

Foolish dreams of neutrality

Having failed to discover utopia in Russia, China or Cuba, Canada's left has now turned its cloudy gaze northward. Believe it or not, we are being told that Sweden should be our new role model. Canada, demands the left, must go neutral.

What's equally incredible, the National Film Board has been using our tax money to promote this nonsense. Its latest commercial for appeasement is called *Harder Than It Looks* and features a folksy fellow from Newfoundland. He tells us that America and the USSR are really alike and that Canada must get out of the way of their power-grabbing. Leftists and the Toronto *Star* soak up this kind of Pablum like hungry toddlers.

Neutrality is the latest form of left-wing escapism from the harsh realities of the world. This I can understand. But when I hear spokesmen for neutrality tell us that the USSR is no threat, that its past aggressions are "ancient history," I get hot under the collar. I'm afraid I was even a bit rough on the apostles of neutrality during a debate last Wednesday night.

Our would-be neutralists — perhaps "neuters" would be a more apt description — talk a lot about neutral Sweden but utterly fail to make any mention of some other neutral nations. Like Lithuania, Latvia or Estonia. They squirm when one speaks of East Bloc espionage against neutral Sweden and Switzerland. They shrug when one recalls neutral Belgium in World War I or neutral Albania in World War II and bluster at the mention of Arne Treholt.

Treholt, a Norwegian government minister, was revealed to be a senior KGB agent. Moscow assigned him the key mission of promoting *neutrality disarmament* and a *nuclear-free zone* in Scandinavia. This he did with

Eric IV ARGOLIS



much success. The National Film Board's commercial for neutrality should have been dedicated to Treholt. Frankly, I think the KGB should have to finance such propaganda films, not Canadian taxpayers. I wonder how many other Treholts are yet to be discovered in our midst? As Stalin said, "arm at home; promote disarmament abroad."

Neutrality may give our left-wingers a warm inner glow but it makes not a whit of sense for Canada. Such pathetic reasoning is no more than one would expect from people who think that Cuba is a democracy or that America, as one simple fellow suggested at the debate, was about to invade Canada. Russian military intelligence has a perfect name for these western toadies and sycophants of the Soviet Union — "s.t. eaters." Pushkin could not have put it better.

Even more poisonous is the thinking of some of our less overtly pro-Soviet advocates of neutrality, the types who hive together in peace institutes and disarmament offices. It is the notion of moral equivalency. There's no difference between the Soviets and the Americans, British or Nazis. All are equally rapacious and immoral. Neutrality is the only way to go. Canada, as the folksy

Newfoundlander observed, should never have gotten involved in "imperialistic wars."

Well, I asked, what about World War II? Should Canada have fought Hitler? "No," came the telling reply. And then, "Well, er, uh . . . maybe later. Uh, well . . ."

I would like to see this interesting moral position explained to survivors of Auschwitz, Buchenwald and Kolyma. This is not neutrality, it is moral absenteeism; immorality in the worst sense. It is turning your back while someone next to you is being robbed and beaten.

"You're having hallucinations from the past," a skinny psychiatrist shrilled at me. There's no threat today he said. In my gentlest manner, I told him of my recent visits to field hospitals in Pakistan where I saw hundreds of mutilated Afghans. Men with feet blown off and napalm victims, children who had lost hands from explosive toys strewn about by the Soviets. They, I suggested, were not hallucinating.

The horrors of the past are alive today. The same system, the same party, the same KGB that killed 20 million people before World War II thrives today in the Soviet Union. Stalin's crimes have never been repudiated by the USSR. No doubt our would-be neutralists would just as happily deal with Nazi Europe if Germany had won the war and tell us that the Third Reich is no different from Ronald Reagan's USA.

Out-of-the-way Sweden is not the right role model for neutrality. Far better, and more to the point, is that once neutral, non-aligned buffer state, Afghanistan. Its tragic fate is the lot of neutrals who happen to stand in the way of totalitarian expansion. This is the true message. The sheep that bleats about being neutral is no less tasty to the wolf.