

NUGGET

NOVEMBER, 1963

THE CASE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES



**A VERY ANGRY CANADIAN FIREBRAND
HURLS SOME PAINFUL TRUTHS AT THE
SMUG BELIEF WE HAVE IN OUR OWN
GREATNESS**

INDICTMENT BY GENE LEES

Americans know little about Canada and care less, but during Canada's recent national election, they were made aware of their neighbor.

For Prime Minister John Diefenbaker was making anti-American noises disconcertingly like those from Latin America. *Look* and the *Saturday Evening Post* carried articles on this new anti-Americanism, the *Post* comfortably concluding there was no real anti-Americanism in Canada. Lester B. Pearson was elected Prime Minister and, since he is thought to be pro-American, that seemed to prove it. Americans settled back into the vaguely smiling complacency that has become your national expression. But as a Canadian I can tell you that Pearson did not win because he is pro-American. He won because Diefenbaker had shockingly mismanaged our affairs.

Canada is indeed anti-American. But whereas Latin anti-Americanism flames and crackles, Canadian anti-Americanism smoulders under a quiet surface, going undetected for years until some incident fans it into sparks. Also, it is hard for Canadians to dislike Americans. You look, talk, dress, live too much as we do. In fact, many of you are blood relatives to Canadians. To say that I dislike Americans would be impossible — the term covers my cousins Bert and Agnes and their children and a mass of relatives in Michigan of whom I am terribly fond. It covers too many of my closest friends and guys I went to school with. Indeed, I think Canadians have a distinct liking for Americans as people. Your generosity, your hospitality, your almost childlike optimism amuse and delight us and warm our conservative and somewhat inhibited hearts. But that doesn't mean we approve of the U.S. or its policies or principles.



At heart we share the anti-Americanism that has become endemic to the Western Hemisphere, and if you do not start to understand the reasons for it, the result may be your political and economic isolation within 10 years and your finish as a major power. If you think a major power cannot be broken in so short a time, consider that England straddled the world in 1939 and was reduced to little more than an island by 1950.

The animosity toward you is largely deserved. Millions of people are tired of U.S. aggression masquerading as charity, your pose of piety, your bombast, your ignorance, your political and military stupidity, and your eternal bloody boasting about that bomb of yours. Last year I visited nearly every country in Latin America where, ironically, I argued the case for you, for I was not then as doubtful about you as I am now. Everywhere I found hostility, ranging from mild to ferocious, toward the U.S.

Americans rationalize that anti-Americanism is the product of jealousy or ignorance of the U.S. Though these factors do enter into it, they are the small part of anti-Americanism. Most countries want no part of your way of life, which they believe is destructive to the individual, so why should they be jealous? And the educated Latin American, like his Canadian counterpart, is *not* ignorant of the United States. He knows more American history, and knows it more accurately, as it pertains to his country, than you do. We have to smile when we hear such statements as that of President Kennedy on April 21, 1961. Of Cuba he said, "Any unilateral intervention, in the absence of external attack upon ourselves or any ally, would have been contrary to our traditions..."

It would not. The U.S. has shown no lack of ingenuity in manufacturing excuses to pounce on weak and friendless nations. Your history of aggression is long and dishonorable, as Mexicans (from whom you stole Texas) and Canadians (from whom you got Oregon and the Alaska Panhandle) can tell you. Latin America has suffered at your hands, particularly in the time of that abominable man Teddy Roosevelt, who boasted: "The United States does not have in the world—and does not deserve to have—more than one single friend: the United States." When Latin nations have stood in the way of U.S. economic ambition, you have sent your hated Marine Corps to break them. These are some of your national disgraces: Panama, 1903; Nicaragua, 1909; Mexico, 1914; Santo Domingo, 1916.

You have often supported vicious dictators in Latin America. Franklin Roosevelt said of the sadistic butcher Trujillo, "He's a son of a bitch, but he's our son of a bitch." The Latins *know* he said that, and they have trepidation about you. Will you invade again? Or foment another of the fake revolutions with which you and the Russians are so skillful? But

SMUGNESS

that is silly, you will say, that was all very long ago. Was it? What about the 1954 revolution in Guatemala stage-managed by that evil old psalm-singer John Foster Dulles? If Canada had elected a government that displeased you, would you have done the same to us? No? It wouldn't be the first time. You have in past encouraged and subsidized subversion in Canada and sent men to attack us, always in the pretense of "liberating" us. The Russians, you see, were not the first to so describe aggression.

