

VERNMENT



CANADA

STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 51/17 COMMUNISM AND THE PEACE CAMPAIGN

An address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L.B. Pearson, delivered to the Sudbury and District Chamber of Commerce and Kiwanis Club, on April 20, 1951.

There is one question these days which, as Mr. Dean Acheson puts it, "twists and tortures all our lives"; what are the chances of war? What are the prospects of peace? Science, now so far ahead of moral and social progress, has developed such new and terrible weapons that war, if it came, would be far more calamitous than it has ever been in the past. We all live under the shadow of these new weapons and this fear, and look anxiously for signs that these shadows will not deepen into the eclipse of total war. The world is so full of fascinating possibilities, there is so much constructive work to be done and we have each one of us so many private hopes and plans that instinctively and rightly we resent and resist the claim that war is inevitable; and look for evidence to refute it. Indeed, so anxious are we for this evidence, that we are in danger at times of finding it where it doesn't exist.

Surrounded by fears and anxieties as we must be in the world today, we will have little chance of making a sound judgment of the prospects of peace or of acting in the best way to secure it unless we have a clear idea of the meaning of peace and of the price we are willing to pay for it. Otherwise, we may easily become confused. We may be led astray by those who wish to exploit our deepest longings for their own purposes. The problems which face Canada today are more serious and complex than any we have ever faced in our history. In order to meet and solve them, it is essential that every individual Canadian should try to keep his eyes unclouded. We must see the world situation steadily and see it whole.

Many of those who are trying to confuse us about peace and to cloud the issues we must face have banded together in various organizations with high-sounding names, such as "The Partisans of Peace" and "The Canadian Peace Congress". The programmes which they put forward from time to time seem plausible and are often phrased in terms which at first sight might seem such as to deserve the support of any man of good-will. But only at first sight. By now, there is a fairly wide understanding, I think, of the ulterior motives of those who have engineered these spurious but seductive peace campaigns; or, as is usually the case, have used others for that purpose. I am not worried that they will succeed in converting any but an inconsiderable fraction of deluded Canadians to support Soviet Communism. But many well-meaning people have been confused by this propaganda, and some have already swallowed

it whole, while its organizers and directors lurk in the background. That is the reason why I intend to take a little time tonight to analyze the arguments and motives of the Canadian Peace Council, which has become, though some of its members may not know it even yet, the agent of a foreign aggressive imperialism.

One convenient way of exposing this "peace" programme is to consider some of the representations which this Council wished to make to the Government recently. In the first place, they wished to present the final results of the "petition for peace", the so-called Stockholm Appeal, on the question of outlawing atomic weapons. At the risk of giving even wider currency to this misleading and dishonest appeal, I propose to quote it in its entirety:

"We demand the total banning of the atomic weapon, the arm of terror and the mass extermination of populations.

We demand the establishment of strict international control to ensure the implementation of the ban.

We consider that any Government which first uses the atomic weapon against any country whatsoever would be committing a crime against humanity and should be dealt with as a war criminal.

We call on all men of good-will to sign this appeal."

You will notice that beneath the demands of the Peace Congress that the atomic bomb should be outlawed lie two assumptions: first, that this is the only weapon of war whose use would be criminal and second that even if attacked no country is justified in defending itself by this means. We maintain, on the other hand, that the cardinal crime in international relations is armed aggression, no matter what weapons may be employed by the aggressor. A victim is just as dead whether he is killed by a bayonet or an atom bomb. War - aggressive war - is the supreme crime - not the use of any particular weapon.

I have said on a number of occasions that I regard the atomic bomb as the ultimate weapon and that it should be considered as such and not used except when there is no other course possible. On the other hand, it would be unrealistic and dangerous to outlaw the use of the atomic bomb until an international system of inspection and control had been established. It is true that those who defend the Stockholm Appeal demand "the establishment of strict international control". We who have argued these matters out with the Russians at Lake Success know what is meant by this. They mean the inadequate Soviet plan for control of atomic armaments which the Partisans of Peace promote so zealously while refusing to accept the much more precise and complete proposal which was overwhelmingly supported by all the members of the United Nations with the exception of the Soviet Bloc. The purpose of this Communist-sponsored petition demanding the total banning of atomic weapons now is purely and simply to eliminate the most important deterrent weapon possessed by the West at a time when the Soviet Union and its friends and satellites have such a great superiority in other types of military power.

