

## External Affairs

communism that the disruptions and dislocations of a post-war period give to a communist minority its best chance to seize power by force and maintain it by the terror and repression of the police state. Systematically the forces of communist imperialism, in these last years, have been trying out these theories in the four corners of the world.

I think, sir, the observation of the Minister of National Defence, and that speech from which I have just quoted of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, are more in line with reality than the observations made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs on May 7. It is very confusing; the ordinary man or woman cannot follow the argument that tries to distinguish between actual communist aggression and the communistic doctrine or form of government.

In his speech at the United Nations on September 27 the minister, describing the attack in Korea, also said this:

In Korea, where the Soviet army had been present in force and where a communist minority was established in power in part of the country, conditions seemed admirably suited for communist seizure of the whole country. This time, however, the attempt was more open and violent than usual, and this time it met with collective United Nations resistance. This is what makes the aggression in Korea stand out. Despite all propaganda camouflage, the fact that North Koreans invaded the Republic of Korea was clear. This was not a *coup d'état* engineered by a minority as in Czechoslovakia, nor a regime imposed by an occupying force as in Roumania. This was armed invasion. As such, it came as a shock to peace-loving nations. But it also acted as a stimulus to them. A swift and sudden assault on a peaceful nation had an obvious meaning for us all.

Mr. Speaker, I submit it still has the same meaning, but the Secretary of State for External Affairs and some of his associates seem to be forgetting that it still carries the same meaning. Communism is not and has not been for thirty-four years merely a doctrine or form of government. It is a diabolical dynamic thing. It is a comprehensive policy with many doctrines aiming at the destruction of all the freedoms and the inherent and hard-won rights of man. It is the darkest and direst shadow that has ever fallen upon this earth.

Winston Churchill, in his book "Great Contemporaries", 1937 edition, at pages 199-200, discusses this point. I am sure the Secretary of State for External Affairs must be familiar with the passage. I apologize for its length, but it seems to me it is most appropriate to be used in reminding the minister about communism and what it means. Mr. Churchill says:

But communism is not only a creed.

A creed is a little more than a doctrine, because a creed embraces many doctrines.

It is a plan of campaign. A communist is not only the holder of certain opinions; he is the pledged adept of a well-thought-out means of enforcing them. The anatomy of discontent and revolution has been studied in every phase and aspect,

and a veritable drill book prepared in a scientific spirit for subverting all existing institutions. The method of enforcement is as much a part of the communist faith as the doctrine itself. At first the time-honoured principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement towards the left.

The creation of a mild liberal or socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions, if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people. Martyrs are to be manufactured. An apologetic attitude in the rulers should be turned to profit. Pacific propaganda may be made the mask of hatreds never before manifested among men. No faith need be, indeed may be, kept with non-communists. Every act of good will, of tolerance, of conciliation, of mercy, of magnanimity on the part of governments or statesmen is to be utilized for their ruin. Then when the time is ripe and the moment opportune, every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private assassination must be used without stint or compunction. The citadel will be stormed under the banners of liberty and democracy; and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken; liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learned by rote is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation progressively for ever. All this, set out in prosy textbooks, written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations, is the communist's faith and purpose. To be forewarned should be to be forearmed!

And then Churchill says this, about his own writing:

I wrote this passage nearly seven years ago: but it is not an exact account of the communist plot which has plunged Spain into the present hideous welter against the desires of the overwhelming majority of Spaniards on both sides?

And may not I comment, is this not an exact account of the communist plot which has plunged Korea into the present hideous welter against the desires of the overwhelming majority of not only Koreans, but also Chinese, and, I would say, Russians as well?

Communism exists only in theory. As we know it, it contains a militaristic element without which it could not exist and has never existed. Communism is but a name to cover tyranny, injustice, malice, hate, international enmity and persecution of religion. It is a movement centred in Moscow that plots and plans and aims relentlessly to control the lives of all the people of the world. Korea is an example of how that works. Therefore to placate or to appease in Korea, or with the Chinese communists, would in my opinion be a more serious disaster than was Yalta, and with more serious consequences. The plan in Korea is not a solitary instance, but part of a pattern, a proposed