

Herald,  
Brehaut

# Danger Trail

JAN 17 1957 By Judd Brehaut

Against the backdrop of current international events it is only a little short of ludicrous for the United States to push for a five-point disarmament plan before the United Nations General Assembly.

Anyone who has troubled to follow the long, sad story starting with Suez can sense only too well that the time for disarmament negotiations is past.

What is needed now is for the Soviet and all those other nations who wish to capitalize on the idealistic weakness of the Western democracies to be convinced that the West will stand for no more nonsense on matters necessary to its own survival.

★ ★ ★

At the time of Stalin's death, the West was quite justified in hoping that perhaps a better international era was dawning; that disarmament and other goodwill gestures might lead to a general lessening of world tension for the benefit of all.

None of these hopes was realized and in spite of repeated reminders of Western diplomats that the world could not safely believe that the over-all Soviet global *et cetera* had changed, many of those diplomats were caught in the same trap that they were so anxious that the public avoid.

Not the least of these was the United States' John Foster Dulles, who has suddenly discovered—and judging from his testimony at congressional committee hearings the discovery was all his own—that the Soviet has unpleasant designs on the Middle East. Nowhere does he drop a hint that Britain and France had discovered the peril many months ago and after failing to awaken the U.S. to the peril during months of negotiation over the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal, undertook to make the needed stand themselves without further consultation.

While it is rewarding in itself to see Mr. Dulles' own words fully justifying the British and French action, he is making himself look more stupid—and dangerous—than ever as a diplomat, and quite unfit to guide the destiny of the U.S. people in the field of foreign affairs.

Even his proposal for using U.S. armed forces to prevent Soviet aggression in the Middle East is so far short of being adequate to meet the situation there that it is a fit companion for his new disarmament plan in the garbage can.

Any interest which Russia and other non-Western nations are prepared to take in disarmament is designed to make it impossible for the West to take any armed

action in defence of its own civilization. The achievement of such a goal will provide those opportunist nations with the very chance they want, to attain their own objectives without incurring the risk of war. How foolish can we get when international co-operation, goodwill and all the other qualities which will bring about a happier and peaceful world have ceased to be a two-way street?

One of the most interesting documents which has come across my desk in recent months is entitled "The Decline and Fall of American Foreign Policy", by Hans J. Morgenthau, director of the University of Chicago centre for study of American foreign policy.

Mr. Morgenthau hits the nail squarely on the head when he writes: "When we heard spokesmen for the government propound the legal and moral platitudes which passes for foreign policy in the inter-war period, we thought this was the way in which the government tried to make the stark fact of foreign policy palatable to the people . . . We were mistaken. These platitudes are the foreign policy of the U.S."

Mr. Morgenthau adds, with biting clarity: "One nation declaring that it, alone among the great powers, will never use violence, first, or will not use it at all in some regions of the world, or that it will use it only if authorized by the United Nations, expands drastically the freedom of action of its enemies and imposes narrow limitations upon its own".

★ ★ ★

Discussing the danger of atomic war, he says: "The possibility of avoiding atomic war rests upon two assumptions, that no responsible government will resort to such a war and that the nations who are able to wage atomic wars have responsible governments. The correctness of these two assumptions allowed the Soviet to resort to force in Eastern Europe and threaten the use of force in the Middle East without the risk of atomic war. Yet we were deterred from threatening the use of force in the Middle East or in Eastern Europe by the fear of that risk.

"The assumption which would make sense of our renunciation of force would make nonsense of our policy of atomic retaliation. Yet the renunciation of force does more than that. It actually increases the risk of atomic war. For it is tantamount to impotence before the threat of force".

To all of which I can only say: Amen.

Ed. J. Brehaut

# No Handsprings

By Judd Brehaut

JAN 24 1957

In the race among Western nations to promote the idea that the West must learn to understand the non-Western nations of the world if we are to have peace, one vital factor is overlooked.

And this factor is that if the world is to ever have peace, the non-Western nations must learn to acquire an equal understanding and respect for the West's viewpoint.

As an individual citizen, I am getting a little more than sick of seeing the handsprings which many Western politicians are doing in order to win the applause and the friendship of non-Western civilizations. They are undoubtedly winning the applause which they desire but I seriously question how much real friendship they are winning.

★ ★ ★

The question of the relative merits of the various civilizations involved cannot be an issue — at least not a trading one — for, in the final analysis, it is people who produce civilizations and not civilizations which produce people, though the traditions of any civilizations may influence their people to a very large degree.

So it is not a question of whether one civilization is better than another. That has always been an arguable point and nothing can be obtained by deliberately pitting one against the other. The point is that no civilization can afford to trade its basic precepts or its standards for the sake of peace. Indeed, in the final analysis, each civilization must defend its way of life until it is modified or developed by a process of evolutionary thought, or else it will perish.

Much of the weakness of the West in this respect lies in a divided mind on this subject. In one sense, our civilization is sufficiently far advanced that we recognize this principle for those who do not subscribe to Western standards. Hence, the emphasis on understanding the other nations' point of view. But we fail to see how the same principle also applies to our own civilization. Our standards, faulty though they may be in many respects, cannot be put up on the trading block without risking their destruction for many generations to come. The rest of the world must be told that in unmis-  
takable terms.

Without such a clear-cut understanding of that principle, we only increase the risk of a world war by raising the hopes of other people that they can achieve the ends, which will seriously affect our own way of life, without the risk of war. When our way of life is directly affected, there can be no other choice for us but to defend it with all the resources at our command and if everyone knew it — and the reasons for it — we would have their respect and a substantial volume of their friendship which we do not now enjoy.