Another point in the Canadian Peace Congress programme is a proposed amendment to the Canadian Criminal Code which would make the publication and distribution of war propaganda punishable by law.

About this, I would say, first, that, so far as I am aware, the only war propaganda now being conducted in Canada is that which appears in Communist journals in support of the aggression being waged against the Republic of Korea. I take it, however, that it is not propaganda of this kind which the Canadian Peace Congress was thinking of when it called for an amendment to the Criminal Code. I can only assume that it is their wish that the Government should stifle those who say that the civilization of the West is in grave peril from the aggressive military policies of the Soviet Union and its satellites and who are anxious that our defences here in Canada and in other countries of the free world should be increased so that, with our allies, we may hope to deter the Soviet Union from further military adventures, or if aggression is committed against us, be able to defeat it. It is pertinent, I think, to remember that in the Soviet Union and its satellites long prison sentences, even death sentences, are being dealt out by the Communist courts to those who grumble against military service or who express doubts about the Soviet Union's ability to defeat the Western powers. The proposed Canadian law, if its drafters had their way, would "protect society" in the same way from Canadians who urged the strengthening of our armed forces or who were optimistic about the North Atlantic countries' ability to defend themselves against Soviet imperialism.

Nothing is more revealing of the minds of those Canadians who have sponsored the Canadian Peace Congress than the fact that they apply entirely different standards to the Soviet Union and to Canada, the country that provides them with the freedom which they abuse. Indeed, they go further. It is not only that they judge the Soviet Union with a different standard than the one they use in judging conditions in Canada. The criteria are actually turned on their heads. For a Soviet citizen to call for the strengthening of Soviet armed forces in the topsy-turvy jargon of these people is something laudable, a contribution to the safety of the home of the Soviet revolution. For a Canadian, however, to call for an increase in Canadian defences is, of course, the most arrant war-mongering. That fact alone, I think, should be a complete unmasking of the motives and spirit of the Soviet propagandists in our midst. There may be - indeed there are - some deluded idealists among them but, behind these and controlling them are the agents of the Cominform. Even the idealists cannot be regarded as disinterested enthusiasts objectively searching for peace. If they were, they would be content to apply the same standards to all countries, occasionally to criticise Russia or Poland or Czechoslovakia. They must simply be regarded as the instruments, often, I am afraid, the willing and skillful instruments, of a ruthless conspiracy which is intent on destroying the free world and imposing its powerful system of abominable repression everywhere.

The Canadian Peace Congress have also been ardently demanding support for the address to the United Nations adopted by the Second World Peace Congress which met last November in Warsaw.

It would serve little purpose for me to dissect at length this farrago of misrepresentation and distortion which calls, among other things, for the withdrawal from Korea of all foreign armies without any mention of the fact that the United Nations forces are in Korea only in order to resist aggression. I should merely like to remind you that over the past months I have participated in attempts by the United Nations to achieve a cease-fire - though not one on any basis which could be called "appeasement" - in Korea and, once that has been established, to arrange discussions (in which the Chinese Communists would be included) looking towards a peaceful and honourable settlement of outstanding issues in the Far East. Although those attempts were pursued with the greatest vigour, they were not successful. Responsibility for failure rests on the shoulders of those countries who plotted and engineered the aggression in Korea, which is now publicly supported by the Canadian Peace Congress; and who refuse to cease that aggression on terms approved by the United Nations.

It will now be apparent, I hope, how cunningly all these demands have been framed to promote the interests of the Soviet Union throughout the world. The proposals regarding atomic energy would sterilize the greatest military asset which is held by the West at the present time. The restraints on public discussion suggested in the name of peace would tend to blind our people to the danger in which we stand. The Korean settlement which the Peace Congress advocates would rob the Republic of Korea of the military support which it is now receiving from the United Nations and would leave it to the mercies of its Communist enemies. Nor is it surprising that these demands mesh so subtly with Soviet interests, since the peace campaign which the Canadian Peace Congress represents in our own country has been launched on the initiative of the Soviet Union and operates under Soviet directives. On November 29, 1949, the Cominform adopted a resolution which reads as follows:

"The struggle for a stable and lasting peace, for the organization and consolidation of the forces of peace against the forces of war should now become the pivot of the entire activity of the Communist parties and democratic organizations".