Your history books say you fought the Revolutionary War because England was imposing taxes without representation. Do they tell you that because of the Seven Years' War with France, England had a public debt of £130 million, most of it spent in your defense, and wanted you to share the burden?

In the Broadway musical *Hot Spot*, a native of the mythical country D'hum tells an American: "We are the only country England ever left voluntarily." You like to believe that. But last year in British Guiana, a woman of Indian ancestry and deep cultivation told me: "We prefer not to be ruled by any country. But if we must be ruled by someone—and I fear we are not ready for self-government—we prefer that it be the British." A few years ago, *Fortune* carried one of the few honest American articles I have ever read on England's relations with her colonies. It told of technological and economic aid poured into them by England and her wish to be shed of them.

England has withdrawn voluntarily from one colony after another, leaving behind a trained civil service. Sometimes, however, you Americans, indulging your eternal propensity for meddling, have forced her to leave too soon, which has brought chaos and bloodshed.

We who grew up in colonies of England found her liberal and just and gifted with a political maturity we all might emulate. Mostly we have missed her when she had gone. This is part of the reason for the almost mystical attachment Commonwealth countries feel to England and the sense of relationship to one another. Our formal connections with England have almost all been severed, and the few tenuous ties that remain we don't *want* cut. My passport states: "A Canadian citizen is a British subject." When I am far from home, it is good to know that I can go to the British consulate for help if I need it. This is one of many things I share with Australians and Indians and New Zealanders and West Indians. We are a family and we know it. It is a curiously proud thing we carry within us, and you Americans will never understand it in a million years, because you cut yourself off from the family.

This does not mean that we have not had our differences with England. Sometimes we have been infuriated by her. You have often been ready with troops and money to help stab her in the back, failing to grasp that these were family quarrels, with both participants wishing you would mind your own business.

In Canada, your pattern has been invariable: you would detect tension, conclude we couldn't wait for you to liberate us, be reassured of this by "intelligence" officers, and send troops—whom we would slap silly. The mistake you made at the Bay of Pigs is one you have been repeating since 1775. In that year you tried to take Quebec, certain the French Canadians would be on your side. But they had been well-treated by the

SMUGNESS

British and whipped your troops.

If that invasion was linked to the American Revolution, the War of 1812 was mostly a matter of U.S. territorial ambition. We were short of supplies and England, at war with Napoleon, could not help us. Fortunately the U.S. businessman is nothing if not avaricious. As he would later sell scrap iron to Japan, he then sold supplies to our soldiers. What really saved us, however, was your matchless military incompetence. A U.S. general named Smyth managed to attack 400 Canadians with 4,000 men *and lose*. Your General Hull bungled so badly he was sentenced to death. (President Madison commuted the sentence.)

You committed atrocities. You burned three cities, Sandwich, Newark, and York (now Toronto) and pillaged homes and churches. The next year the British took Washington and, in retaliation, burned the Capitol, the Library, and the President's mansion, though they touched no homes or churches. After the war, an American general named McClure said York had been burned in retaliation for Washington. York was burned in 1813, Washington in 1814. What is it you say about the Russians rewriting history?

A few years after you lost that war, a force of 1,000 American volunteers attacked us. This was getting monotonous, to say nothing of irksome. We threw you out again. You didn't give up, though. A little-known verse of *Yankee Doodle* goes:

"Secession first he would put down
Wholly and forever
And afterwards from Britain's crown
He Canada would sever."

Your behavior toward Canada during the Civil War was abusive. You accused us (unjustly) of aiding Confederate raiders, but kept silent about the 40,000 Canadian volunteers who fought in the Union army. After the war, Irish-American troops, having a grudge against England, decided to attack us, since we were handier. Your government did nothing to impede them. Some Congressmen gave them money. The would-be raiders sang:

"Many battles we have won along with the
boys in blue
And we'll go and capture Canada, for
we've nothing more to do."

We threw out these and various other attackers from the U.S. You came, you saw, you got clobbered.