The belief that we can "sell" them the principles of democracy as a way of life merely by offering it to them on a silver platter as if it was a pleasant new dish is probably the greatest misconception which we have of the facts of life. In spite of the understanding which many of the intellectual groups in non-democratic countries may have of democratic processes, the millions of people of those countries have no conception of democracy. Most of the rulers, no matter how hard they may try to introduce democratic processes to their people through elections and the like, do not practise democracy in their daily dealings with their people, because they cannot.

★ ★ ★

Democracy is not something which can be adopted overnight. We were quite unable to do so. Our concept of democracy — and it is still far from being perfect or even being near that goal — was the result of centuries of struggle, often punctuated with blood and violence. It is silly and completely unrealistic to expect people who have no concept of democracy to become democratic overnight.

This may take generations, and even when it is achieved — if it ever is — we ourselves will be that much more advanced. No matter how much we may want it and no matter how much help we are prepared to give them, the gap may never be closed.

To think otherwise is to risk all that countless generations before us have risked, lived and died for. It cannot be given away. We may never have the real peace for which all the world hungers but we can have a healthy respect for each other which can result in an absence of war.

# Bitter Struggle

JAN 31 1957

—By Judd Brehaut

Newspapers this week have carried a number of items reporting the progress of a general strike in Algeria and the new tension which it has brought to that part of French Africa.

To many Canadians, disorders and troubles in Algeria and other parts of French North Africa have become so commonplace over the post-war years that reports of a general strike appear uninteresting and unimportant.

But the political background of that general strike is every bit as important to Western civilization as are the momentarily more-alarming events in the Middle East.

★ ★ ★

Whatever differences of opinion or reservations which people may have — and I have many — about the wisdom of French North African policy, the root cause of the trouble there is the same as in every other part of the Middle East.

Russia knows that she could never win the Middle East or gain a military foothold on the African continent through open conquest as long as the Western democratic powers have vital interests there and are prepared to defend them.

But the Kremlin does know that if it can pry the West out of that part of the world the Arabs and the Africans will be an easy push-over for its military might.

That is why the Soviet is working actively behind the scenes to encourage local nationalism wherever it can, whether it be in Iraq, Trans-Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Algeria, Tunisia or Morocco. And its chief agent and tool is Gamel Abdel Nasser, president of Egypt, who has long had grandiose ideas of becoming the leader, perhaps the dictator, of first the whole Arab world, second, the whole African continent and thirdly the whole Moslem world which stretches far beyond those confines into other parts of Arabia and into Russia itself.

Colonel Nasser and his own aspirations would not be worth worrying about were it not for the fact that Russia is doing everything in its power to make him successful. Once that is achieved — if it ever is achieved — I wouldn't give a plugged penny for his political future or even his life. Russia would take care of

that without any consultation with the United Nations and the Kremlin would be well on its way to conquering the world.

The troubles in Algeria are all part of the pattern and whether or not the West can fully agree with French policy, France must have Western support.

The Algerian strike this week had one purpose only: to influence the United Nations General Assembly to intervene against the French and have it stop its military campaign to restore order in the territory. And as usual the respite would be used merely to maintain the status quo while greater efforts are made to build up nationalist strength and increase the political demands before the U.N. can even get around to negotiating a political settlement.

The Algerian situation is complicated by the fact that it is peopled, generally, by two distinct population groups: 1,200,000 of European origin, the majority of whom were born there and are entitled to look on the country as their homeland, and 8,300,000 Moslems.

★ ★ ★

Of the Europeans, a minority (as elsewhere in the world) are short-sighted, egotistical, and responsible for much of the hate and distrust which Moslems have for the Europeans. The Moslems, themselves, are made up of Berbers (descendants of the original natives) and Arabs, who had conquered the land before the arrival by the French. In addition to these two groups there is also a considerable Jewish community.

Under the present nationalist demands, the European group and much of the Jewish community would henceforth be classed as foreigners, subject to expulsion or whatever other repressive measures might be devised to deprive them of their land, their industries or their wealth and cast them out into the growing volume of state-less refugees.

Yet, at the moment, the nationalists, while sufficiently numerous to cause serious trouble, are a minority of the Moslem population. Most Moslems are living in fear of nationalist reprisals and any sign of weakness on the part of the West will leave them no other course than to join the rebel cause for their own protection.

# Maginot Line

—By Judd Brehaut

FEB 7 1957

Britain's new defence minister, Rt. Hon. Duncan Sandys, said in Ottawa the other day that the next global war would see the use of H-bombs.

Mr. Sandys' statement is not a surprising one, really, though it may have come as a shock to those folk who still cling, hopefully, to the belief that a full-scale nuclear war would be so horrible that no nation, aggressor or otherwise, would dare use them first and risk their own annihilation.

In theory, the hope is reasonable enough. But in practice it is a very different matter for several reasons. One, as Mr. Sandys pointed out, is that it is inconceivable that a large section of humanity would allow themselves to be humiliated and defeated without using everything they've got in the cupboard.

That is the obvious reason and it is one which most people will willingly recognize and understand. What concerns—or should concern—the Western world more in these critical days are the circumstances under which a nation might resort to their use without having their backs to the wall.

★ ★ ★

The hope that fear of the annihilation of whole civilizations would do more than any other factor to keep the peace is one which has been widely current in Western civilization ever since the end of the Second Great War. Mankind just can't afford to continue having wars has been the cry, but, unfortunately for us, history does not support this theory in any way.