The same resolution went on to direct that,

"Particular attention should be devoted to bringing together into the movement of the supporters of peace the trade unions, women's, youth, co-operative, sports, cultural and educational, religious and other organizations, as well as scientists, writers, journalists, workers in the cultural field, parliamentary leaders who are in favour of peace and against war".

In Cominform double talk those last words mean "in favour of the U.S.S.R. and against the strengthening of the defences of the free world".

To a fanatical Communist there need be, I suppose, no inconsistency in a peace movement which is at pains to justify the acts of aggression of the Soviet Union and its friends and satellites. To the faithful fanatics, the Soviet Union is the principal champion of peace in the world and any course which serves its interests must automatically be in the service of peace as well.

A champion of peace? That claim on behalf of the Soviet Union is very hard to swallow. We would expect those who pose as champions of peace themselves to behave peaceably. That is the legitimate test of the intentions of the Soviet Union. In applying it, I suggest that we should look at the kind of language they use about those who differ from them, at the size of their armed forces and at the policies they follow towards their neighbours.

So far as the language which these Soviet apostles of peace employ, I can myself speak with some feeling. I have been the object of some of Mr. Vishinsky's attacks and I have had the pleasure of seeing myself described in the Soviet press as "a running dog of American imperialism". It is of no importance what is said about me by Mr. Vishinsky or by Pravda. What is of importance is the continual stream of vilification and abuse of the countries in the West which is put abroad by the Soviet press and the Soviet radio; particularly the United States of America, the great leader of our defence against Communist aggression. A recent issue of "New Times" published in Moscow, for example, declared, "The American imperialists are preparing to drown whole nations in blood, to turn whole countries into desert zones. They are waging a brutal war of conquest against the Korean and other Asiatic peoples". And so it goes on day after day after day.

Incidentally, if one follows what is said by Soviet propaganda with any care, as I unfortunately am obliged to, it is possible to obtain a certain amount of wry amusement from it. Of whom do you think did the Moscow Literary Gazette write with such enthusiasm in October 1947? -

"He smiled, while the breeze gently stirred the blond hair of the people's hero as though caressing it. (His) broad and manly face radiated such energy, such will power and warmth, while his handsome gray eyes were lit with such a penetrating, active, and inspired intelligence that more than ever one understood why this people's leader, this unflagging fighter for peace and democracy, disposes of such great authority in his own country and beyond its borders."

Of whom did the same journal write in September 1949?--

"Anyone who has seen or heard (him) even once will have noticed that he is loquacious as a parrot, puffed up, bombastic, and conceited. The parrot has put on the uniform of a marshal. At parades and banquets he appears dressed up as a Christmas tree, and makes eyes to the public. You should see how he poses - chest out, head back, eyes bulging."

It was the same man in both cases - Marshal Tito. The Canadian Peace Congress would have cheerfully echoed and applauded each statement at the bidding of Moscow.

Another index of the Soviet Union's love of peace is provided by the size of its armed forces. After the Second Great War the U.S.S.R. demobilized to a much less extent than any of the Western powers. At the present time the active strength of the Soviet Army, exclusive of the huge secret police forces, is not less than 175 divisions with 25,000 tanks and 20,000 aircraft. Everyone

there is trained for war from the cradle to the grave. These forces are stationed partly in the Soviet Union and partly in Germany, Austria, Poland, Roumania and Hungary. It is their presence in or on the borders of the satellite countries which has made possible the ruthless suppression of liberty there and the subjection of their interests to the interests of the Soviet Union.

