

the declared will of its people. In every case force was used and force was decisive. Mr. Khrushchev really let the cat out of the bag last February when he wrote—and some of his colleagues repeated it at the last party congress—as follows:

Of course, in those countries where capitalism is still strong, where it has in its hands an enormous military-police apparatus, there the serious opposition of the reactionary forces is inevitable. There the transition to socialism will take place in conditions of sharp class, revolutionary struggle.

What this means, in plain English, is that communism will use force when it considers it necessary to do so, and if it can, in order to destroy parliamentary democracy and establish the dictatorship of the communist party. In effect, the new position in Moscow is exactly the same as it was when Stalin, some years ago, said that the communist parties would be quite happy to achieve power by parliamentary means, by peaceful means, but that they would use force if they had to and in any event they would achieve power peacefully for the same purposes as if they had achieved it by force.

A question arising out of this which concerns us in this country and in other countries, is this. Does this mean that Moscow is still willing and anxious to assist any and every foreign communist party in its revolutionary plans, in its determination to overthrow free parliamentary government? That, Mr. Chairman, seems to me to be a vital question, the test of Soviet sincerity. It is for them to demonstrate that they are not concerned now with international revolution. I do not expect—nor can any of us—that these people in Moscow and elsewhere should abandon their revolutionary slogans. That probably would be too much to hope for. But we can expect, and indeed we can insist as a test of good faith, that they show that in fact they are keeping out of our domestic affairs. We have no assurance on this score in this country or in other countries. Nor have we any reason to believe, changing to another aspect of Soviet policy, that they have abandoned or weakened in any respect what has been for some years now the primary objective of Soviet policy, the weakening and destruction of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO is still a major target for Soviet attack; that is still the great tribute to its value and strength. It certainly should counsel us to preserve that strength.

Re-assessment in NATO

So far as the military side of this question is concerned it may well be, as has been indicated, that new developments both political and strategic may make a reassessment of NATO's plans and NATO's defence policies desirable. It may even make desirable some reassessment of plans and strategy to meet new circumstances. But that, I suggest, must not imply any weakening of NATO's deterrent and defensive forces.