

The debate—here and in the First Committee—has also produced, among many other things, a great deal of confusion. Some of this is due to deliberate efforts to confuse. Some is due to the fact that the Communist delegations have presented us with contradictions and inconsistencies.

For instance, we have listened to Mr. Vishinsky denounce as useless the Kellogg Pact and, at the same time, urge in even more general and unspecific terms than those used twenty years ago, the adoption of a new pact amongst the five Great Powers. We have heard him tell us that Marx prophesied that a capitalist society led inevitably to crises which in turn led inevitably to war. The correctness of these prophecies, he said, could be read in history. On another occasion, however, Mr. Vishinsky, referring to the future of the non-Communist world, said, and I quote his words: "I am no prophet. Marx was no prophet either." On many occasions Mr. Vishinsky went to great lengths to deny the fear that the Communist party believed in the inevitability of force and violence to bring about the social and political changes in which it believes. On another occasion, however, and again I quote his exact words, he said that, "now both in the United Kingdom and in the United States, the prior condition for any people's revolution is the destruction (not *change*, but destruction) of the governmental system set up in those countries before the Great War".

Yet, in the face of these words and others of the same kind used by contemporary Communist leaders, in the face of the violent and warlike pronouncements of the Cominform, especially those hurled at the Government of Yugoslavia, Mr. Vishinsky asks us to believe in the lamblike qualities of Russian revolutionary communism. Naturally we don't believe this, and we are not deceived by it. Nor are the peoples of the world deceived except those whose minds and souls are drugged and deadened by propaganda from a state machine which prevents them securing information from any other source; a machine, which when it sees fit, can alter for Soviet consumption even the text of speeches given here by the Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R.

Communist delegations have been accusing us—and I have been honoured by specific inclusion in this list—of trying to divert attention from their peaceful intentions by introducing confusing and irrelevant issues. To them any issue which is embarrassing is irrelevant just as any quotation which is disturbing is "torn out of its context". But what *is* relevant to Mr. Vishinsky; what coherent pattern emerges from the hours and hours of talk in this debate which we have heard from the Communist delegations? What does Mr. Vishinsky really want? Essentially it is this: that we should brand the United States and United Kingdom as warmongers; then, so branded, they should be embraced by the U.S.S.R. in a pact of peace and, touched by this fraternal embrace, they and the other democratic countries should disarm unilaterally, without any adequate assurance that the most heavily armed country in the world will put into effect similar measures of disarmament or that it will cooperate in a sincere and earnest desire to close the gap that now divides the world.

This kind of "propaganda disarmament" has been exposed so many times as a manoeuvre, not only futile for, but even dangerous to, peace, that there is little to be added. It has never been exposed more effectively than in the following paragraph from the official Soviet History of Diplomacy published in the U.S.S.R. in 1945. That passage translated into English reads: