



## STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 55/43 SOME ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Address by the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. L.B. Pearson, before the Indian Council of World Affairs, New Delhi, November 1955.

I am glad to be back in India again after nearly six years and to have the opportunity - my first - to address this distinguished Council. This fine new building is a testimonial to the public spirited support enjoyed by the Council and of the high regard with which it is held. It is an honour to appear before you and I have been touched by the warmth of your welcome.

In the past ten days I have travelled over nearly half of this country. I have seen your great city of Calcutta; your mighty ramparts, the Himalayas; the holy city of Benares, which is older than history, and I have crossed the vast Gangetic Plain. But ten days is not enough; not even enough to explore New Delhi or the seven cities which have preceded it on this location. Nevertheless, you will forgive, I trust, the passing guest from drawing at least one firm conclusion from a short visit. I know now that India and Canada have at least one characteristic in common - magnitude. We both have a great deal of geography - though you have, of course, much more history and so many more millions of people than we have.

May I add also that even my brief visit to India has revealed to me something of the ravages wrought by the floods which this year have been unprecedented in both extent and intensity. On behalf of the Canadian people I want to express my deepest sympathy with all those who have lost so much and who have endured and who must continue to endure the hardships and miseries which flood losses inevitably entail.

I did not have to come to India to know that the Indian and Canadian people were friendly to each other. If we were not, the relationship between our two countries could not have been so firmly based on that close co-operation which exists even when it doesn't always lead to specific agreement. With India we try to make our co-operation both positive and helpful. This is freely reciprocated on your part with beneficial results which, I believe, stretch beyond our respective boundaries.

There are, of course, such profound and obvious differences between our two countries that one may be pardoned for wondering what we have in common. We have much in common, however. There are many practical as well as abstract things that draw us together. Tonight I wish to mention only two factors which our peoples share in

their outlook and their way of living. These are, first, a belief that poverty, ignorance, dirt and disease are evils in themselves and, as such, are to be fought and defeated; secondly, a tolerance which is not indifference, but an active habit of the mind, expressing itself in political thought and action.

I need perhaps elaborate only on the second point. While the subtleties, the endless permutations, that are possible in your evolving society, with its roots so deep and its traditions so old, are unknown in Canada, there is in our young and comparatively uncomplicated country a resemblance to your own in the habit of accommodation, of tolerance and compromise that we have developed. With us - as with you - it was essential that we should develop these qualities if political unity, indeed, if national existence was to be preserved. This development, furthermore, has taken place within certain political concepts which are completely familiar to both our peoples; belief in the rule of law, in the dignity and worth of the individual, and in the responsibilities as well as the rights of citizenship.

Canada does not share by any means the cultural and linguistic variety of your country, but we are also a plural society. In creating the Canadian nation we have had to consider at all times the relations between our two main ethnic groups - French and English - and the necessity for accommodation between them. This necessity is something that Canadians have been brought up on, and it means that not only the varying aspirations and needs of these two groups must be taken into account when decisions are made, but also the stresses of a federal form of government. Each group must act with the interests of others in mind. Hence, simple, massive, dogmatic solutions are no more acceptable to us in Canada than they are to you in India. This predisposition toward give and take, mutual accommodation and the finding of workable solutions, has, I believe, much to do with the nature of the policies pursued abroad by both India and Canada.

More than five years ago when I made my first visit to India and Southeast Asia in connection with the founding of the Colombo Plan, there was little reason for optimism about the trend of world affairs, and there was much to discourage bold international initiatives in the social and economic field. Nevertheless, faith governed the efforts of those who drew up the Colombo Plan at that time; faith that through co-operative human effort the world could be made a better place in which to live.

Notwithstanding the international climate at the time of our 1950 meeting in Colombo, that meeting generated a spirit of enthusiasm which has never flagged. The results of the Plan achieved up to date justify that enthusiasm.

I have just returned from the Singapore meeting where, as you know, we unanimously decided to be associated together for at least five more years in the Plan. Long before the Singapore Conference convened, however, this has been laid down as an objective for the Canadian delegation. It soon became apparent that we shared this objective with the other members. Everybody wanted the Plan to continue; not merely because it has assisted in the economic development of the areas concerned, but because it has also assisted and

encouraged the growth of friendly co-operation between countries from various parts of the world - from Asia, North America and Europe. The original members of the Colombo Plan belonged to the Commonwealth of Nations, but since Commonwealth membership should never be a limiting factor, it was right and proper that membership in the Plan should have been extended to include, as it now does, virtually every country in South and Southeast Asia.

There cannot surely be too much of this kind of contact by which we get to know each other better and understand each other's problems and policies.

It is a matter of great satisfaction to Canadians that they have been able, under the Colombo Plan, to give some assistance to this country, which has chosen to work out its economic destiny by democratic means. Canadians recognize that the more quickly the material standard of living rises in India, the better off we all shall be. We, like you, are convinced that economic and social progress are essential to a durable peace. We have backed your judgment that Indian resources are capable of supporting a fuller and richer life, and we have some knowledge of the great efforts which your people are making to improve their conditions. The tremendous drive behind your first Five Year Plan and its impressive results, and the massive and imaginative second Five Year Plan now in the making as a worthy successor, give sufficient evidence that, compared with what you are doing out of your own resources, the foreign aid you receive is modest. But it is, I think, important - both economically and politically.

On Tuesday of this week, I had the honour to attend the formal opening, in connection with the Mayurakshi River Development, of a dam which you have honoured my country (and I assure you we greatly appreciate the honour) by calling the "Canada Dam". It is part of a multi-purpose project which will be bringing water to 600,000 parched acres and turning out 4,000 kilowatts of hydro-electric power.

Developments such as these are indicative of the wise use to which Colombo Plan funds are put by India. In this case, the external aid consisted in large part of the proceeds from the sale of the Canadian wheat given to India under the Colombo Plan. The rupees thus obtained were used to pay Santhal villagers for construction work which would increase rice production. This is part of the magic of the Colombo Plan by which wheat from two successive Canadian harvests will be turned into rich rice crops in India year after year. This is indeed the reality of international co-operation and behind it is the equal reality of friendship.

There is another Indian-Canadian Colombo Plan project which I would like to mention. As you may know, it was announced jointly by your Government and mine on September 16 last that Canada had offered, and India had accepted, an NRK atomic reactor under the Colombo Plan. A team of Indian scientists led by Dr. H.J. Bhabha, head of your Department of Atomic Energy, visited Canada recently for discussions on this matter with our scientists and officials. It will be a great result if, between us, we can harness for the welfare of the masses of India, and of this whole Asian area, the forces released by the splitting of the atom. I am sure that it can be done and, if so, we in Canada will benefit too.

Because of the release of atomic and nuclear energy in a world of fear and disunity, where scientific progress has far outstripped social and moral advance, we have become conscious of a terror of universal proportions. It has become epitomized in the hydrogen bomb, the special and unique problem of our generation. This ultimate weapon has meant, in the words of President Eisenhower, that "there is no alternative to peace". Indeed it is true, there is now no alternative to peaceful co-operation. Hydrogen and hate go ill together. They are an explosive mixture. Because of the recognition of this fact in the highest places, there has of late been an easing of those tensions which could snap us all into oblivion. Real peace is not yet with us. But if we show imagination as well as wisdom, we may secure it. Now is the time for seizing and making the most of every opportunity that may lead to a better state of affairs than this poor world has known since 1914. With the stakes so high today, it is now more necessary than ever for all those charged with the responsibilities of leadership to do their utmost to ensure that good sense and moderation control their actions. In this situation it is, I think very foolish and no service to peace or security for any government or any leader anywhere to hurl threats or launch provocations against any other.

In the months ahead there will be more room, I think, for diplomatic movement and manoeuvre than there has been for many years. This will give us great opportunities, but it will also involve us in dangers and risks. It will, I am sure, underline and emphasize the realities and necessities of interdependence between nations. It may also lead to further easing of tensions. The clouds which have so thickly clustered over our heads for these many years are still there, but now there is at least a rift in them through which we can see a star which might guide us to real peace. In recent developments, which give us at least some ground for hope, though none for wishful thinking or unrealistic optimism, your Prime Minister has played a constructive role of far-reaching importance, which I feel privileged, as a Canadian, to acknowledge. His most recent trip abroad was followed with interest all over the world. I have just completed a shorter, and, of course, much less important trip, which took me to one of the places which he visited, the Soviet Union. I am glad I made that trip. It gave me an opportunity to meet and talk with leaders of one of the super-powers on whose decisions will depend to a large extent the fate of all nations and all peoples. These meetings and talks were for me of real value in trying to reach my own conclusions as to the sources and nature of Soviet policy and the bases of Soviet power.