The story of the way in which the independence of the satellite countries bordering on the Soviet Union was extinguished has never been fully told. But I would like to remind you of a few facts which illustrate the relations between Moscow and the satellites. Virtually all aspects of their national life are now under Russian domination. Marshal Rokossovsky, for example, one of the commanders of the Red Army in the Second Great War, sits in Warsaw as the Commander-in-Chief of the Polish armed forces with his top officers also Russians. In economic matters, Soviet domination is equally thorough. Interesting information on this subject has come to light since Marshal Tito took Yugoslavia out of the Cominform. Since that time his representatives have several times spilled the beans - if I may use that expression - in the United Nations, to the undisguised fury of the Cominform representatives. They have told in detail, for instance, how the Soviet Union controlled industry and commerce there as long as Yugoslavia was a satellite. At a meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations in October 1949, for example, Mr. Vilfan of Yugoslavia explained that in 1946 the Yugoslav Government under pressure from Moscow signed agreements by which two joint companies were formed, a shipping company and an air transport company. Half the shares of these two companies were to be held by the Yugoslav Government and the other half by the Soviet Union. The director was to be appointed by Moscow. In the upshot, the Soviet Union invested less than 10 per cent of its share of the capital required whereas the Yugoslav Government invested more than 75 per cent of its share. Nevertheless, the Russian director operated the activities of the company in a manner which served primarily, according to Mr. Vilfan, the interests of the economy of the Soviet Union.

In contrast with the relationship based on trust and friendship between a big and smaller country, like Canada and the United States, the relationship between the U.S.S.R. and any one of its communist neighbours can only be one of complete domination on the one hand, and subservience on the other. This emphasizes how fortunate we are in our relations with our own neighbour. To imagine what, in fact, our position would be if the United States behaved like the Soviet Union and we were one of its satellites, you would have to picture an American general installed in Ottawa as the Chairman of the Chiefs of Staff Committee and an American in control of T.C.A. and operating it in the interests of the United States, and some officer from the F.B.I. taking notes at this meeting to make sure I followed the party line; or, if I didn't, to make sure I was liquidated! In the Cominform system, there is no room for the friendly good neighbourhood such as we have on this continent. There is no room for the free partnership such as we have in the North Atlantic Alliance. If you submit to Moscow, you are like Tito was - a paladin of communist virtue. If you refuse to submit, you become what Tito is now alleged to be - a Fascist beast.

If one examines either Soviet propoganda or the size of the Soviet armed forces or the relations between the Soviet Union and its satellites, it is difficult to regard the members of the Politburo as champions of peace. Were they champions of peace early that morning last June when tanks made in the Soviet Union rolled over the 38th Parallel to attack the Republic of Korea? Were they champions of peace when they forbade Czechoslovakia to accept economic benefits which the United States held out to her as a recipient of Marshall Aid?

Peace, however, means more than the absence of war or even peaceful intentions. It means social justice and decent standards of living within nations; as well as good relations between them. That, in its turn, means raising the standard of living of those hapless millions, especially those in Asia, who live in misery and in distress. There cannot, for instance, be real peace if, as a member of the House of Commons put it the other day, North America is "a residential suburb surrounded by slums".

The Canadian people, I know, are anxious to do as much as they can to improve the lot of peoples who are less fortunate than they are. I shall mention only one example. Before the end of this Session, Parliament will be asked to vote \$25 million as the Canadian contribution for the first year of the Colombo Plan. This money will be used to improve the standard of living of countries in South and South-East Asia by enabling them to embark on a new programme of economic development. Dams will be built; hydro-electric plants will be assembled; arid land will be irrigated; so that at the end of the six-year programme 13 million acres will have been brought under cultivation and there will be an increase of 10 per cent in the food grains produced. It is hoped that the Colombo Plan will mark the beginning of an upward spiral of development which will remove the spectre of famine from such countries as India and Pakistan.

We are contributing to this programme because the kind of peace which we believe in is not one based on the dominion of one country by another, but rather on positive good-will and tolerance. The kind of peace we believe in is a state of affairs in which there is a deliberate effort to enable individuals to develop freely and to realize their highest capabilities. It is a state which has to be worked for and which has to be constantly recreated.

