

through "quite a protracted process" to detach itself from existing ties with the United States and NATO and that to maintain a "non-aligned" position such as that of Sweden would be very expensive and could mean "paying three times as much, at least, for defence as we are now".

George Ignatieff, also a former ambassador to NATO, said that while he did not think "deterrence has completely failed", "deterrence in itself creates the treadmill of ever-increasing armament." It has also created greater reliance on automation, which in turn can and does carry risks of war by accident.

What, then, is the solution? Mr. Ignatieff as well as the "Science for Peace" association of which he is a member, recommended an Institute: a) which, through scientific studies, independently carried out, would challenge the strategic or tactical rationale for the various weapons systems deployed for defence with a view to eliminating those elements that are particularly dangerous and destabilizing; and b) which would not restrict its research to military questions, but would exercise its imagination and have the courage to challenge traditional ideas (mainly held by the military or diplomatic establishments, interested as these are in preserving the status quo), and to open new avenues, for instance by trying to identify the specific contributions that the political, social, economic, psychological and ethical sciences could make towards international stability.

Later, in the debate on the Bill, Pauline Jewett of the New Democratic Party accepted the clause allowing the Institute to study defence as such, although she indicated that she would have preferred not to have seen the inclusion of this subject matter among the main preoccupations of the new organization.

From the foregoing it may be concluded that none of the witnesses who supported deterrence argued that it was an absolute value *per se*: on the contrary, everyone recognized, either explicitly or implicitly, that deterrence should be accompanied with measures designed to avoid fear and instability, and to promote better means of control.

b) *Security Through Disarmament*

Several organizations opposed the policy of deterrence described above, stating forcefully that security could only be achieved through disarmament; that weapons should be banned as the *sine qua non* of warfare, and that no defence was possible against thermonuclear attack. Consequently it would be unreasonable, in their view, for the Institute to waste time studying insoluble problems; the Institute would do better to concentrate its efforts on changing attitudes and diverting the enormous sums of money currently poured into the

bottomless pit of an impossible defence towards meeting the crying needs of the under-developed world.

Jim Stark, Director of Operation Dismantle, talked of "security through disarmament" as a "revolutionary" idea with which it was very hard for people to deal. He believed that the least qualified to pursue the implications of this concept were "those with a vested interest in the military establishment."

Frank Kennedy, President of End the Arms Race spoke of the need for "Canada's policies to be consistent with achieving world peace through disarmament." He believed Canada should help to freeze the arms race by refusing to test the Cruise Missile. It should also set "an example in becoming a nuclear weapon-free zone."

Anne Adelson of the Toronto Disarmament Network maintained disarmament was unlikely to take place "if it must wait for the initiatives of governments and experts." "Its precondition is simply a constructive interplay between the people and those taking momentous decisions about armament and conducting the negotiations." In view of this she felt it was "extremely important" that the "Institute not be isolated from the public at large and the Canadian peace movements" and that it not be "solely responsible to Parliament" which might lead it "to produce information that supports its (Parliament's) policies".

Finally, other people like Mr. William Epstein, for many years a member of the UN Secretariat, while making it clear they were not in favour of unilateral disarmament, were emphatic that unilateral initiatives should be taken for the purpose of promoting disarmament.

c) *Security Through Conflict Resolution*

Various witnesses expressed surprise that the section of the Bill dealing with the role of the new organization did not contain anything to suggest that peace lay beyond the boundaries of research restricted to issues of arms control, disarmament and defence. They argued that global conditions made it urgent that the dialogue between the superpowers and their allies should deal with more than the mere symptoms of the current international crisis, which was what discussions about armaments amounted to. It was essential to take up those issues which were at the core of East-West problems, forming the Great Divide that separated the two worlds: ideological, cultural or economic "imperialism" of all kinds and the serious tensions generated between Governments and the governed, and between various political communities. A number of witnesses spoke eloquently on this theme.