On all sides in Russia I received fervent protestations and assurances regarding the peaceful nature of that policy and the defensive character of that power. I was also told of the fear of war, brought about by the alleged aggressive policy of others, which filled the hearts and minds of the Soviet people, who have already suffered so cruelly from war, and who, like the rest of us, would suffer even more in any future atomic conflict.

It is, I think, true that wherever one goes today, you find, among the people, deep fear and insecurity, and, with these, a passionate desire for peace. The trouble is that while we all desire peace, we do not always initiate or support policies that make for peace. Yet policies are far more important than; indeed, are prerequisites to peaceful co-existence.

In the Soviet Union, I did my best, whenever I had the chance, to convince those whom I met and talked with that in the West we too desired peace and that our regional collective security arrangements, such as NATO, originated and grew up only because of our own fears of war, and because of the failure of the United Nations to give us the security that would banish those fears. I insisted that these arrangements were purely and exclusively defensive, and that my own country would have nothing to do with them if they were anything else.

When NATO was formed, we had good reason to fear aggression and a policy by which an aggressor could in Europe attack and defeat his disunited victims, one by one. If that fear had not existed, or if the United Nations had been able to provide collective security on a universal basis, there would have been no need for, and therefore no justification for, NATO. It follows that if circumstances change, if fear of war can be removed, and if the United Nations can effectively discharge the security functions visualized in the Charter, then - but only then - should NATO, or any other defensive collective security system, which represents a genuine coming together of the countries concerned, disappear.

In putting this point of view forward in Moscow, I had at least one great asset. I sincerely believed what I said. I also asserted - and I believe this too - that the United States of America which is by far the most powerful member of the Western coalition, will never commit any military aggression or deliberately provoke any military conflict.

We in Canada know our southern neighbours well; better, I think, than any other people do. We do not blindly follow or even support all American policies or actions, especially, if I may so say, in Asia. We do not like all the manifestations of their way of life as, I am sure, they do not like all of ours in Canada. To use a North American expression, they "sound off" easily. So do some Canadians, and possibly even some Indians! They occasionally say things that are regrettable. These outbursts make the world headlines, while the disapproval and condemnation of them by the sensible, serious, quiet and decent Americans, who make up the vast majority of the nation, are rarely cabled across the oceans.

Canadians, I ventured to suggest in Moscow - as I have in other places - know that the American people are good neighbours and good friends - possibly the least aggressively-minded people in the military sense that ever achieved massive power. If this were not so, Canada, rich in resources and very strategically placed from the American point of view, but with less than 16 millions of people, would not exist today at all; or only as an American vassal state, which, I assure you, we are not.

Canada's foreign relations - our day-to-day international problems - are concerned, to a large extent, with our southern neighbour. My few days in Russia, however, made me more aware than previously of the fact that we had a northern neighbour as well, with whom we in Canada, as you in India, would like to have good relations.

There is another matter which concerns us much in Canada; maintenance of the closest possible contact with the members of the Commonwealth of Nations. One of those members, the United Kingdom, is the mother-land of many Canadians, and the source of many ideas that mean much to us, as they do to you in India; free parliamentary government, the rule of law,

and even-handed justice. We value Britain's wisdom and experience in international affairs.

This world-wide association of independent states, this valuable mechanism for international co-operation, which we call the Commonwealth of Nations, has been strengthened immeasurably by the inclusion of three Asian members, India, Pakistan and Ceylon. These permit it, among other things, to act as a bridge between Asia and the West, at a time when there are all too few bridges of this kind.

In this, and in other ways, the Commonwealth, which is utterly different from the Empire of yesteryear - a difference which was essential if it was to survive - can and does contribute much to international stability and co-operation. The world, in my view, would be the loser if it disappeared.

Nor has it any need for binding arrangements or formal machinery in order to endure. Indeed, I think most Canadians would say - and I'm sure most Indians would agree with them - that it is able to persist largely because of its almost casual and informal structure, which gives the freedom and flexibility necessary in the dynamic world of today. Despite the absence of machinery, consultation within the Commonwealth is close and continuous, and though it may seem strange to an outsider, it goes on even when strong differences of policy exist - as they do - between members.

Indians and Canadians are associated in two other international organizations. For over a year they have worked together, amicably and well, in the three International Supervisory Commissions in Indochina. Through the friendships established in this joint endeavour, another strong link has been forced between our two countries. As members of the Commissions, we have not always been in full agreement on all matters, but we have always tried to be in agreement and we have nearly always succeeded. I would like to pay my respects here to the devotion, ability, and sincerity of the Indian members, civil and military, of these three Commissions. They have earned the respect and friendship of their Canadian colleagues in the work for peace and security and freedom which they are together trying to do.