It may sound quite unreal in this Atomic Age to talk about earlier generations or to make a comparison between hydrogen bombs and earlier weapons. We know that there can be no comparison between the relative deadliness of modern weapons and the weapons of the past. Yet, other scribes from the time when bows-and-arrows replaced the cave-man's club and the discovery of gunpowder made earlier weapons obsolete, down through the whole long list of more and more deadly weapons, have probably written in the same vein.

But peace only reigned until some despot, ostensibly for the needs of his own people but almost invariably for his own aggrandizement and power, decided

that he could usefully use the fear of other nations to achieve his own objectives without running too many risks of war. The subsequent gains of such a policy, before others could awaken to the peril, put the despot in a much-improved position from which he could risk the consequences of war with a better than average chance of emerging as victor.

And the current Western faith that fear will prevail in the final analysis is as dangerous a doctrine as has ever stalked the land. That faith, belief, hope or whatever you want to call it—personally, I think it is the expression of our own fear of atomic warfare rather than anybody else's fear—is fast becoming another and equally-useless Maginot Line. It will fail us, too, as the years in which we can hope to shelter behind it are now being numbered.

No-one in his right mind, in the Western world at least, wants another war—global or any other kind. We know the horror of it but our horror, basically, stems from the fact that Western civilization, founded upon and steeped in Christian precepts and traditions, places the world's highest value on human life.

★ ★ ★

We must never forget that there are hundreds of millions of people in the world beyond the range of our civilization who do not share our standard of human values. Millions of them sincerely believe that their present lives in this world must be lived out at that level and their next "life" on this earth will find them in better circumstances providing that they have earned it. A quick and painless death holds no real terrors for them and in many cases it is welcomed, particularly if their last act in life is one likely to earn them a higher reward on the next round.

But whether that aside is relevant or irrelevant to the present discussion of causes, the fact remains that a new crop of ambitious despots is in the making and they can use the beliefs of their own peoples to make war righteous and justified.

The stakes are high, probably higher than they have ever been before, and the game will grow rougher every day unless the West can call a halt to it now.

# Gaza And Aqaba

—By Judd Brehaut

EEB 1 4 1957

The terms "Gaza Strip" and "Aqaba" are familiar enough to the average newspaper reader today. They are the current hot-spots in the Middle Eastern situation, bones of contention between Israel, Egypt and the United Nations.

But few people know very much about them, except as points now occupied by the Israeli forces which Israel has expressed her determination to hold until the U.N. has exacted some firm guarantees from Egypt about their use pending an over-all political settlement.

Unfortunately, it is not easy to pick up the thread of background developments affecting the whole Middle Eastern problem, let alone the particular ones of the Gaza Strip and Aqaba. The search for some material led me through mountains of files back from the present time through eight years which separates us from the proclamation of the formation of the State of Israel, the U.N. debates which led up to it, a whole series of partition plans, amendments and modifications.

★ ★ ★

Throughout those years — and for many years before that — Palestine, as it was then known, has been a veritable dog's breakfast of intrigue, trouble and warfare. All this is generally realized, of course, so let's get back to Gaza and Aqaba.

For our own purposes at the moment, we need only go back to the United Nations Palestine partition plan of 1947 which provided for the division of Palestine into two separate and independent states, one Jewish, the other representing the Arabs who dwelt in Palestine, with an elaborate plan to encourage what would amount, eventually to a sorting out of population through bans on land sales to Jews in the Arab portions and vice-versa.

The Zionists and the Arab states bordering upon Palestine (no-one ever seemed to bother consulting the Arab residents of Palestine) all disliked the idea of partitioning but the Zionists accepted it as being better than nothing. The Arab states and Egypt never did, preferring their own plan of turning all of Palestine into an Arab state. While they did agree among themselves to form an administrative bureau for the portions of Palestine designated as an Arab state, they specifically avoided creating a government and their forces crossed the Palestine border the very moment that the Jews proclaimed their own state under the name of Israel.

The Gaza Strip, taking its name from the historic Philistine port and stronghold

of Aza or Gaza (which also gave us the term gauze bandage) is a tiny area bordering the Mediterranean sea, stretching from the border of Egypt's Sinai desert twenty-six miles up the coast to within thirty-five miles of the Israeli port of Tel Aviv. It is about six miles in width and was taken by the Egyptian forces when they invaded the barren Negev peninsula which adjoins the eastern border of the Sinai desert from the Mediterranean south to where it touches the Gulf of Aqaba, leading into the Red Sea.

Gaza has always been regarded as being an integral part of mandated Palestine as was the Negev peninsula, which was designated as part of the new Jewish state. The Egyptians, who captured it in the first flush of victory in 1948 when the State of Israel was proclaimed, have since maintained it as a jumping off point for border raids on Israel because it is more easily maintained and supplied than any other point in their own Sinai desert. Since the Israeli re-capture of it three months ago, the area has known peace for the first time since 1948 and a new civil administration is already bringing order and the first glimpse of relative prosperity to the people there.

★ ★ ★

Aqaba, as I have already said, is the name of a gulf at the northernmost tip of the Red Sea. On its apex, a few miles from where the borders of Egypt's Sinai peninsula and Trans-Jordan reach the same waterway is the Israeli port of Eliat, which the Jewish state has created as a transport point for its trade with Southeast Asia and the Indian ocean to offset the long and expensive haul around the Cape of Good Hope following the closure of the Suez canal to it by Egypt in 1948. Indeed, despite the facilities, few Israel-bound ships have ever been able to use the Gulf of Aqaba for Egypt has fortified the entrance to the gulf, 100 miles to the south, and its guns have effectively blockaded the port for as long as it has been in operation.

