

The Indian resolution -indeed my letter to the Foreign Minister of Communist China - emphasized that fact, that once an armistice can be achieved in Korea - and there is supposed to be only one obstacle to that achievement - then we should be ready to sit down with the Chinese at a political conference to deal with Korean political problems generally. It is not only implicit, it is actually written in the terms of this United Nations' resolution.

If the Chinese Communist Government will abandon the aggression that has been going on in Korea and refrain from participating in aggression elsewhere they have nothing to fear from us on the other side, and much indeed to gain by that course.

That ... is all that I think I need to say on Korea at this time. But in concentrating on Korea, I would not wish the House to be left with the impression - as I am sure it would not be, because of its knowledge of international developments - that Korea is the only danger spot in Asia. One has only to mention Indo-China, where the situation is not propitious; Malaya, where the banditry and the fighting still goes on, though the situation is improving; Iran, where there are elements of discontent which might deteriorate into chaos, and we know who exploits chaos; and indeed in the whole of the Middle East, where there is division, disruption, social unrest and political awakening.

There were of course other important questions before the United Nations Assembly, and some of them are still before the Assembly. I heard the other day, at a plenary session of the Assembly, the leader of one of the important Asian delegations speaking in connection with a resolution which has been supported by all the Arab and all the African, but opposed by a good many of the Western powers - I heard this delegate, who is not unfriendly to the West, in deploring this division on resolutions of that kind, say that Asia and Africa are on the march, and will not be denied.

We should realize, and the realization is not always a pleasant one, that they are not invariably marching with the West as they move. That philosopher and historian, Arnold Toynbee, in a very interesting article which appeared the other day under the significant title The World and The West gives three explanations for this discouraging development, why Asia and the Asians do not always seem to be with us on issues that we think are fundamental to the development of freedom and democracy in their own part of the world.

These three reasons lie, he said, in the appeal that Communist doctrine inevitably makes to the people in those countries of the world. It is a three-fold Russian Communist appeal, and it is not always easy to resist. Certainly it is not easy to resist at the United Nations, and the Russians there know how to exploit this appeal to a maximum value.

The first appeal they make to the Asian is: If you follow the Russian example, Communism will give you strength to stand up against the West, as Communist Russia does today. To some Asians the West does not mean what