

Since the war, no less than ten former colonial areas in Asia have been formed into independent states. The old colonial order, with its good and its bad, has ended.

Political change stimulated a desire for change also in the old economic and social order, which had meant so little in human welfare to the submerged millions. Those who had achieved freedom demanded, and more urgently, bread as well. But bread, unlike independence, cannot be secured by a political campaign. In the first place, the populations of these Eastern countries are increasing at a rate that overreaches normal economic development. Therefore, abnormal measures are called for. But these countries are ill-equipped for rapid, abnormal, development. Political instability; administrative weaknesses; shortage of qualified technicians; economic unbalance; lack of capital for industrial development; all these are road blocks in the way of social progress and human betterment in Asia. Yet the demand for such improvement remains insistent. It can only be achieved within a measurable time with assistance from countries technically and materially more advanced.

Where can Asia get this help? From international communism led by the Soviet Union, or from free democracy led by the Western powers? Both offer co-operation. One is a spurious, but also a superficially enticing offer; of paradise at once, if only communism is established and the bourgeoisie liquidated. The other, the democratic, is a genuine, but less exciting offer of help and co-operation with results to be achieved slowly, with toil and effort. In this competition for the friendship of Asia, Western countries, moreover, have to live down the reputations with which they have been branded, often unfairly, as colonial and exploiting powers. Communism, on the other hand, has no such reputation to live down in Asia where its sordid, anti-national record is not yet generally known. We in Canada, who live well and enjoy political freedom, know that communism is a debasing and degrading economic and political system. The masses of continental Asia, however, do not. They have never had a standard of living comparable even to that in the Soviet Union today, nor have they, for the most part, known the civil and political liberties that we take almost for granted, and by which we have been enriched for so many years. So communism looks more attractive to many of the peoples of Asia than it does to us; and communist propaganda is skilled and unscrupulous in taking advantage of this fact. Lenin and Stalin put up communist theory in a package specially designed for marketing in the colonial areas of Asia, and their salesmen are having far greater success in peddling their wares in that part of the world than elsewhere.

It is against this background that we should survey and try to assess what has happened in Korea.

When the North Korean army made its cynical and aggressive attack on the Republic of Korea, it reflected the determination of Soviet imperialism, using international communism as its spearhead, to extend its sway over Asia, and ultimately over the world. There was nothing new in this communist policy of aggression. The method adopted in Korea, however, in contrast to that hitherto used in Europe, was new, in that an open and armed attack was made. Of course, Mr. Malik is now attempting to convince the United Nations that the North Korean communists were the victims, not the aggressors. He is an ingenious person, and, if instructed to do so, could, I am sure, prove conclusively, to his own satisfaction at least, that a fist has been knocked out by a chin!