

How the NDP sees it

These assumptions are based on a belief that the Americans know best about strategic, nuclear and other issues, that they know best about areas such as Central America, that the American analysis and assessment of any given situation will be correct and reflect Canadian interests fully, and that the Americans will share their knowledge and assessments fully when asked to do so.

Canadian policy makers and governments, from Mackenzie King to this day, continue to hold these beliefs and assumptions. They hold them in the face of overwhelming contradictory evidence — evidence that the Americans do not know best (MIRVing warheads, ending SALT, Star Wars), that their analyses and assessments are not always correct (Vietnam), that they do not reflect Canadian interests (the Olympic boycott, Grenada) and that they do not share their knowledge, assessments or plans (the entire history of NORAD up to the 1985 revelations of plans to deploy nuclear weapons here).

While Canada from time to time has diverged from enthusiastic support for specific US policies — by maintaining trade with Cuba, and late, muted criticism of US bombing in Cambodia, for example — Canada has never taken a fully independent course, or a course in concert with countries other than the US, on any fundamental

foreign or defence policy issue. Lost opportunities range from Pierre Trudeau's dismissal of the neutron bomb as a "European matter," to Mark MacGuigan's "quiet acquiescence" on Central America, to Erik Nielsen's "prudent" acceptance of Star Wars research and Brian Mulroney's "benefit of doubt" support of US policies in general.

So the question is not so much one of decisions being made in Washington rather than Ottawa. There is a more fundamental question as to whether Canadian policy makers have the will, interest and ability to make decisions for Canadians about critical foreign policy and defence matters. It is this question, given the poor record of successive Liberal and Conservative governments, that forms the basis of NDP international policy making and parliamentary activities.

Willy Brandt has called democratic socialism "the humanitarian ideal of this century." Internationalism is part of that ideal. Arms spending must be diverted to human needs. The division of wealth between societies, as well as within them, must be attacked in bold and imaginative ways. The preservation and extension of basic human rights must be a constant struggle. Such views, coupled with a continuing call by the NDP for greater independence, offers Canada a real alternative to old party foreign policy. □

An idea for Canada

Where the Hot Lines cross

Canada and the superpowers

by Charles-Philippe David

After years of complacency in Canada about the issues related to our national security, the topics of defence and nuclear weapons are now high on the government political agenda. A chief dilemma, however, of Canadian policy towards international security problems is that Canada is a difficult place from which to try to influence questions of war and peace. For one thing, our country sits right in between the superpowers thus making most military issues affecting our security largely dependent upon the actions of the United States and the Soviet Union. Canada has limited ways to protect itself from these actions, and it inevitably has the defence policy of its geography. Under these conditions, it is imperative for the Canadian government to take the strongest action it can in order to achieve a balance between our geographical "limitations" and the need for imaginative political solutions. Thus can the government show the population that indeed it cares about our survival by never being short of ideas to promote lasting nuclear peace in the world.

In this article I shall review those security problems and examine the limits on Canadian solutions, then offer one proposal for improving the dialogue between Washington and Moscow.

Two security problems for Canada

Canada, as it enters 1986, is confronted with new and serious strategic problems. One issue is the arms race in offensive nuclear weapons. The ongoing modernization of superpower nuclear arsenals — always a worrisome trend in the opinion of many Canadians — is likely to entwine Canada more than it already is with the results of that modernization. For example, so far our country has never been involved as a territorial platform to launch ballistic missiles carrying nuclear warheads toward the United States or the Soviet Union. This geostrategic fact could now change because of the Soviet deployment of a potent and credible nuclear submarine force, which may move free from detection or surveillance in some of the Canadian areas of the Arctic. According to Harriet Critchley, in an article published in the Fall 1984 issue of *International Journal*, the Soviet submarine *Typhoon*, for instance, could be positioned in those waters in such a way that its SS-N-20 missiles, each carrying between six and nine warheads, would reach all potential American targets, even some

Charles-Philippe David is Professor of International Relations at the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean, Quebec, specializing in strategic studies.