As can be seen from any map of the Middle East, both these points are of vital interest to Israel and of no practical or economic use to Egypt, separated from it by the vast Sinai desert, except as a jumping off point for military incursions. The Israelis can hardly be blamed for demanding the return of the Gaza Strip and for U.N. control of the Sinai coastal strip along the Gulf of Aqaba. Both actions are prerequisites to a reasonable peace and a political settlement in the Middle East.

# Beware Of Myths

—By Judd Brehaut

FEB 21 1957

One of the most interesting developments on the international scene during the past week was the ouster of Dimitri Shepilov as the Soviet foreign minister and the naming of Andrei A. Gromyko to succeed him.

Like everything else that the Soviet does, the shuffle has been regarded with forebodings in Western circles which tend to see it as an outright return to Stalinism as if Stalinism was a thing which could be revived merely by turning on a tap.

Of course, no-one knows what is going on inside the Soviet but it has always been my opinion — and especially so since the death of Stalin — that the West makes a grievous error in assuming that everything that Russia does is *ipso facto* a concrete step forward in its grand design of world conquest.

★ ★ ★

But let us have no misunderstanding in the shades of interpretation here. The grand design does exist and the shuffle is undoubtedly dictated by the desire to further the grand design but more often than not it is my belief that the jockeyings are attempts to save the grand design from a serious setback.

Western opinion is so dictated by a fear of Russia that it is almost automatically assumed that Russian diplomacy is infallible, without any chance being acknowledged that the Soviet itself might have made grievous errors in judgment and that it might be making politically-defensive moves against developments in the West or elsewhere in the world.

The ouster of Shepilov provides a good case for speculation. As I have said the general interpretation in the West tends to be gloomy but it need not be so. In the first place, while the advent of Andrei Gromyko (whose chief claim to Western fame was his ability to voice the greatest number of Soviet "nyets" while at the United Nations) undoubtedly presages a tougher-talking foreign policy in the Stalin style, it is doubtful if Stalinism can ever be revived under present conditions in Russia.

Stalinism is a one-man show conducted by a very strong man at that. When Stalin threatened there was always the certainty that his grip on Russia was so tight that he could carry out his threat if he — and he alone — thought the risk was worthwhile.

There is no such man in Russia today and it is doubtful if there can be one for many, many years to come. Even

Stalin required more than a decade to so consolidate his power by ruthlessly eliminating his opposition that he could speak as undisputed master of Russia during the Second Great War and up to the time of his death. If anything, the present Russian scene is roughly equivalent to the situation there in 1924 with the death of Lenin and Stalin's struggle for absolute power against the collective which had inherited Lenin's mantle and lasted through until as late as 1936.

While there are, undoubtedly, some individuals in the present collective who would like to seize power today, the big difference between the situation now and in 1924 is the existence of a powerful Red Army, whose top officers would almost certainly react quickly to prevent even one of their own number from seizing absolute power. And the fact that since Stalin's death changes in the top hierarchy of the Kremlin have not been sealed by the liquidation of any of the ousted personalities indicates the existence of factions which are strong enough politically to be respected.

★ ★ ★

Be that as it may, Shepilov's ouster may not have been dictated as much by the Soviet failure in the Middle East — brought on by the exposure of its ripening military plot to use Egypt as a base to seize control of the Arab world — as by the Soviet need to salvage as much of its operation as possible in the face of an awakening Western world. Gromyko can be expected to play a much stronger hand at the United Nations and elsewhere in the diplomatic world, but it more likely will be from a position of weakness rather than strength. It will be his job to regain the initiative for Russia, a job which will be made that much easier if the West persists in its attempts to placate the Soviet while the Kremlin recovers from the serious damage its cause has suffered in both the Middle East and in the Eastern European satellites.

The West's (and in that respect these days, unfortunately, an observer cannot escape pointing his finger at Washington) greatest weakness lies in its inflexible thinking on the over-all East-West power struggle and the effect which this has in its attempts to solve critical day-to-day issues in world affairs. This leads, in itself, to a double standard in judgment and in action which can only lead to greater crises and more chaotic conditions.

# The Rule Of Law

—By Judd Brehaut

Whatever happens at the United Nations between the time this column is written and the time it appears in print, the ultimate fate of the world organization will still be a debatable point.

At the time of writing the Afro-Asian and Soviet blocs were waging a ding-dong battle against Mr. Pearson's latest four-point proposal to end the U.N. deadlock in the Middle East. By the time this appears the fate of these proposals will probably be known so it is of little use attempting to assess them in detail here.

But whatever happens, the pattern for the future of the world and the U.N. will still be as clouded as ever and it is likely to remain so until the nations of the world agree to take another hard look at their interpretations of the aims and the objectives of the world organization.

★ ★ ★

I have before me a recent speech delivered in the British House of Lords by Lord Cherwell, personal assistant to the Prime Minister in 1940 and holder of other senior wartime cabinet posts, dealing with that specific aspect of the United Nations.

Lord Cherwell strips away much of the idealistic terms which usually surround any discussions on the subject.

He begins by stating the fact that the intention of the founders of the world body was "to substitute law for war", the best nutshell summing up of the ideals of the U.N. which I have ever run across.

But of this phrase, he says:

"It is another of those comfortable slogans expressing a desire felt by all of us in rhyming monosyllables, which seem to have an almost hypnotic effect. Of course, we all want the rule of law among nations but what are the laws which we wish to rule?"

"Evidently, it is not the laws accepted in principle for thousands of years — the fulfillment of contracts and the sanctity of treaties. Rather it seems to be commandments promulgated *ad hoc* by the U.N. General Assembly whenever differences arise. That is submission to an arbitrary body. It is not law."

