

communists, to be contemptuous of their own sensitivity, and then releasing them back into society?

What of the psychological costs? The fear, the stress, the sense of hopelessness? What are the consequences to our culture of having whole generations grow up in the nuclear shadow, not entirely sure there will be a future? Is this part of the reason our society is ignoring the ominous trends for the future, because we have a basic loss of faith that there will even be a future?

To all of these costs of the war system to Canadians and to humanity we must add the cost of war itself, because the war system does ultimately produce wars. There have been some 200 wars since the end of the Second World War. They have killed 25 million people. Countless millions more have had their lives destroyed in other ways.

And finally, there is the cost of an ongoing and increasing risk, through accident or mania, of nuclear holocaust and the final destruction of our civilization and perhaps the whole of the evolutionary process.

How can we accommodate ourselves to these costs? How can we begin to justify them as "regrettable, but necessary" to the maintenance of deterrence and security? Do these costs not warrant the fullest possible mobilization of the intellectual and political resources of every person, of Canada, of all countries, to create a world free of war?

World federalists believe there is one paramount question which must be asked again and again and again in the framing of a new Canadian foreign policy: *"Does it strive to do absolutely everything Canada can do as a country to end the Cold War and the war system?"*

**Recommendation 1-1:** That the paramount consideration in the framing of Canadian foreign policy be that it strive to do everything Canada can do as a country to end the Cold War and the war system.

### C) Nuclear Strategic Planning and the Abandonment of Reason

We will not argue with the assertion that nuclear weapons have helped prevent war with the Soviet Union since the Second World War. Probably they have, although the existence of the U.N. has surely been equally a factor, since the U.N. has helped extricate the superpowers from the show-downs they have had despite their nuclear arsenals, or even because of them, as during the Cuban missile crisis.

What must be challenged, however, are the views:

- that deterrence can be a satisfactory basis of security for the indefinite future
- that deterrence is the only option we have
- that Canada's security depends on supporting the U.S. definition of deterrence in its management of its arms race with the Soviet Union.

These points will be addressed here and throughout this paper.

The first problem with deterrence is that the strategic doctrines of the U.S. and the Soviet Union, are based on a series of mutually agreed upon, but ultimately unsupportable