

(A CHALLENGING CHOICE, Con.)

the main cause of arms races.

The belief that military strength can prevent war generates the policy of "deterrence". Deterrence is the theory that if you can convince your enemy that it will be more costly to attack than to remain at peace, the enemy won't attack. Since the destructiveness of nuclear weapons have made it impossible for nuclear powers to "win" nuclear wars in any meaningful sense, nuclear arsenals tend to be justified almost entirely on the grounds of their deterrent value. Deterrence has become the most important element, the "cornerstone", in the foreign policies of the superpowers. National leaders everywhere believe that peace must and can be built on deterrence.

But deterrence has at least two problems, neither of which is yet recognized to a sufficient degree by national leaders. A moral problem is that it involves the willingness to vindictively kill hundreds of millions of people. A practical problem is that it won't work indefinitely. Deterrence eventually tends to fail because it involves repeatedly risking war. This failure probability, or "inherent instability", of deterrence can be demonstrated "scientifically" by mathematical probability analysis. The widely used probability equation

$$P = 1 - (1-p)^n$$

(where n represents the number of repetitions, or time) shows that if an event is repeatedly risked, the probability of the event happening approaches certainty (Deterrence strategists may have overlooked this practical difficulty because they always think of deterrence only in terms of the psychological effect of weapons systems on the thinking of the "enemy", rather than trying to imagine all of the ways that deterrence systems might break down). Mathematical probability analysis - scientific analysis - also shows why history is largely a cycle of wars. In their quest for peace through military force and "balances of power", nations have practiced deterrence, and deterrence, being inherently unstable, has always broken down. Nuclear deterrence, which has generated arsenals of nuclear weapons large enough to destroy the human species, tends to break down into catastrophic nuclear war. The probability equation shows that nuclear deterrence is a "Faustian bargain", in which a period of "peace" is purchased at

the cost of eventual, catastrophic nuclear war.

Nuclear deterrence policies, although they may be adopted as "peace" policies, in reality ultimately are catastrophic nuclear war policies. This is a scientific fact.

An important difference between the United States Pacifist Party, and all other political parties, including the Democratic Party, is that the USPP recognizes this fact, and other parties as yet do not. Thus, although the Democratic Party advocates a "freeze", and would scrap the B-1 bomber, and MX missile programs, it still bases its foreign policy on deterrence. On page 46, the 1984 Democratic National Platform reads, "The Democratic Party believes that the purpose of nuclear weapons is to deter war, not to fight it." Consequently, no matter how sincere Democratic Party leaders may be in their desire for peace, they are locked into a policy - nuclear deterrence, that will make nuclear war probable.

In addition to the Democratic Party's current support for deterrence, there's the Democrats' decades long record of supporting military policies, and their inability to keep their peace promises. President Truman authorized the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and inaugurated the strategic nuclear bombing of civilian centers, when he could have taken a more humane route by at least demonstrating the bomb's power to the Japanese in way that wouldn't have destroyed human life. Truman stated that he "lost no sleep" over the decision.

John F. Kennedy established the "Green Berets", authorized the Bay of Pigs invasion, and reported that he "cried" when it failed. Democratic Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara engineered the policy of "mutual assured destruction" (MAD), and implemented escalation of the Vietnam War.

Lyndon Johnson collaborated in the "Gulf of Tonkin incident", escalated the Vietnam War, promised the American people he would bring peace to Vietnam, and sought peace by further escalating the bombing, and sending half a million U.S. troops to Vietnam. Richard Nixon, and the Republican Party, extricated us from Vietnam, not the Democratic Party.

Jimmy Carter began his Presidency seeking arms reduction agreements, and ended

(Continued page -8-)