This must be the key point in any discussion of the future of the United Nations because it is a principle which has to a large extent ceased to exist in the General Assembly's deliberations. Mr. Pearson himself, ignored it in his address to the assembly earlier this week in which he warned the United Nations that it was

now reaching a point of no return in our efforts to deal with the problems arising out of the military intervention in the Suez area."

Said Mr. Pearson:

"The Canadian delegation, like many other delegations here, has tried to take an objective and impartial position in dealing with the problems . . . We are not influenced by a desire to support either of the contestants at the expense of the other in our efforts to find a means of bringing to an end a conflict which has been growing in intensity over a period of some years. We are solely concerned with finding the best policy to pursue in order to resolve a series of difficult problems by means which will bring peace and security to the peoples of both countries. We have no other interest than this."

There is nothing wrong with Mr. Pearson's intentions and no-one will quibble with the fact that Canada has no other interest than bringing peace and security to the peoples of both countries involved, or even to the peoples of all countries. The rest of it is more concerned with expediency rather than justice.

★ ★ ★

But how can any country enjoy peace and security without the supremacy of law? And law, to be supreme, must have an adequate force to back it up. The law — the fulfillment of contracts, the sanctity of treaties and even the U.N. resolutions — has been deliberately and maliciously flouted for years by the Egyptians who have, at the instigation of Soviet Russia, encouraged the Arab world to do the same. Because this has been so the Middle East is now in a turmoil and both Canada and the United States, in particular, seem to have forgotten that it is the force of law which must be restored before peace can be restored to the Middle East rather than back-breaking attempts to avoid offending those who have done the most to destroy the rule of law.

Unless, the more advanced nations of the world — and they can still swing a narrow majority in the General Assembly — are prepared to return to the primary values, the United Nations charter is not worth the paper it is written on. The United Nations can be saved now to fulfill a worthwhile role in keeping world peace but it may not be possible to save it in a year's time.

# Ghana Story

MAR 7 1957—By Judd Brehaut

One of the most interesting political experiments in the Commonwealth — indeed, in the world — is now under way.

I am referring to the creation of Ghana, the first all-Negro independent state within the Commonwealth.

The story of Ghana, its people and the tremendous strides which it has made since 1901 when Britain first assumed full responsibility for the government of its component parts is a fascinating one, particularly for people like Mr. John Foster Dulles who can see nothing but the basest exploitation in British colonial policies.

The story is far too long to be told here and much of it has been told already in the news columns during the past week. However, what has not been too well told is how the state fits into the larger picture in Africa.

Of course no-one should expect the new state of Ghana to be a model Commonwealth country merely by being granted its independence under a governor-general. It will have many serious troubles of its own, perhaps, for many years to come — the Ashanti interior, for example, is not too pleased about the new constitutional set-up under which some measure of local autonomy has been given. The Ashantis, generally, have been far more in favor of a federal system, under which they would, like the Canadian provinces, run most of their own affairs. But this was over-ruled in a plebiscite which heavily endorsed the Convention People's Party of Prime Minister Dr. Kwame (his Christian name is Francis but is seldom used) Nkrumah (pronounced En-Kroo-mah) in 1954.

★ ★ ★

But all internal problems aside, what interests me most is the part it will play against the whole African scene. That is an important question for the future of the world. The Ghanaians will be the pace-makers of African nationalism. All of Africa, particularly the "black belt", is watching it closely and if the Ghana government keeps its head it can lead to an orderly and sensible development of a major part of the continent.

Whether Dr. Nkrumah is the man who can do it, nobody knows. He is known to be a knowledgeable man, converted to Christianity in his early years, educated in Christian missionary schools in Africa and where he became a teacher before going abroad to both the United States and to Britain (the London School of Economics) to further his education. He is a Socialist and he envisions a West

African Federation which may explain why he did not want his own country organized along loose federal lines so that it could enter any larger federation later as a complete entity.

How far afield he would like to go, eventually, is also a question mark which only time can answer but there are already several checks if power ever turns his head or the heads of his successors.

One is that the African west coast is entirely different from any other part of Africa. In the first place, West Coast Africans derive from a much higher stage of culture than those in East Africa and have known European influences for well over 300 years while the East Africans have only known them to any extent since about 1890. Furthermore — and this is probably the most important factor — partly due to the mosquitoes, tsetse flies, the horribly damp and unhealthy climate on the west coast, compared to the East African highlands, and to the British policy of allowing no-one but the natives to settle and own any land, West Africa is almost 100 per cent Negro, with only a handful of whites and no Asiatics. As a result there has been no racial friction such as in Kenya and elsewhere to cause any real hate for the white foreigner.

★ ★ ★

Of a more artificial nature, is the barrier which the new British-inspired Central African Federation of Southern and Northern Rhodesia and Nyassaland will form to contain any future imperialistic ambitions of the Ghanaians as well as to check the spread of any unfortunate political developments in the apartheid-ridden Union of South Africa.

We have, therefore, three distinctly different forces at work in Africa at the moment and three distinctly different approaches to the awakening nationalism. In South Africa is the white man's attempt to completely suppress the overwhelmingly Negro population; in Central Africa a serious attempt to create a strong multi-racial federation to serve a mixed population of Negroes, Europeans and Asiatics; while in West Africa the Negro is being given his head after careful tutelage and continuing help through membership in the same Commonwealth as we Canadians belong.

Under the right conditions, and with time to mature in its independence, Ghana may lead the whole of the Dark Continent out into the wonderful paths of Western enlightenment.



# Nasser's Aims

— By Judd Brehaut

MAR 14 1957

With Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt hardly waiting for the dust to settle behind withdrawing Israeli troops before proclaiming his own control over the Gaza Strip, the time has come to take another look at what is known of his ambitions.