That kind of peace is worth paying for. The military dangers which threaten the free world at many points are so grave that we will all have to pay a substantial price to protect the peace we value. We will have to re-arm in co-operation with our allies. We will have to pay for re-armament through heavier taxation. We will have to work harder. We will have to forego some of the luxuries to which we had looked forward. I am sure that Canadians will not complain of these sacrifices when they remember the cause in which they are made.

But there is one price which we will not pay even to secure peace. There are some things we value even more than peace. We will not pay for it by sacrificing our own freedom or the freedom of other countries.

There is much, then, that we must do, both as a nation and as individuals, in order to preserve and improve the inheritance we have received. I would suggest

that one of our duties is to take every advantage we can to see that the propaganda which is disseminated by the Canadian Peace Congress and other similar bodies is countered and frustrated. I was very pleased, for example, to hear of the action which was taken only a few weeks ago by some under-graduates of the University of Toronto. There has been at Toronto, as at other universities, a Peace Council which has been following the Communist propaganda line. It occurred to some 50 students in the Faculty of Applied Science that there was no reason why this Campus organization should not be captured, and captured by completely constitutional and democratic means so that it would represent the genuine desire for peace of the great majority of the students. Accordingly, having read the constitution of the Peace Council, as approved by the University authorities, they appeared at the scheduled annual meeting only to find that no more than eight students were present, all set to elect a Communist executive on behalf of the University. To the discomfiture of the chairman they announced their desire to become members of the Peace Council. They were then informed in the course of an argument that they could only obtain membership at the cost of 50 cents, that they could not take part in the election of the new executive, and that they had to prove their genuine support of world peace by signing the Stockholm Peace Appeal. The bright engineers having read the constitution, were not thus easily put off. They proceeded to pay the 50 cents (as one of them said afterwards "my only 50 cents") and then challenged the suggestion about the Stockholm Appeal as there was no mention of this in the approved Constitution. However, they did know that according to the constitution nominations for the elections of the new executive should be called for at least a week before the election date and that members had to be in good standing for at least a week before voting at the election. So as soon as they paid their money to become members in good standing the new "Democratic members" passed a resolution of non-confidence in the old executive and demanded its resignation. The Chairman and President of the Council refused to put this motion to the meeting and after some argument he and the party henchmen stalked out of the meeting. The new majority then elected a provisional Chairman, proceeded to make nominations for a new executive and called an election meeting for a week hence - all according to the constitution. If more Canadians were to show something of this same high-spirited crusading zeal, we would very soon hear little of the Canadian Peace Council and its works. We would simply take it over.

Canadians have never been known for any lack of spirit or resourcefulness. These qualities will be needed, as never before, if we are to meet successfully the grave danger which now threatens the whole of the free world. It would be folly to underestimate that danger. The armed forces now in being at the command of the Soviet Union and its allies and satellites are at present much greater than those of the free world. Moreover, by its support of the intervention of the Chinese Communists into the war in Korea, the Soviet Union has shown that it is much more willing than we had thought to run the risk of precipitating a Third World War. On the other hand, the military forces of the countries associated in the North Atlantic alliance are growing. Even when they have been increased to the limits now planned, they will not be nearly large enough to present any threat to the Soviet Union. They will be enough, however, we hope, to make the Soviet Union pause before launching an act of

aggression. In this re-arming, the purpose of the North Atlantic alliance is not to prepare for war, but rather to avert war, by making it crystal clear that cheap victories by the Soviet Union and its satellites are no longer possible. We must, therefore, go forward steadily, in co-operation with our allies, to build up our strength, and then to use that strength, not to provoke conflict but to seek peace. If we can avoid comforting illusions and confusion, if we can show tenacity of purpose in re-arming, if at the same time we can be flexible enough to seize whatever opportunities there may be for negotiation, and finally, if our Peace coalition can stand steadily together, united against attempts to divide it, we can hope that peace will be preserved.

"The next war", Bertrand Russell has said, "if it comes, will be the greatest disaster that will have befallen the human race up to that moment. I can think of only one greater disaster: the extension of the Kremlin's power over the whole world. Whatever we do we shall be united, but it is better to be united in a common salvation than in a common death."

S/C