

*External Affairs*

Asiatic or eastern pattern, for world domination. Therefore a negative statement of policy such as we have had from the minister, and which we now hear from statesmen in the United Nations, gives little hope to the enslaved peoples of the world.

MacArthur therefore was a symbol. He was recognized by the free peoples of the world as a symbol, because he stood four-square to all the winds that blew. He had a definite policy. He was sure of himself, and his definite policy was the reason for his being hated by the communists.

A most interesting commentary respecting MacArthur's attitude is found in an article which appears in the *United Nations World* for May, 1951. This article, entitled "Four Shots in Teheran," describes the assassination of the late prime minister of Iran. Referring to the cause of his death, the writer states:

One fact over which he had no control decided the issue—the Korean war.

Then it goes on to say:

In the days following the murder, when the mobs paraded in Teheran, one cry was heard above all others. It was not a cry for bread or tractors; it did not ask for social liberty; it was not directed against the rump parliament, the Shah, or the land-owners; it was directed against a general then living in Tokyo. However improbable it seemed, the mobs were shouting "Down with MacArthur!"

In today's issue of the *Ottawa Citizen* there appears an article on the front page entitled "Ridgway feels U.S. does not understand issues." It is a dispatch from the Associated Press, New York, and says:

In a letter to his church, General Matthew B. Ridgway, supreme allied Far East commander, said the United States does not seem to understand the issues in Korea.

The letter was read Sunday by Right Rev. Paull T. Sargent, rector emeritus of St. Bartholomew's Protestant Episcopal Church. He said the United Nations commander wrote from Korea:

"Would God the American people might see a full length movie of current events here in their true setting. It would, I think, make crystal clear the issues for which their sons fight and are content to fight. Yet America seems not to know.

Hundreds of thousands of poor people, the old, infirm, infants, the sick, fleeing night and day across country, over the ice of frozen streams in temperature at zero, no shelter at night but that obtained from huddling together and from such of their belongings as are on their backs or ox or small two-wheeled carts, driven to all this by one seemingly overpowering fear, the fear of government by communists.

Is not the issue truly whether some day our women, our babies, our sick and our aged, are to be driven forth by Asiatic masters, or now while yet there's time, this America and our allies may extinguish all petty issues and unite with all they have to destroy the greatest peril we have ever known?"

Communism is a colossal fraud and is deserving of our highest contempt.

[Mr. Browne (St. John's West).]

There is another article, in the same issue of the *United Nations World*, by Eugene Lyons, an experienced newspaper reporter who has spent many years in Moscow. He criticizes other correspondents who, with the assistance of the Russian government, have written articles and books praising the Russian experiment. He calls the Russian people the neglected item in the world equation. He states that the Russian people are prisoners in a colossal penitentiary and subjected to all the inventions of tyranny. They have to suffer many cruelties. They are not permitted to go outside their country or to have contact with other countries. They are not permitted to know the truth about what goes on in the outside world. A colossal fraud and injustice is being perpetrated upon the Russian people.

This article draws attention to the moral responsibility resting upon the statesmen at the United Nations and upon the statesmen of the world generally. Should the people behind the iron curtain be abandoned to their doom? The people of Poland were once allies of the United States and of the United Kingdom, but after the conference at Yalta they were progressively handed over into the hands of their former enemies, the soviet rulers. Do we think that these people and the other peoples in the eastern countries should remain for ever under that tyranny and under that injustice?

I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Pearson) is familiar with the enlightening statement made by Stalin to President Roosevelt at Yalta when President Roosevelt was advocating free democratic elections in the countries in eastern Europe. Stalin said:

A freely elected government in any of these countries would be anti-Soviet, and that we cannot allow.

That applies to all countries behind the iron curtain, and in Asia, especially in China, where a communist government is in power at the present time. It applies to Russia, where a communist government exists. I should like to direct attention to a pamphlet issued by the Foreign Policy Association as part of its headline series. It is entitled "Face to Face with Russia." It was written by Philip E. Mosely, and it says:

From the point of view of soviet leaders, war and peace are continuing, if not alternating, aspects of one continuous, inescapable struggle. The nature of the struggle and of the contending forces may change, as they see it. But the struggle cannot be wished out of existence. And "compromise" has an evil sound in the Russian political vocabulary.

Then at page 48 he states:

But does the soviet concept of continuous struggle—a struggle which must last until the soviet form of socialism is adopted throughout the world—mean that war is literally inevitable?