It has been popular, of course, to regard Colonel Nasser as "a tin-pot dictator", presumably meaning that he is really a straw man which one good gust of wind would topple over. Many times during the past six months I have thought of him in that vein but now I wonder if, perhaps, this is not the biggest mistake in Western thinking about him.

It is true that as the leader of the Egyptian army—which after all is not a very good army in any respect as the Israelis proved only a few short months ago—he is probably more guff and wind than flesh and bones. But there are two other factors present in the situation which can make him a very dangerous man indeed.

One, of course, is the support which Russia is giving him, support which will be given up to the hilt to achieve his own ambitions until the Soviet is able to move in safely itself and dispense with his services in a way which the Kremlin has used all too often. Why should Russia put her own armies into the field to do the job somebody else can do for it, particularly when armed Soviet intervention would put the whole Western world at its throat?

★ ★ ★

The other factor is the legitimate stirrings of nationalism throughout the Arab world and all over the African continent. I say legitimate because there are few in the Western world who want to deny these lands their independence and freedom but our own survival, both as a civilization and as a peoples, demands that certain basic precepts of international behavior be recognized and respected.

But let's look, briefly, at Colonel Nasser's ambitions. They are taken from his own book, *The Philosophy of the Revolution*, which is as revealing as Hitler's *Mein Kampf* of the dreadful Thirties.

Nasser is a life-long revolutionary, having participated in a political assassination in his student days, led or participated in political demonstrations, and was wounded, arrested and banned from government schools. Since then, mostly

in the last six months, he has become the first real Arab hero in more than twelve centuries and he considers himself the instrument of aroused Arab and Egyptian nationalism which will create an empire greater than that of the Moors.

But he wants considerably more than his stated "Arab empire from the Atlantic ocean to the Persian gulf". He also envisions Egypt and the Arab world as having the major voice in the fate of all Africa and beyond that he wants the Mohammedans of the world to unite in a single, powerful force.

In his writings, Nasser speaks of three sources of strength—the great number of Muslims around the world, the strategic position of the Arabs astride the "crossroads" of the world, and the vital importance of Arab oil to much of the world—and three "circles" of influence.

★ ★ ★

He points to the eighty million Muslims in Indonesia; fifty million in China, millions in Malaya, Siam and Burma, the nearly 100 million in Pakistan and the forty million in the Soviet itself. Grandiose ideas that we can be excused for laughing at but what a perfect set up for Russia to use in furthering its own plan for world conquest.

While his present consideration is the Middle East—his first "circle"—he has written of the great Negro continent to the south of Egypt in these words:

"The Dark Continent is now the scene of a strange and excited turbulence, the white man, representing various European nations, is again trying to redivide the map of Africa". (We only need to think of the formation of Ghana and the new Central African Federation to realize what he is hitting at.)

He continues:

"We shall not, in any circumstance, be able to stand idly by in the face of what is going on, in the false belief that it will not affect or concern us".

After outlining his dreams of a new Arab empire, he says: "And now I go back to that wandering mission in search of a hero to play it. Here is the role. Here are the lines, and here is the stage. We (Egypt) alone, by virtue of our place, can perform the role".

Of such thoughts are new imperialist despots made and honest desires of people everywhere for independence and a better life, provide a useful vehicle.

A new factor has been introduced into the critical Middle Eastern situation during the past week. And the implications are not too pleasant for the West.

This new factor is the pronouncement by Crown Prince Faisal of Saudi Arabia — obviously with the approval of his brother King Ibn Saud — that his country has no intention of allowing Israeli ships to traverse the Gulf of Aqaba.

While all part of the whole Arab-Egyptian-Israeli crisis in the Middle East, Prince Faisal's announcement is disquietening because it indicates that the Arab states — as distinct from Egypt — are prepared to play a more active role in the potentially-deadly international dart game.

★ ★ ★

Up to now, as I have said, Arab hostility toward Israel was admitted, and a number of the Arab states were willing to play along with Egypt in its avowed intent to destroy Israel at the earliest possible opportunity. But at the same time there appeared to be some reluctance to, and some doubt whether they would, concede Arab leadership to non-Arab Egypt.

At one time not so long ago it was hoped that pro-Western Iraq, the Arab kingpin in the Middle Eastern anti-Communist defence alliance known as the Northern Tier running from Turkey in the west to Pakistan in the east, would emerge as the natural leader of the Arab world. This hope was so real a few years ago that Soviet Russia began its active campaign to support Egypt and its dictator, Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser, who was known to have definite grandiose ideas along those lines. And we all know how successful this strategy has been.

A mutual hate of the newly-established state of Israel was the cement with which President Nasser used to translate his ambitious political dreams into reality and the weakness of the Western nations — more properly the weakness of the United States — in dealing with him has done for him what he could not have hoped to do himself.

Saudi Arabia, one of the largest of the Arab kingdoms numerically as well as being one of the wealthiest, has now indicated its willingness to carry the ball for Nasser.

This is the same oil-and-slave-rich state for whose king, the United States laid out

its finest red carpet barely two months ago (President Eisenhower even broke long-established tradition by going to the Washington airport to greet him rather than on the White House steps) and hailed the conclusion of his visit as being a concrete step towards promoting a permanent settlement of the political questions in the Middle East.

Now the question can well be asked whether King Ibn Saud was successful in pulling the wool over Washington's eyes in the approved Arab trading fashion or whether non-interference by the U.S. was the price which Mr. Eisenhower had to pay for continued Arab friendship and access to their great oil reserves or for Saud's acceptance of the Eisenhower Doctrine against Soviet aggression in the Middle East.

