

(Why?)

probability analysis, that is, by a rigorous, scientific method. This means that deterrence is an unscientific doctrine.

If deterrence is unscientific, then military power isn't a rational approach to international relations. Under these circumstances, pacifism and nonviolent resistance become rational alternatives. Science demonstrates by an indirect method that pacifism and nonviolence are the only rational approaches to international conflict.

Such a situation completely changes the rhetorical context within which a pacifist political party can be developed. Now, the military alternative to pacifism is demonstrably impractical. Pacifism and nonviolence become scientifically viable, if not as proven theories, at least as hypotheses that it's reasonable to experiment with.

When a scientific case can be made for pacifism and nonviolence, the potential for growth of a pacifist political party is virtually unlimited. While science can't answer all of life's questions, its demonstrated ability to roll back ignorance and impotence are so impressive that nearly everyone, regardless of his or her political persuasion, respects science. A pacifist third party has the potential for virtually unlimited growth because it's the most scientific party that can be created.

Similar reasoning shows why non-pacifist parties can't differ significantly among themselves in regard to their "peace" platforms. All of these parties accept the principle of deterrence. Therefore, all of them are war parties. This doesn't mean that they advocate war - almost all political parties advocate peace - it simply means that their policies will bring war. Once it's established that deterrence leads to war, then the only question that remains about parties that advocate deterrence is, How fast will their policies make war come? Some deterrence strategies may postpone catastrophic nuclear war longer than others. That's not a significant difference, particularly when no insights exist concerning how long a particular strategy will postpone catastrophic war.

For these reasons, a pacifist party can expect to grow steadily, and eventually become the majority party, and the differences between non-pacifist parties and candidates, on the question of preventing war, can't be significant. That's why joining and working for the United States Pacifist Party is the most reasonable political action that

anyone can take. It's the only action that can make the avoidance of nuclear war probable, and leave open the possibility of humanitarian development in every field of human need.

(Getting ↓) ~~~~~

"victors", and none of the experts disagreed with Robert McNamara's statement that nuclear wars couldn't be kept limited, but the movie didn't clearly establish why deterrence would fail. The scenario, or sequence of events that led to the war, could be dismissed as not inevitable.

This weakness in the peace movement came up a few nights earlier in "Nightline" interviews that Ted Koppel had with a representative of the British peace movement, and a U.S. State Department official. The peace movement representative said that they missiles shouldn't be installed because they were "first strike" weapons. The official said they weren't, and observed that they were necessary for deterrence. The peace activist had no response to this. Her problem may have been that a large number of activists in the peace movement believe in deterrence. What they object to is arsenals that they think are larger than "necessary."

The same problem is shared by the "Freeze" movement in this country. Although a freeze could end the arms race, a very important accomplishment, it would leave intact deterrence. For this reason, it doesn't get to the heart of the matter, and hasn't been able to change the opinions of much of the population, and most elected officials.

If the peace movement is to make steady gains, end the arms race, and prevent nuclear war, it must focus on deterrence. It must show people why deterrence won't work; why it's probably one of the most dangerous policies that a nation could adopt.

The strongest argument against deterrence is provided by mathematical probability analysis. Once it can be demonstrated that deterrence follows the same failure probability laws as "Russian roulette", deterrence is no longer rational. It dooms all nations that adopt it. Furthermore, the argument is irrefutable. Once people understand it, they can't be dissuaded from the belief. If the peace movement focussed on discrediting deterrence, it would begin to remove the keystone of the structure of rationalizations that lead government officials to continue the arms race, and the public to acquiesce in that policy.