"Since the Revolution," *Look* said a few months ago, "Canadians have suspected that the U.S. would like to gobble up their country. The suspicion is well-founded... We did manage to get hold of the Oregon Territory, where the North West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company had been in business for some 50 years, and the Alaska Panhandle, which limits Canada's coast line."

By the end of the 19th century, the U.S. was in a period your own historians admit was one of militaristic expansion. A Washington newspaper editorialized, "Both Cuba and the British Colonies, at the proper time and in the proper manner, will ultimately be annexed to the American union." A Democratic state convention, held during that period in Vermont, adopted a resolution that is amusing in its similarity, in tone and the very phrases used, to Soviet propaganda preceding the takeover of some country:

"That, in the true spirit of Democracy, deeply sympathizing with the downtrodden, oppressed, and over-restricted of every clime and country, we hail with joy the rising spirit of liberty in the provinces of Canada . . . and that we cordially extend to them the hand of friendship, fellowship, and bro-

therly love; that we will use all peaceful means in our power to further their object in becoming members of this our glorious union of free, independent, and sovereign states."

The Canadian view of U.S. behavior in World War I is perhaps exaggerated, but it is not without validity. You made no protest when Germany attacked Belgium, yet Secretary of War Newton V. Baker had the gall to say the U.S. was "now in the dominant moral position in the world." Even when the Germans sank the *Lusitania*, you did nothing. When the German submarine U-235 asked U.S. destroyers to change position off the Atlantic coast so it could sink Allied shipping, they moved. The Germans sank the ships, our people died. A historian later wrote, "America counted her profits while Canada buried her dead."

In the last months of the war, you jumped in. Canadians felt that, having gleaned the profits of the war, you now wanted to claim the victory. I have still not seen a convincing refutation of that interpretation. Your claims that "we won the war" and "the Yanks did it," screamed out on posters, infuriated your allies.

Despite its small population and the exhaustion of its forces, Canada contributed more than the U.S. did even in the *final days* of the war—which is to say nothing of what the other allies contributed. Here are the statistics for the last 100 days of the war. The figures in the center column are Canadian, those on the right American:

Troops engaged	105,000	650,000
Days of operations	100	47
Casualties	45,830	100,000
Prisoners taken	31,537	16,000
Guns captured	623	468
Machine guns taken	2,842	2,864
Trench mortars taken	336	177
Territory freed (sq. miles)	610	336
Villages freed	228	150
German divisions defeated	47	46
Maximum advanced (miles)	86	34

In other words, a Canadian force a sixth the size of the American force was in action more than twice as long, captured about twice as many Germans, 50% more guns, nearly twice as many mortars, freed nearly twice as much territory, and advanced more than twice as far.

A joke of that period was revived in honor of your World War II boasting. When an Englishman went swimming, a friend ran for help, knowing the waters were infested with sharks. When he returned, the Englishman was on the beach, drying himself. Why hadn't he been attacked?

"It's veddy simple, really," the Englishman said. "You see, I have a tattoo on my buttock. It consists of an Ameddican flag and the words 'We won the war.' Not even a shark will swallow that."

Canada had been at war nearly 27 months when the U.S. was attacked Dec. 7, 1941, and many youths who had been in the senior class the year I entered high school were already dead. As my 13-year-old mind tried to cope with the fact of their extinction, an American tourist at Niagara Falls, Ontario, said to me, "Well, son, we're at war now. When is your country going to get into it with us?"

Though relations between the U. S. and its allies were more cordial than in World War I and the U. S. contribution unquestionably greater, American pretentiousness again was a problem. When 5,000 Canadian Commandoes attacked the French coast, taking along 25 U. S. Rangers as observers, a New York newspaper headlined: "Rangers Hit Dieppe."

Despite such bombast, Canada and the U.S. achieved a level of co-operation that was unprecedented and Canadians even developed a certain amused affection for the U. S. It didn't last. We participated in scientific research with you, and some of the work on the atomic bomb was done in Canadian universities; as soon as you found out how to build one, you denied us knowledge of it.