Whichever it may have been (perhaps, it was all three) it is becoming increasingly obvious that the United States has paid too high a price for whatever it wanted — a price which it is likely the whole Western world will have to pay far and beyond anything which Washington was able to envision.

The Arabs, even the lowliest of the race, have always had the reputation of being among the shrewdest bargainers in the world. Ibn Saud, throughout his conference with Mr. Eisenhower, constantly maintained that there was little danger of Communism taking over the Middle East (it should be noted he did not say Soviet Russia but was apparently referring to the home-grown kind) and his attitude could have been designed to draw more-advantageous conditions out of the U.S. in exchange for his agreement to accept the Eisenhower Doctrine.

★ ★ ★

Is this the reason why the United States constantly worked to water down any strong Western resolutions at the last session of the U.N. General Assembly? Is this why it has consistently refused — even up to Monday of this week — to offer any guarantees or make any promise to Israel?

The swarthy-skinned traders at the cross-roads of the races which is the Middle East have proved once again that Rudyard Kipling is still right, however much we wishfully deceive ourselves that we can in this day expect to deal with those "east of Suez" on the basis of Western fundamentals of negotiation.

# Some Sidelights

— By Judd Brehaut

MAR 28 1957

International developments beyond the scope—for the present at least—of the continuing crisis in the Middle East provided the most interesting reading during the past week.

Not that these developments overshadowed the Middle Eastern situation in any way but their individual significance against the backdrop of the whole picture of world political events should not be ignored.

As for the Israeli-Egyptian tension itself there was nary a sign on the whole horizon which could be considered comforting. The Bermuda conference of President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan was disappointing though it would be quite improper to brand it a failure, or even a near-failure, until more is known about it. That time, I think, will be when Mr. Hammarskjold, the United Nations Secretary-General, will be faced with reporting what is more than ever likely to be the failure of his mission to talk a little sense into Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt.

★ ★ ★

Of the other developments, probably the most interesting one to those Canadians—and there is ample evidence to suggest that the majority are of that opinion now—who believed that Britain and France acted quite properly in their military intervention to protect the Suez Canal Zone last October, is the news that Dictator-President Ernesto de LaGuardia of Panama is more than toying with the idea of nationalizing the United States-owned Panama Canal.

While the majority of Canadians would undoubtedly agree with any military action which the United States felt was necessary in protecting its treaty rights in the canal zone and safeguarding its use for the ships of all nations, there would be considerable satisfaction in seeing how gracefully Mr. John Foster Dulles could manage to scramble down from the "high moral ramparts" on which he took refuge when Sir Anthony Eden set the pace in Suez last October.

Not that there is any doubt at all that he would scramble down hurriedly for, at long last, some "crisp, rippling decisions" would be pouring out of the White House in the best Time Magazine manner.

Continuing Soviet preparations to achieve its eventual goal of dominating the world were evident in the news that an increasing number of unidentified submarines—almost certain to be Soviet rather than Chinese Communist under the circumstances—are prowling under the

waters of the South Pacific ocean and as close as forty miles off the Australian port of Darwin.

There is, admittedly, no cause for immediate alarm because of this for it is only natural that Russia, with reputedly the largest submarine fleet in the world, would be almost constantly engaged in long-range exercises and manoeuvres. But it is on exercises like these where strategy and tactics are tested, waters charted and remote refuelling locations spotted for future use. These latter possibilities remind me of the last year or so before the outbreak of the Second Great War when Nazi Germany used to send its Graf Zeppelin cruising up the St. Lawrence river, ostensibly because of poor weather conditions to the south, instead of overland across the northern U.S. to its Western terminus at Lakehurst, N.J. There is good reason to believe that large numbers of aerial photos were taken of the St. Lawrence at that time, a belief borne out by the fact that Nazi U-boats were later known to have hidden out in remote coves and uninhabited stretches along the north shore of the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

★ ★ ★

Continuing Soviet pressure on Poland also shows that the Soviet has no intention of letting that satellite nation slip further from its grasp. At the moment, it is trying to starve Poland into a more complete submission by only shipping in what amounts to about a day's supply of needed food, giving the Polish government no opportunity to build up its food stocks. The unabated terror campaign in Hungary—no longer necessary for political purposes there—is also believed to be designed to intimidate the Poles and much is being made of Polish fears that any further attempt to withdraw more into the Western orbit will almost certainly result in the loss to Poland of the heavily-industrialized former German area centred on Stettin.

This territory was awarded to Poland in the war settlement to compensate for the loss of its eastern provinces to Russia proper. West Germany still lays claim to it and vows one day that it will get it back, all of which leaves no alternative for the Poles than to keep on relatively friendly terms with Russia while attempting to keep the small measure of independence which it won for itself in the revolt early last fall. A Western guarantee of her present Western boundaries could well be one of the smartest diplomatic moves which could be made.

One of the more interesting aspects of the international scene during the past week has been the Russian propaganda blast against the Bermuda conference.

The Soviet propaganda machine has been hitting on all eight cylinders alternating charges that British agreement to accept United States' custody of the atomic warheads for its soon-to-be-acquired U.S. guided missiles is proof that the U.S. has forcibly reduced Britain to a state of being a second or a third-rate power and threatening immediate atomic retaliation if the NATO forces made any aggressive moves in Western Europe.

In addition, the Russians have dropped some nasty innuendoes on other facets of Anglo-U.S. relations and the handling of the international crisis in the Middle East, none of which need bother us too much for this kind of Kremlin propaganda is something with which we long have been familiar.

★ ★ ★

However, outside of the few critical weeks which immediately followed on the Anglo-French action in Suez, the West has been comparatively free of such propaganda in recent years.