I come now to a third international organization - the United Nations - where so many distinguished Indians have played important roles, and where our two governments have worked closely together. I have personally many happy memories of my association with that very distinguished Indian jurist, that fine and modest man, the late Sir Benegal Narsing Rau, with whom I had the honour to serve on the three-man committee which sought in January 1951 a way to end the fighting in Korea.

I have also had years of happy association with Mrs. Pandit, in the work of the United Nations, over the Assembly of which she has presided with a grace, a distinction and skill that no mere male President has been able to achieve.

This is the first year I have missed a United Nations Assembly. One reason I regret this is that it means I won't be working with, arguing with, and drinking a lot of tea with

my friend, Mr. Krishna Menon. However, my colleague, Mr. Paul Martin, is heading the Canadian delegation to the General Assembly, and I know Mr. Martin and he have been seeing a great deal of each other; I feel sure to their mutual benefit.

In the United Nations also our two countries do not always see eye to eye, but we do respect each other's views and we discuss our differences frankly and amicably without the sound and fury that so often characterize, or used to characterize, public debate in the "glass house of Manhattan".

We are working toward the same objective there as in other places, and we are in the habit of exchanging, very fully and very frankly, views on all the matters that come up. When we differ, I find that the difference is never one of ends, but only of means, and it is usually due to differences of outlook and analysis and emphasis, derived largely from differences in political evolution and environment.

To minimize these differences, in the United Nations and elsewhere, it is essential that we try to understand each other's point of view, each other's difficulties, and, indeed, each other's sensibilities. Visits such as the one I am making are a great help to me in that respect. Canadians - and Americans - are learning more and more about Asia. Among other things, that it is not, and never should be simply a reflection of the West; that it is far more than what we sometimes call an "underdeveloped area"; and, indeed, that the "underdevelopment" in certain respects is on our side. I hope that Asians will in their turn become increasingly aware of the fact that North America is not merely a land of gadgets and "go-getters", of plumbing and plutocrats.

It seems to me that the most fundamental and far-reaching revolution of our time is the emergence out of the cataclysm of two world wars, and, if viewed in the perspective of history, the sudden emergence of a new Asia, only a very small and diminishing part of which is now "colonial".

I speak with diffidence and without authority on such a matter, but surely one fact that stands out strongly in this emergence is the renaissance of Asia's ancient life and culture; a renaissance which is so notable in India. A century ago Asia gave the impression of lethargy with its great period of achievements behind it; with only a brooding nostalgia over a splendid but abandoned past. Today it is eager and restless with visions and strong in its determination to achieve new goals of freedom and welfare. This was strikingly apparent at the Asian-African Conference held in Bandung last April, at which India played such an important role. On that occasion my Prime Minister, in a message to the Chairman of the Conference, conveyed the good wishes of Canada for the success of the Conference and expressed the hope that it would contribute to the welfare of the people of Asia and African and promote settlement by peaceful means of all disputes likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. I do not have to agree with all the detailed conclusions of the Conference to pay tribute to the wisdom and moderation of men - including men from this country - who were there and who have preserved their sense of perspective and proportion through these times of revolutionary change and passionate conflict. Bandung, like Colombo and Singapore, could not

but encourage those of us who believe that East and West can work together for the common welfare.

We are now emerging into an age when different civilizations have to learn to live side by side in peaceful interchange, learning from each other, studying each other's history and ideals and art and culture, mutually enriching each other's lives. The alternative in the world of today is misunderstanding, tension and clash. That is not a tolerable alternative in the atomic age.

Man's conquest of science, but not of himself, faces us, then, with the challenge imposed by the inescapable interdependence of all sovereign states. That challenge can only successfully be met by the development of understanding, tolerance, and a sense of brotherhood on a global scale. There can be no national, racial, religious or class limitations to this brotherhood of man.

More than twenty-five years ago, Mahatma Gandhi had this to say: "Interdependence, when it is not inconsistent with one's self respect, is necessary to bring home to man the lesson of humility and the omnipotence of God". I pray that we may learn that lesson as the only sound basis for policy and action - national and international.

We may hope that the world today is moving, if somewhat gropingly and even by compulsion, towards such an ideal. In that slow, but upward progress, I am confident that our two countries, India and Canada, will come closer and closer together in mutual understanding and friendly co-operation.

S/C