The U.S. would often double-cross its allies in the next few years. It betrayed England, France, and Israel when they moved to regain the Suez Canal. You condemned them, stopped their invasion of Egypt, made them pull out. The Israelis fortunately stayed long enough to strip the Sinai Peninsula of cached Russian arms, apparently meant for later use *by Russians*. The Hungarian rebellion was under way at the time. Though the U.S. stopped England and France from taking back a canal that was legally theirs, you did nothing (except make speeches) to impede the Russian re-invasion of Hungary, which was *not* theirs.

It was the same with Algeria. Algeria was a department of metropolitan France, not a colony but a part of France itself. It was a situation comparable to the U.S. being told to get out of Alaska, which is part of the U.S. itself. The issues in Algeria, legal, social, and political, were complex and confusing in the extreme, but Americans, whose national sensitivity to moral subtlety is usually at the level of a Western movie and who seem to be afflicted with an undying hunger for their own historical justification, simplified the whole tangled affair to an issue of "colonialism." The U.S. gave tacit support to the F.L.N. rebels (some diplomats thought because U.S. oilmen had their eyes on Sahara petroleum) and ignored the French position that the real issue was not whether France or the Algerians would control Algeria, but whether France or the Russians would. Now that Premier Ben Bella has visited Castro and invited Castro to visit him this summer, who in Washington remembers the French warning?

The cheap moralizing of Dulles and Eisenhower at Suez and the American incapacity to understand the French agony in Algeria is going to cost you dearly. When the Panamanians move to nationalize the Panama Canal, how much support does the U. S. think it can get from England, France and Israel?

These and other events have given the Western nations a distinct picture of the U.S. ethical position, which is: when someone else's national interest is involved, military action is immoral; when U.S. national interest is involved, it is moral. Consider Dulles' infamous brink-of-war speech. Consider the blockade of Cuba. (You called it a quarantine, but it was a blockade, and a blockade is by international law an act of war.)

It is the same with spying. It is immoral when the Russians do it, moral when you do it. This is the incredible principle enunciated by the Eisenhower Administration after the Russians shot down your U-2 spy plane: it was all right to violate Russian airspace because *you* needed the information, and you are the good guys.

Duplicity in dealing with your allies continues under Kennedy. The latest case involved England. You had talked the British into equipping their Vulcan bombers with Skybolt missiles instead of developing their own. Then President Kennedy blandly announced that no

SMUGNESS

Skybolts would be built; they were not in the U.S. national interest. England was left without rapid means to deliver nuclear warheads on Russian targets — the face-saving polaris missile deal notwithstanding.

It is not only your dubious performance as an ally that has produced distrust of you. There is also your undiminished aggressiveness. *Whether this is expressed by your government or your businessmen is a purely academic consideration to other nations.* Recently Canada woke to the realization that you had almost succeeded in doing economically what you had failed to do militarily. We found we no longer controlled our economy. Ira Mothner, a *Look* senior editor, wrote:

"The press and public (of Canada) feel that foreign ownership or control of more than 60% of the nation's manufacturing, almost 75% of the mining, and 80% of the oil and gas industries, is far from desirable. They believe that companies controlled from without will not always do what is best for Canada. They also believe that subsidiaries of American companies are often prevented from reaching their full potential because they may compete with their parent firms in the international market. Also, some American-owned companies deny Canadian executives the top jobs."

The principle is becoming clear to us: U.S. investment means an immediate increase in the number of jobs and in surface prosperity but an ultimate drain on the economy through profits flowing out of the country and into American banks. Though Canada exports far more than it imports, it has a huge annual deficit, largely due to the movement of dividends to the U.S. If this were allowed to continue, Canada would end in the same dilemma as the Latin American countries: a poor branch-office satellite of the U.S.

The American businessman gives little respect to a country's legal efforts to alter these conditions. Brazil, in an attempt to prevent the drain-off of money, passed a law that any Brazilian company must be 51% Brazilian-owned. Americans hire Brazilians as figurehead owners of the majority stock and continue as they were.

Your performance in Latin America has been heavily, even predominantly, immoral. When the Alliance for Progress was instituted, the President of Brazil told you it was too little and too late. The peoples of Latin America want you to go, preferably peacefully. I don't think they want Communism — they're too individualistic for it — but if they continue in frustration they will turn to Russia (via Castro) for help. And they will confiscate, as Brazil confiscated an American-owned telephone company last year.

