



## A foreign policy critic says:

# "We play Tonto

# to

## America's Lone Ranger"

### Special to Excalibur

The following speech was delivered by Waffle member Cy Gonick, a member of the Manitoba legislature, to external affairs minister Mitchell Sharp at a recent teach-in at the University of Toronto.

Foreign policy is a complicated business. I do not pretend to know all of the intricacies of this field. Like many of you, I probably have more questions than I have answers — and I'm particularly happy to have the Secretary of State for External Affairs so handy — so that maybe he could answer some of my questions.

I have written on Canadian foreign policy many times. But I thought that for purposes of this teach-in — it would be best to take as my point of departure the Review of Foreign Policy for Canadians published just a few months ago under the authority of the Honorable Mr. Mitchell Sharp.

I have read this document very carefully and I would ask Mr. Sharp, right off — How can you sir, justify deliberately and consciously omitting Canadian independence and sovereignty as one of the 3 main objectives of Canadian foreign policy. You listed it as a possible high priority objective — then you deliberately dropped it to sixth place on your list. And what did you replace it with as your number one objective — economic growth.

Of course that does not come as a surprise to any of us. Economic growth has always been an obsession with Liberal governments. Not economic growth to eliminate poverty, mind you, or gross income inequalities by class and by region.

Growth trickles down too little and too late to affect poverty. And there has been no change in income distribution or regional disparities for the past 30 years. Economic growth for the sake of economic growth. Economic growth so that Toronto can be a Chicago; economic growth to finance the electric backscratches and the Spadina Expressways; economic growth by way of exporting Canadian raw materials to feed that great resource glutton to the South of us. That's what you have said our foreign policy should serve above all else — because that's the kind of economic growth we suffer under your kind of government.

And now we want to know: why this should be the No. 1 objective of our foreign policy. And we want to know: Does it mean that Canada will keep on fleecing the Caribbean and other underdeveloped regions in order to contribute to Canada's so-called economic growth. The growth of Canada's banking community and E.P. Taylor's stable is more like it.

And you say that you will be extending various incentives, laws and guarantees to Canadian businesses to invest in the underdeveloped world. Isn't that like saying if you guys can't compete with the Americans in doing business in Canada, better high-tail it to Jamaica where the natives are easier to exploit. And by the way here's a few bucks from your friends, the Canadian taxpayer, to help you out.

You say in your review that Canada rejects race discrimination and that you have asked the Polymer Corporation to get rid of its investment in South Africa. Yet you sanction Canadian businessmen trading with South Africa. You abhor apartheid and

encourage doing business with its practitioners. And then you wonder why this generation is cynical!

As I read your review I kept looking for an analysis of what is happening to America. For like it or not, the entire world, certainly Canada, has to define itself in terms of the USA.

To be fair there was an analysis of sorts. You said there are a few riots there that break out occasionally and that the Americans have become mixed up in a war somewhere in Asia — but you presumed that the racial problems would subside and that the war would soon be over and you hoped that there would be no others like it.

And that's your analysis. America is still the land of justice and freedom and equal opportunity — helping the poor people around the world to improve themselves. They got sucked into Vietnam. But that was just a mistake. And when you feel brave enough Mr. Sharp you may even find the courage to say — it was a terrible mistake.

And the blacks? Well that's a bit of a problem — but education and job training will fix that up. Anyway the Black Panthers are still a small minority.

Now I want to know, I think it's fair to say we want to know: is that your analysis of where America is at in 1970? Because if it is — it explains everything. It explains why you don't feel any urgency to protect Canada against the invasion of American dollars, and American culture and American values and American corporations.

It explains perfectly how you can write a review of Canadian foreign policy which evades the entire issue of American domination of this country, and simply assert, as you do in your report: "The U.S. is Canada's closest friend and ally and will remain so."

My analysis of America is something different, my analysis of America is that America has become an empire — reaching out to all corners of the world for markets and raw materials.

The metropolis has become glutted with goods and depleted of resources. So the metropolis has to find a hinterland. Its main instrument is not its army or navy or air force, or even its secret service, although these have to be called on occasionally to police the recalcitrants. Its main instrument is the multi-national corporation. Neat, Tidy, Efficient, Bloodless.

There is the local comprador class too of course. These are the neighborhood flinks who administer their own countries as resource colonies for the great metropolis. (Canada has its own special breed of cop-outs.)

The result is not economic development. It is the creation of one-crop economies. Dependence. The draining away of resources. The removal of profits. A brain-drain from hinterland to metropolis.

The result is not development but underdevelopment — misery and poverty perpetuated and aggravated by this new imperial relationship. And when the poverty and misery finally leads to rebellion and peasant uprising as it must, then in the name of freedom and anti-communism, it is squashed by the U.S. marines or the native soldiers that they have trained.

We have seen it happen — in Guatemala, Brazil, Guayana, Indonesia, the Dominican Republic, to name only a few in-

stances. Only in Cuba and Vietnam has the rebellion not been crushed. We still await the outcome in Peru and Chile.

The British historian Arnold Toynbee summarized America well when he said, "She is no longer the inspirer and leader of the world revolution. . . (but) the leader of a world-wide anti-revolutionary movement in defence of vested interests".

Today Canada stands as America's sidekick. We play Tonto to America's Lone Ranger.

We supply her with nickel and iron ore and natural gas and copper and zinc, parts and equipment and special fuels to beat down the Vietnamese people, to gun down the guerillas in Latin America and to help her to police the rest of her empire.

We test her chemical and bacteriological weapons — the same ones that are used to napalm Vietnamese villages and Latin American jungles.

And what do we get in exchange for the resources that we supply to maintain the American empire? We get what we deserve. We have become a dump heap for America's surplus gunk — the things that America produces best.

