring Canada in on that line.

Which leads one to the omissions. Why is there nothing on our Africa policy? Why is there nothing about off-shore Canada, its problems over maritime boundaries and fishing quotas? Why nothing about the environment, in the year of Chernobyl and acid rain arguments with Washington and the Brundtland Commission? In the 16-

page chronology, there are only five environmental entries and no mention of Mrs. Brundtland's team touring Canada. Oh well, there's always the 1987 volume — and *that* should be exciting!

Clyde Sanger is an Ottawa writer. His latest book is Ordering the Oceans: The Making of the Law of the Sea.

Letters to the Editor

Sir,

Professor Jockel protests a bit much. I did not accuse his book (*Canada and Collective Security: Odd Man Out*) of advocating policies favored by the American government, or NATO. And I questioned no one's patriotism. My three careless words — "perhaps too long" — should have been fully explained. They referred to attitudes, not specific policies.

Despite our intimate, and generally beneficial alliance, a huge difference obviously exists between the world views characteristic of the United States — a superpower — and Canada, a modest middle power. Americans tend to be obsessed with power. Canadians are more prone to think in terms of diplomacy and peaceful settlement. Professor Jockel has studied Canada for many years without ever grasping that essential difference. He remains incorrigibly American, and I trust he does not regard that as an insult.

The puzzle is why Professor

Sokolsky, a Canadian, agreed to co-author such a savage attack on his country's defence policy, one replete with such phrases as "riding almost free," "just barely on the bus" and "shirking." He could have held these views before his long period of study and teaching in Washington and, if so, I apologize. In my thirty years in Canada's academe, however, I have rarely encountered such reverence for military power, or contempt for Canada.

Many of my colleagues are still agonizing over the American influence over our universities. Recently particular concern has been expressed (see this journal, May/June, September/October and November/December 1986)) about the impact on our foreign policy of reliance on American textbooks and professors. I have consistently contested this concern and argued that our teaching of international politics has benefitted greatly by American scholarship.

The book under review makes me wonder whether I have been right.

Peyton Lyon
Ottawa

Sir,

In his review of *Amnesty International Report 1986 (International Perspectives, Sept/Oct 1987)* Tom Sloan is troubled by one "niggling question":

It somehow seems appropriate to use the same cool tone to describe the legal execution of convicted murderers as one does to detail the wholesale murder and torture of dissidents.

Amnesty International condemns torture and the death penalty in all cases without exception. In our view, there are no circumstances whatsoever — even national emergencies — that can justify the infliction of pain and death by a government upon the prisoners under its jurisdiction.

Amnesty International's opposition to both torture and the death penalty is based on the same article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Article 5) which states that no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In the view of our organization, an execution — the total extinction of a human personality — is the cruelest, the most inhuman and degrading punishment of all. We believe that it is torture carried to its ultimate conclusion.

Robert Goodfellow
President
Canadian Section (English speaking)
Amnesty International
Ottawa