

Mr. Cafik: Yes.

**Professor McNaught:** Therefore, to build up alliances based upon this kind of incredibly intricate electronic system of devices and controls, in which you say you have a balance of terror—and which is not a balance because the United States says we have to maintain our superiority—is not credible, because within that system all of the leaders of the great powers say that there is a real danger of accident and that that is the way in which nuclear war will come. In fact, Mr. Kennedy went even further and said there could probably be a mathematical formula by which you could predict when it would come.

**Mr. Cafik:** In view of this, what is the solution? Do you suggest that all countries on this side of the sort of war of nerves, on the west, should unilaterally disarm and disband their associations with one another for mutual defence?

● 1240

**Professor McNaught:** I agree with you that we find ourselves in a kind of Greek tragedy. As I said previously, I am not questioning the good faith of most of the people who construct and maintain the system, but I am saying that because we can contribute nothing substantial to it, and because all the other methods of containing it and rolling it back as a potential end-of-the-world system have failed within the military-alliance approach, we owe it to the world to strike out on a different line. I am not saying that only the countries in the west should do it. I am talking of the country we can influence.

**Mr. Cafik:** I find a little inconsistency there. You say we should get out of NATO because we do not contribute anything to it. I would regard your argument as more consistent with your approach if you thought we should get out of it because we did contribute something to it.

**Professor McNaught:** You are quite right. When I put it that way there is an apparent disconnection there. I agree with you that we should get out of it if we did contribute something to it, yes.

**Mr. Cafik:** So that is not an argument. The amount of contribution is not germane to your argument.

**Professor McNaught:** It is in the sense that I reject that as a counter-argument. If it is said to us, as to anyone who supports non-alignment that we have to stay in because we contribute an important element to NATO, I say that is not in fact an argument. We do not, but even if we did we should get out.

**Mr. Cafik:** Then what is the argument for getting out? Do you feel that these military alliances such as

NATO and NORAD, discounting Canada's participation in them at the moment, have any material effect in eliminating, or decreasing, the possibility of a nuclear war?

**Professor McNaught:** On the basis of the fact that the alliance system, on our analysis of it and its history, seems to be (a) self-perpetuating and (b) mushrooming in its effect, when you relate very contemporary recent history to the history of the alliance system—say, prior to World War I—and the fact that the alliance system leads, by its own internal generating power and the condition of its armament race,—which still goes on—to increasing the likelihood of war, it seems to me that the argument is that the alliance system will lead us to war and that this is one of the principal reasons for working against its continuance.

**Mr. Cafik:** Then you think that not only should Canada withdraw from NATO but that NATO should be disbanded?

**Professor McNaught:** It is probably not up to Canadians to argue that case, but to take their own action and proceed on the assumption that actions do, in fact, speak louder than words. In other words, I think that an image and an initiative are what we should be pursuing and not a cloud of verbiage on what other people should do.

**Mr. Cafik:** I gather you are a historian. From an historical standpoint, bearing in mind that since World War II roughly 50 wars have been fought in the world and that none of them has really been in Europe, or has affected the real European theatre, would you conclude that that proved that NATO was not a deterrent to war, or perhaps that it was? Or would you not draw any conclusion?

**Professor McNaught:** I do not think it is necessary to draw definite conclusions from that, no. I think that it is quite clear that the fiftieth, if that is the exact number . . .

**Mr. Cafik:** I think it is a little more than that.

**Professor McNaught:** . . . of wars beyond Europe—certainly a number of those wars have been closely related to the competition of the existing alliance systems of Europe and America. The Korean war would certainly be an example. The Vietnamese war is clearly an example. As to whether or not NATO has prevented war in Europe, it seems to me you cannot make that conclusion just because wars so far have happened outside Europe.

● 1245

In other words, if NATO had not existed, there would still have been within the context of nuclear