

*Supply—External Affairs*

although in the process national and racial considerations appear to have become involved.

Neither do I wish to minimize, however, the significance of the nature of their differences over method. Communist China maintains an attitude of unreasoning militancy while the Soviet union proclaims the policy of peaceful coexistence. The communist dogma of the inevitability of war is thus at the very root of Sino-Soviet differences. How this conflict of view between the two leading nations competing for influence and domination of the international communist movement is resolved can have the most profound influence on the peace of the world for years to come.

There can be little doubt of the aggressive nature of current Chinese policies. Quite apart from China's often proclaimed call for active prosecution of wars of liberation, her adherence to the doctrine of the inevitability of war, her rejection of the test ban treaty, and similar evidence of a hard attitude, communist China has provided a modern example of expansionism through her limited invasion of India last year. A statement at the time revealed that her object was not only the promotion of territorial claims, but the diverting of India's economic resources to defence and the discrediting in India's democratic process. It had all the evidence of a bid to demonstrate to other nations that the principal power in Asia was communist China, not India. It is also noteworthy that the Soviet union condemned China for its intransigence for refusing to negotiate the border settlement with India on the basis of the so-called Colombo proposals, and reiterated its belief that negotiations are better than war.

The dispute between communist China and the Soviet union is likely to force both of these countries to re-examine the fundamentals of their relations with the rest of the world.

We should be careful, however, not to become complacent at the sight of the two communist giants openly quarrelling between themselves. There are factors which could make them keep their dispute, despite the evident contradictions, within bounds. But quite apart from this, it does not follow that bad relations between the Soviet union and communist China will necessarily mean any improvement in relations between either of them and the west, nor even necessarily any benefit to the non-communist world in which they are already competing for influence.

How, then, are we to deal with the communist Chinese colossus, whose annual population increase is equal to the present population of Canada? For almost the entire period

of its existence communist China has been effectively isolated from the non-communist world, partly as a result of western policies but partly out of deliberate choice. We have had a recent example of China taking an initiative to intensify its own isolation. The test ban treaty was a step, albeit a small one, away from the arms race and therefore away from war. It is unfortunate and ominous that the Peking authorities chose to express strong opposition to it, in sharp contrast to its ready acceptance by the vast majority of the nations of the world.

So we must carefully consider whether the degree of isolation which now surrounds communist China is healthy; whether it promotes international peace or tends to intensify the threat to it. At one time the Soviet union was in a similar state of isolation. I wonder how many of us believe that Soviet isolation served the interest of world peace? I well remember Mr. Vishinsky saying in the United Nations that never would he allow the windows of the Soviet union to be opened to the ideas of the west. And the nations of the west at that time, for the most part, strove to establish contact with the Soviet union along lines which have now clearly become better established.

Some means must be found to remove the suspicion and ignorance which feeds on isolation. The lesson of the last years seems to point toward increased contacts. Whether those contacts take the form of scientific and cultural exchanges or of limited agreements, they serve to lower the barriers of hostility. I do not suggest it would be appropriate to rush into some new formal relationship at this time with the Chinese people's communist republic. The avowed intention of Peking to occupy Formosa stands as a serious obstacle to both the seating of communist China in the United Nations at this time and to the recognition of the Peking regime. But I suggest that the increasing ostracism of communist China from the world community may be self defeating and a potential threat to international stability. It is not too soon to begin in the west to formulate realistic and farsighted policies toward this Asian giant.

Trade, of course, has a special place in the process of overcoming the mistrust which exists between the west and the entire communist block. The Soviet union and other communist countries are facing a particularly difficult problem of resource allocation at the present time, and both the nature of this problem and the attempts to deal with it will have important implications not only for the domestic and foreign policies of those countries but for east-west relations in general.