Mr. minister, with all respect, either you and your government have not understood what America is about — or more likely, you understand very well, but it is in the interest of the class that you represent, of which your former colleagues at Brazilian Traction are only one example, to maintain the status quo and to support the USA. For them it's still the most profitable thing to do. And in the end the only thing that counts is profit. That's the way our system works, as you are well aware.

While I'm at it let me ask you some more questions. You say in your review that one of the priorities of your government will be to participate in arms control talks. How can you say this on the one hand and on the other conduct one of the largest commercial sales of arms in the entire world? A half a billion dollars a year.

Not only does your government condone the merchandizing of murder weapons abroad — but it actually subsidizes it — through accelerated depreciation allowances, direct capital grants and grants for research and development, free use of publicly owned machinery, etc.

Either the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing — or it is sheer hypocrisy to say that you are seriously concerned with arms control while your government promotes the sale of arms throughout the world.

I want to say to you, Mr. Sharp, that I fully approved of your



"Yessir, son, you play yer cards right, an' someday all this'll be yours. . ."

government's announcement of a phase out of Canadian military forces from Europe. And I wondered at the time what would be done with the returning soldiers. I had hoped that we would give them a big pension and turn them out to pasture.

Instead I hear that they are receiving regular training in counter-guerilla warfare — in some islands off Puerto Rico used also by the U.S. Defence Department to practice the invasion of Cuba.

I also hear that some of them have been training in Australia in jungle warfare; and some are in Jamaica practicing counter-insurgency warfare. I wonder why our government would be training Canadians to fight against peasants?

Now I hear that Canadian forces are being trained in riot control to keep down the natives here in Canada. There was an exercise in July '67 in putting down a mock civil insurrection led by a labor leader. Mr. Sharp — what is your government thinking of?

Now, I have asked you many questions and I have made a few criticisms. To be straight with you, I should offer some alternatives. And I am prepared to do so.

I believe that we should place Canadian sovereignty and independence as the No. 1 objective of Canadian foreign policy. Because without effective sovereignty and effective independence all of our other objectives are distorted.

To remain an economic satellite and a resources colony to the U.S. means to inherit America's unhabitable cities, her extremes of poverty and affluence, her violent race relations; it means that we are accomplices in America's efforts to put down the revolutionary aspirations of the people of the third-world; that we join Uncle Sam's anti-communist crusade around the globe.

A change of such proportions implies wholesale measures to halt the absorption of Canada's economic and cultural life into the United States. And it means that these economic measures would be accompanied by a wholesale review of our bilateral treaties, agreements and transactions with the USA.

For example, it would surely mean opting out of NORAD, a defence arrangement which was obsolete before it was completed, and which costs us \$125 million a year to maintain.

It would mean entering no further energy deals with the U.S. It might mean negotiating free trade agreements with every country in the world except the USA — in order to open Canada to the world yet keep us out of the USA.

It would certainly mean ending immediately the defence production-sharing agreement with the U.S. which makes us accomplices to American war crimes in Vietnam.

And it would mean an end to Canadian collaboration with Britain, the U.S. and Australia on chemical and biological weapon testing and turning our CBW scientists loose on anti-pollution research instead.

If we are really interested in minimizing the possibility of war between the United States and the Soviet Union we would see that joining in the defense system with the U.S. and permitting U.S. bombers to fly over Canada on "fail safe" missions towards the Soviet Union, has not decreased, but increased tensions between the two countries.

Instead of adding to this madness we might instead propose

that the Arctic area be used internationally as a mutual missile and bomber detection system.

I believe that the best contribution Canada can make to world peace and security is to bow out of the cold war. That means getting out of NATO entirely. We make no military contribution to peace through NATO nor do we make any diplomatic contribution.

In his research on Canadian foreign policy, Professor John Warnock has examined 16 key decisions involving NATO over the years. In all cases the policy changes were initiated by the United States and then approved by the organizations including Canada.

Canada has not made one important peace initiative through NATO nor has any other single country. To argue that membership in NATO gives Canada some influence over policy decisions is simply not borne out by the facts.

Canada spends over 1.8 billion dollars on arms a year. Virtually none of this expenditure adds to our national security. I believe that we could disarm almost entirely without affecting in any way the world balance of terror. In fact, as a non-aligned activist nation we could do far more to advance world peace.

In my view we should take most of that 1.8 billion and add it to our foreign aid program. Do you know how little we give to foreign aid now?

Mr. Sharp says that we will increase our allotment by \$60 Million in 1971-72 over the \$364 Million spent this year. Our government gives more aid each year to American business investors in Canada than we do to all the third world countries combined. Social justice for the rich — that's been the policy of this government.

If we shifted most of our defence budget to foreign aid this would increase the total western aid to the underdeveloped countries by as much as 1/5.

But it's not enough to increase foreign aid. To whom will the foreign aid be offered? I think we have to be very tough-minded about that.

Most of the third world is corrupt and graft ridden, run by governments interested solely in their own survival; governments that cooperate all too willingly with imperialist nations whose main functions seem to be to help the imperialists rape their own countrymen.

I think that it is essential for us to assign our foreign aid only to countries that have shown themselves to be serious about social and economic reform. Countries like Tanzania, Chile, Cuba, Peru, Ceylon, and China. To give foreign aid to reactionary governments is to support reaction, not social justice.

Consistent with this foreign aid program would be a deliberate policy which would identify Canada more firmly with the black Africans and their struggle against surviving white oligarchies in South Africa, Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia. That means trade and investment boycotts at the very least.

And finally Canada must speak out on Vietnam finally and clearly so that her voice is heard: And the message must be: Get out. Now. Immediately. Leave Vietnam for the Vietnamese. Mr. Sharp, can't you say that? Here. Now.