Canada is legalistic by temperament. We do not plan confiscation of your properties and moneys—though that may be because our plight is not as desperate as that of Latin America. Lester Pearson promised during his campaign that he would set up a national development corporation to start "buying back Canadian resources and Canadian companies."

To an American, all this must come as a shock. All you've been trying to do is export American democracy. *We don't want it, damn it.* On the one hand some countries aren't ready for it, and on the other some of us feel we have a better democracy than you do. I for one believe that the Parliamentary system of the British Commonwealth is better than

SMUGNESS

your stiff and ponderous republican structure of government. Among its other beauties is the fact that a vote of no-confidence in Parliament can bring down a defective government. When you get a dud for a President, as you did with Eisenhower, you have to endure him for the full four years, at the end of which he begins fence-mending with Madison Avenue efficiency to con you into four more years of mismanagement.

We are a freer people than you are. Even a Communist can shoot off his mouth in Canada. To be sure, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police occasionally show signs of becoming as neurotic as your F.B.I., but we usually manage to put a stop to that. Something you Americans cannot seem to understand is that there is no such thing as partial freedom of thought and speech. You are either free to think and say whatever you please, or you aren't. If even one of you is restricted in this freedom, including a Communist, *then none of you has freedom*. Are we in Canada naive to tolerate the Communists? Not at all: they have run for office as members of the Labor Progressive Party and been largely rejected.

Recently *Life* carried an editorial on the muzzling of Russian artists in recent months, particularly the young poet Yevgeny Yevtushenko. The intellectual thaw, *Life* said smugly, had ended; it was inevitable in a totalitarian state. But how long ago were you wearing the muzzle of McCarthyism? Is it not fair for the rest of us to ask, on the basis of your performance, if you are going through a "thaw?" How long will the thaw last if Barry Goldwater works his way into a position of true power? I think you would have trouble convincing Robert Oppenheimer or Larry Parks or Pete Seeger that you have freedom of speech, thought and association in your country.

It is, as a matter of fact, fascinating to see in how many ways you are like the Russians. You laugh at them for claiming to have invented everything; we laugh at you for the same thing, and the case against you in this regard is stronger than the case against the Russians who, as even *Life* once pointed out, have a long and brilliant scientific tradition.

Your belief that no one else is as free, as good, as happy, as advanced as you are, is incredible. One night Vaughn Meader was doing his satire on President Kennedy on television. A friend with whom I was watching said, "No matter what anyone says, that couldn't happen in any country but this." She had never been to any other country, but with peerless American complacency she was convinced this was so. In point of fact, the style of political satire introduced in this country by Mort Sahl has been a fixture of Paris nightclubs for God knows how long. Come to think of it, Sahl was born in Canada.

Yet, ignorant of the institutions of other countries, you are quite sure you should replace them with "American democracy." *It is not exportable*. In Canada we have socialized railways and airlines. (One railway is government-owned, the other government-subsidized.) Free enterprise could not operate trains profitably at prices people could pay, because of the vast distances between population concentrations. In fact, yours is the only Western nation I know that doesn't have nationalized transportation. While Canada and other countries continue to operate excellent government

SMUGNESS

railways, your railways deteriorate under free enterprise. And you continue to believe your newspapers when they say waste and inefficiency are "inevitable" with socialism.

The American Medical Association similarly lies to you about Britain's socialized medicine. This annoys the hell out of the British, including their doctors, who in the main are happy with it, despite difficulties bound to arise in a new system. The British on the whole get better medical care than you do. With Kennedy proposing Medicare, the A.M.A. has become even more hysterical about socialized medicine, fearful that doctors might not be able to pile up as much money as they now can. If you are gullible enough to believe what the A.M.A., in its surpassing self-interest, continues to tell you, that's your red wagon. But quit preaching to the rest of the world when they have tried it and found it good. You speak from ignorance, they from knowledge.

