

reconnaissance force to look after that area and ensure that it is not in fact being annexed by other powers.

Professor McNaught: The kind of reconnaissance force that I have heard suggested for the northern reaches and which you would need, based on the argument that the Americans do not accept the sector theory of geography and that the Russians may use floating icefields and the rest of it, is roughly the same kind that you have to police the fisheries, is it not?

In other words, if the Americans decide to move in there they will move in there; and if the Russians decide to move in there they will move in there. And I have yet to hear any persuasive arguments advanced by our Department of National Defence since they abandoned their plans for defence against the United States that there is very much we could do about it.

Mr. Cafik: Thank you. I had a number of other questions but I think I should leave them.

The Chairman: Mr. Harkness, then Mr. Ryan.

Mr. Harkness: Professor, would you agree that your paper here really is a statement of the pacifist position and constitutes an argument that Canada should take a pacifist stance in international defence policy?

Professor McNaught: Well, sir, pacifism is a difficult thing to define. Woodrow Wilson has been called a pacifist by his principal biographer, and yet he conducted a fairly substantial military operation abroad and in Mexico. I would not define the position that I am putting forward as a pacifist stand because I think "pacifist" has to have a fairly precise meaning and that means a person who is never willing to fight.

Mr. Harkness: Would you agree then that you are putting forward the position of disarmament or more or less complete disarmament?

Professor McNaught: Yes.

Mr. Harkness: As a historian looking at the situation between the two great wars, does it not give you some cause for concern that the pacifist feeling that existed during that period, particularly in the United States and Great Britain, and as a result the disarmament of those two countries, was a very strong reason for—in fact perhaps the only basic reason why the Second World War broke out?

Professor McNaught: Yes, I think I would agree that, in other words, Professor Underhill was wrong then

and he is wrong now. That is to say—I say that with great respect; he is my mentor in some ways—that it was wrong to not prepare, to not make an alliance with Russia when we should have made an alliance with Russia to prevent the Nazi explosion and we should have contributed more to that alliance militarily than in fact we did. My argument, however, is that the entire nature of war has changed. We now are involved with a weapons system which has revolutionised the whole concept of the use of power in the world and in such a way that the kind of contribution which we could have made effectively in the twenties and thirties is no longer open to us.

Mr. Harkness: But would you not agree that the basic situation still exists that disarmament on the part of a considerable number of nations invites aggression from those which are armed? In other words, we get back to a large extent to what Mr. Cafik was talking about when he brought up this statement of yours that there is no defence in a nuclear war and therefore you should do nothing about it. Is it not a fact that the real defence against a nuclear war, as Mr. Cafik pointed out, is the deterrent power of both nuclear and conventional armies? This is the greatest guarantee, in fact the only guarantee we have against such a war taking place.

Professor McNaught: Well, of course, I disagree with that proposition. I do not regard it as a guarantee. I believe that it is open, and progressively open, to accident or electronic failure. I do not accept most of the arguments put forward about feeling safe, not in the ultimate sense. I do not see it as a guarantee at all, and I do see a very substantial movement towards disarmament as a far greater guarantee which will certainly have to be undertaken in the context of increasing UN police activity in the minor areas.

● 1255

Mr. Harkness: Do you really believe that if the western countries got rid of their nuclear arms and got rid of their conventional arms we would not almost immediately have the situation where the Communist bloc would use their arms in order to, we will say, take over the entire world?

Professor McNaught: Well, sir, I have not suggested that we should say to the United States, "Destroy all your weapons." What I have said is that the limited area in which Canada can in any circumstances have real influence is not along the line of contributing to an armaments race; it is along the line of saying convincingly to other people, "Do not join it." The problem is limitation and we are not going to solve that problem by supporting an alliance-based arms race.