What, then, has brought on the latest propaganda barrage so close on the heels of the talks between Prime Minister Macmillan and President Eisenhower in Bermuda?

There are several possible reasons.

First, the Soviet leaders could suspect — though fear might be a better word — that in the absence of any disclosure of a tangible agreement on some of the more critical issues before them, some secret understandings may have been reached between the two powers.

Second is the possibility that the Russians realize that the area of firm agreement is so relatively small that it would not be too hard at this time to drive another wedge into Anglo-American relations which would widen the existing chasm between the two big Western powers.

Third, of course, is the possibility that it is a mixture of the first two reasons.

Personally, I believe that the second reason holds the real answer and that the West may be on the threshold of witnessing a display of propaganda pyrotechnics from Moscow designed to rub a plentiful supply of salt into Anglo-American sores and scare Western people silly.

This will be a most important thing to watch for in the coming months, over and above what more-dangerous developments may occur in the Middle East or elsewhere in the world. There is, we all know, a great deal to be criticized — indeed must be criticized — in the present Washington policies but the people of the West must guard against letting any honest disagreements degenerate into any anti-U.S. tension for it is such developments which Russia will exploit to the full.

This kind of Soviet international mischief-making is already apparent in their twisting of justifiable Western criticism of the U.S. retention of the custody of atomic warheads stock-piled in Britain into a deliberate Washington plot to reduce Britain to the status of a third-rate world power. Washington may have a lot of faults to answer for in its handling of recent international affairs but it could hardly be credited with planning something which could only cut its own throat in its world battle against Communism. Misguided, yes; but evil, no. The latter is unthinkable.

★ ★ ★

In the Middle East, events seemed to mark time in the past week with Egypt and Israel restricting themselves to verbal battles during the visit of Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, the U.N. Secretary-General, to the area.

The continued explosiveness of the situation cannot be denied, however, and it is quite apparent from President Nasser's remarks about the Arab refugees from Israel that he has no intention of softening his position in the least. I have always considered Israel's failure to provide some compensation for the hundreds of thousands of Arab refugees, who were dispossessed in what was then Palestine, to be a serious blot on the record of the new Israeli nation. Its offer this week to make such compensation available — presumably in reply to the Egyptian dictator's blast — is, naturally, a welcome one but the wording of Col. Nasser's statement make it all too plain that compensation of this kind is very far from what he has in mind.

Col. Nasser was not asking for compensation to the dispossessed Arabs but for a full return of their rights, their property and their land. In other words, nothing less than the death of Israel as a nation.

*Herold  
Brehaut*

# Easter Hope

APR 18 1957

— By Judd Brehaut

The recent British White Paper on defence has posed some questions to the Western world which the Western world is as yet clearly unprepared to answer.

Whether the British decision was based on far-sighted realism, dictated by economic circumstances which made a re-examination of conventional defence costs imperative or whether it was a mixture of both, doesn't matter. The point is that Britain's action may force the Western world to face up to certain questions which it doesn't want to face.

And I am not referring to the question of the morality of nuclear or atomic warfare. That question is already out of our hands and beyond our control. The weapons exist and they will be used by any major power bent on conquest or in need of defence.

★ ★ ★

The big question must be whether the mere possession of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and a determination to use them will actually deter a power which does not stand to suffer as much damage as its opponent. This very pertinent question was raised the other day by a British writer and commentator on international affairs, Commander Sir Stephen King-Hall, in his weekly News-Letter, who contrasted the certain total destruction which the British Isles would suffer from three or four well-placed H-bombs with the wide open and thinly-populated spaces which make up the great Russian land-mass from Eastern Europe across Asia to Communist China and beyond to the Pacific. Most of densely-populated Western Europe is in approximately the same position as the British Isles and it is, I think, quite proper to ask which nation, or group of nations, would be the most deterred from risking an atomic war. The Soviet is in a far better position to gamble on its ability to absorb more damage than Britain or the rest of Western Europe, and after all that is the basis on which all wars have been fought.

The only deterrent of value then is for the Western nations to create by a far closer association than they have ever achieved before a land-mass approximating the size of any

potential aggressor which could not be knocked out with a few well-placed bombs and from which a war of attrition could be carried on for a longer period of time. Only then would Russia be deterred because the chances of its own success would be so limited that it would think twice before taking the risk.

Nuclear deterrence, then, is only a tool in the Western defence kit and to rely on it alone is a dangerous fallacy unless there is a realization beneath the surface differences of opinion among Western nations and justifiable tensions which occur from time to time that a very real spirit of collective security must prevail. I am not one to say that honest differences of opinion among Western nations should be squelched or ruled out on security grounds for, unfortunately, if they are not thoroughly aired and solved, such differences have a habit of rankling and growing to the point where even greater damage can be done to the fabric of collective security. The safety-valve of spirited discussion and freedom of speech and freedom of thought are still our finest means of achieving the unity of understanding which the Western world needs so desperately.

But, as I have said — and this newspaper has said many times — before a collective security entirely based on fear of what might happen if we don't have defence alliances is not enough to hold us together.

★ ★ ★

About a year ago the "three wise men" of NATO made a close study of ways and means by which the alliance could be strengthened by improving the cultural and economic ties among the member-nations — a report which has apparently become lost with its recommendations during the more serious international crisis arising out of Egypt's seizure of the Suez canal, the Soviet's brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolt and other similar tensions.

Yet that report deals with the real issue. The spirit of Western unity must be revived and nourished as a preliminary to achieving a brotherhood of man, without which all will be lost. That is my Easter hope for 1957.