If we were to let you export American democracy, what would it get us? Tony Accardo and J. Edgar Hoover? Mafia penetration of business, politics, and entertainment? Machine politicians? Scandals like that shaking the New York State Liquor Authority and police, or the burglars-in-blue disgrace of the Chicago police three years ago? The White Citizens Council and the Black Muslim movement? Barry Goldwater and the John Birch Society? Payola to disc jockeys and kickbacks by artists to television talent-bookers to put them on TV shows? The freedom of the artist not to say what he wants but what book company and record company executives think will make a profit? Dick Clark and Ricky Nelson? Stomach Acid and Nasal Congestion? Will you turn us into garrison states of the kind you have become?

When Dwight Eisenhower left office, he made a television speech that is the only thing I ever respected him for. He said: "We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations . . . In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

In his disturbing book, *The Warfare State*, which I suggest you read, Fred J. Cook gives some staggering figures. The Defense Department owns \$160 billion worth of property, making it the world's largest organization. At one point the Pentagon owned more land than the combined areas of Rhode Island, Vermont, Delaware, Connecticut, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Maryland, and New Hampshire. Kennedy's 1962 budget asked for a military outlay of \$52.7 billion plus \$3.7 billion for the space program. The American taxpayer was spending 77 cents of every tax dollar for "past wars, the cold war, and preparation for wars of the future."

The Hébert report of the House of Representatives revealed that 1,400 officers from the rank of major up were on staff with the top 100 corporations getting the \$21 billion going for military procurement. General Dynamics, which gets the biggest piece, employed 187 retired officers, including 27 generals and admirals, and was headed by Frank Pace, former Secretary of the Army. These men handed out big orders and then — surprise, surprise! — got big-salaried jobs with these firms on retirement.

SMUGNESS

There is evidence that you create many of the world's tensions for the benefit of this military-industrial complex. Remember the fuss over the "missile gap"? Of course. But do you remember what started it? A speech by General Thomas Power, head of the Strategic Air Command. In January, 1960, he said the Russians had so many missiles they could wipe out the U.S. in 30 minutes. Panic mounted. By purest coincidence, of course, Power was trying to get from Congress an extra \$500 million for S.A.C. After he got it, it was "discovered" that there was no missile gap.

It has been estimated that a quarter to a third of all American economic activity hinges upon military spending and that it may go to 50%. "Under such circumstances," Cook said in *The Warfare State*, "self-interest in military spending becomes a national disease . . . every food store, every gas station feels that it has a stake in keeping the war plants going . . . any cutback, even any threat of cutback, elicits screams of protest from workers who have jobs at stake, from a wide variety of businesses that have profits at stake, from politicians who have votes at stake."

And on top of this comes Barry Goldwater with his incredible comment on Cuba, "If it means war, let it mean war." This is a man who has been seriously discussed as a candidate for the Presidency. Given your industrial-military machine and a man like Goldwater at the helm, who would then be the more dangerous, you or Russia? Good God, man, you and the Russians *now* have destructive power equal to 10,000 tons of TNT for every man, woman, and child on earth. How high do you want to blow us all? Are you mad? Is Goldwater mad? Given all these circumstances, wouldn't the rest of the world be a little mad to believe your claim that only the Russians are blocking disarmament?

Of late, Robert McNamara, your brilliant Secretary of Defense, seems to have made progress toward breaking the death's-hand grip of the military on your country. The Skybolt case was awkward. Though you betrayed an ally in cancelling it, it was essentially a moral decision. For McNamara was breaking the suicidal armaments cycle of the U.S. economy — or at least trying to. He has scrapped several other arms projects and ordered 70 defense installations shut down, meanwhile setting up an Office of Economic Adjustment to help affected communities adjust to peaceful production.

But distrust by other nations, which has been so long accumulating, will not dissipate quickly, and the movement away from you will continue. Pearson's election should not delude you that Canada will give you support in everything. During the Korean War, Pearson said: "The days of relatively easy and automatic political relations with our neighbor are, I think, over." Pearson originally opposed nuclear arms in Canada. All that he has said recently is that Canada must *honor its commitment* to accept nuclear warheads for Bomarc missiles — and re-examine later whether the commitment should have been made.

Eldon Griffiths wrote recently in *The Saturday Evening Post* that Charles DeGaulle "has demonstrated a basic fact in the modern world — that history's wheel is still turning, that the long post-war period of American hegemony is drawing to a close."

