loosed from a Communist ark and in which dwell 170 divisions of soldiers, bears in its beak, not the emblem of peace, but poison ivy! I hope we will send this particular bird back to the Kremlin ark from which it came where it can report to its keepers that we are not so foolish after all!

This Communist peace campaign, though many of its supporters do not realize it, is simply another weapon of war against free democratic society - as much a weapon of war as are the communist armies, so vastly greater than those of the free world. There is no better proof of this than the Communist reaction to events in Korea, and to the participation of the United Nations in those events. Let us look at the facts and cut through the lies of Red propaganda.

5

- 1

τí

3

Ĩ

2

By June 24th, 1950, every man, woman and child in North Korea had signed, or at least made his thumbprint on, a peace declaration. Yet during the very time that these declarations were being collected and forwarded to the Communist "peace headquarters" in Paris, preparations in North Korea were being furiously accelerated for the launching of a naked and cynical armed aggression on the Republic of Korea. These preparations must have been going on for weeks, and were designed for only one purpose - offensive war. And so on June 25th, this attack was launched, almost before the ink on these North Korean "peace" declarations was dry. When the Communists now tell us "to fight for peace", they mean to make it possible for this Communist aggression to succeed; just as they have told us that it would be their duty, if war ever broke out with Russia, to fight for peace by stabbing their own countries in the back. There is no peace in this campaign, but there is much danger to peace in it!

It has, of course, been stated officially in Moscow, and echoed by obedient Communist parties throughout the world, that war broke out in Korea as a result of an attack by South Koreans on North Koreans. The transparent nonsense of this lie should be obvious even to Communists themselves. Even Goebbels would be ashamed of it and he was certainly a master of the big lie. The South Korean forces were armed with machine guns and rifles and light artillery. They were in no position to commit, with any possibility of success, any aggression, even if they had desired to do so. Furthermore, the fact that they were caught so completely unprepared that they could not put up any effective initial defence; that they were the victims of amphibious operations on the coast; that great tanks at once started rumbling down their roads into the south, showed that this aggression had been carefully worked out over the weeks against the unsuspecting South Koreans. The evidence on this matter is so conclusive that it does not need to be repeated in detail. It is made all the more convincing because it has come from a United Nations Commission on the spot, which includes representatives of countries who could not by any stretch of the imagination, be called satellites of Washington. These United Nations Commissioners, and not Moscow, have told the truth about Korea. It was on the basis of the facts revealed by them that the Security Council took the quick and decisive action that it did.

It is tragic that this action had to be taken by the Security Council, because it does mean armed police action which, in its turn - as we know already means death and destruction. It would have been even more tragic, however, if the United Nations had defaulted on its clear-cut obligations to come to the defence of an attacked people, especially when quick and strong leadership was given in this undertaking by a great power which had forces in the area that could be made available to the United Nations for the restoration of peace. If the United Nations had failed at this time, the consequences would have been grave, not only for our world organization, but for peace itself. We would have once again repeated the performance of Abyssinia and Munich. In all the grim anxieties of the present situation, there is a gleam - more than a gleam - there is a promise of hope for the future in the fact that this time the collective conscience of the democratic World has expressed itself in action and not merely in words. The United Nations has intervened quickly and effectively, and collective security has been shown to mean something. The lesson of this can be read in other quarters where it perhaps needs to be read. If it is understood, we will have indeed struck a blow for peace.