## Appendix 1

Statement by the Chairman of the Canadian Delegation in the Opening Debate of the General Assembly, September 27, 1950.

During its brief history, the United Nations has existed under a shadow of fear, the fear that the problems arising out of one great war would resolve themselves, not in a peace, but in a new war. As the Fifth Session of the Assembly opens, this danger has been brought nearer to us by the reality of warfare in Korea. Indeed, as we debate the issues of peace and war in this Assembly, men are fighting and dying in Korea for the cause of the United Nations. We pay tribute to their gallantry and to their devotion.

This war in Korea is but the continuation by armed and open aggression of the policies which communist imperialism has been pursuing by other means in other states. It is part of the theory of communism that the dis-ruptions and dislocations of a postwar 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. In countries where they have been able to depend upon the direct support of the Soviet army, they have been successful. Only one country in which Soviet forces were one country in which Soviet forces were actually present in the post-war period has been able to throw off the control of the Kremlin, and even that country now feels itself to be gravely menaced. Whether or not continental China will be brought into the orbit of this international conspiracy remains to be seen. We may hope, however, that the Chinese people, with their own age-old civilization, with their traditional wisdom and tion, with their traditional wisdom and patience, will not walk into the trap. The consciousness of their own great undeveloped resources and the strength of their national feeling will we hope make them justly apprehensive of be-ing exploited by Soviet imperialism.

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. Hence the speed and determination with which many of the free democracies, my own country included, have applied themselves to the task of jointly building up our defences against aggression. The countries which have felt obliged to take these steps in self defence and to preserve the peace will not be deflected from their purpose by any specious manœuvres designed to weaken and divide them, or to put them once again off guard.

The effect of the North Korean aggression within the United Nations itself has been to give overwhelming support to the organization in this crisis of its existence. It has, however, demonstrated that, with very few exceptions, the members were not in a position to make that support immediately effective. They were caught by surprise and unprepared to meet at once the demands of the situation. We have, I hope, learned the lesson of this experience. We have also learned, however, that the United Nations can act in response to a challenge; that it is no longer remote from reality, a mere international talking-shop. A new impetus has been given to our world organization and a new atmosphere is generated in this Assembly of which we are all, I think, conscious.

Events—and United States and British soldiers—are rapidly demonstrating in Korea that aggression does not pay. It will soon be necessary for the United Nations to show with equal vigour and resourcefulness that it can deal with the problems of the postaggression period in Korea. The political and economic life of that country must be established on a basis which will enable the Korean people to fulfil the destiny that has been promised them. As hostilities draw to a close in Korea, and the Assembly takes up its new responsibilities there, it seems to our delegation that certain specific principles should govern its decisions and that we should embody these principles at once in an Assembly resolution.