I believe DeGaulle's intention is to

SMUGNESS

break up N.A.T.O. England will have to enter the Common Market in time; it is geographically logical. DeGaulle's Europe will be its own powerful defense complex, with the U.S. excluded. Unless the U.S. matures quickly, its natural friends, the nations of the two Americas, may well be drawn into alliance with Europe instead of you. If that happens, you will be left awfully alone, staring eyeball-to-eyeball at the Russians until you conclude your tacit suicide pact in mutual extermination.

It is ironic that both you and the Soviets began as revolutionary nations and have become more reactionary than the "old" societies of Europe. *You* are afraid to deviate in the slightest from your stiff free-enterprise shibboleth; *they* are in comparable fear of "revisionism." If you are both so stupid as to die for this stubbornness, the rest of the world wants to be standing safely off on the sidelines with its fingers in its ears.

Frankly, we'd all prefer that you didn't do it. Aside from the problem of fallout on all our countries (radioactive particles of former Americans and Russians messing up our milk supply and all that sort of thing), you would leave us with another problem. In case you and the Russians haven't thought of it, let me point something out to you: Mao Tse Tung would be delighted to see you blast each other into that great political rally in the sky. The Chinese are hungry, and the thought of *two* vast and empty lands, silent but for the wind that stirs the black ashes, must make the old gentleman's mouth water. To be sure, he would have to wait until the radiation had died down, but the Chinese are a patient lot. This is so obviously why Mao is pointing at you and telling the Russians, "Let's you and him fight."

Now we Canadians and the Mexicans and the European nations close to Russia, we're not snobs or prejudiced or anything and we have nothing against the Red Chinese, I guess they're all right in their place, but, well, er, um, we just don't want them for neighbors. They're so *pushy*, y'know what I mean?

I jest, of course. But the jest is based on an eventuality that is quite predictable if you and the Russians persist in your psychotic inflexibility. I am reminded of one of Bill Mauldin's greatest cartoons. A little boy, reading an essay aloud in class, is saying: ". . . And my conclusion is that wars is impossible unless both sides is right."

Most of the world wants neither American capitalism nor Russian Communism. We are arriving pragmatically at the conclusion that some sort of amalgam of free enterprise and socialism is the most sensible economic and social answer at this stage of man's evolution.

Most of the world (Mao is the exception) hungers for peace and quiet work. We of the other nations do not want to see you die. I love the Americas. I think of the whole magnificent panorama of the New World, and want its peoples to flourish, including you. I think how lovely the Canadian Arctic is, even in the winter, and of lonely Canadian lakes surrounded by rock and^e jack pine, and how much southern Chile looks like Canada. I think of the music we have all made: beautiful orchestral works by Canadian composer Robert Farnon and compositions by Chico O'Farrill and Mario Ruiz Armengol in Mexico City and the bossa nova songs of my Brazilian friend Antonio Carlos Jobim. I think of

French-Canadian songs and Argentine tangoes and jazz by Gerry Mulligan and Ben Webster and Art Farmer and Clark Terry. I think of Hemingway's books and Mexican movies and the Canadian paintings of Tom Thomson and A. Y. Jackson. I remember the Canadian Rockies, the California Sierras, the Andes of Peru. Those mountains are the common spine of all our countries.

We have a common heritage, too, whether we speak English, French, Spanish or Portuguese. We are peoples who came into a lonely and hostile land and built something. We inhabit the richest part of the world, and I like to imagine that we might become one federation of nations, one astonishing country stretching from the Arctic shore to the Strait of Magellan.

A union of the Americas could happen, as a union of Europe is happening. But we too would have something to say about its terms, about what this amazing American world should be like. I speak for millions of people below the Rio Grande and above the 49th parallel when I say this:

Yankee, our enemy, go home. Go home and clean up your country. Get rid of your Mafia. Stop making speeches to the world about your dedication to justice and equality and demonstrate it by permitting the Negro to take his rightful place in society. Show us that you respect the superior — in art, music, politics, everything — more than the mediocre. And then, later, Yankee, come back as friend and colleague in the magnificent American experiment. Take your fingers off our economic throat — our Canadian throat, our Mexican throat, our Chilean throat — and when you have done that shake our hand and be our brother.

But fail to do that and we will chop those fingers off right up to the shoulders.

It's up to you. We're quite serious. ■

