

Again, when he says that Soviet Russia abhors "power politics" and stands for "close international co-operation based on mutual respect and the sovereign equality of states", we simply point to the Soviet attitude toward Yugoslavia, or recall the fate of those Polish or Czech or Bulgarian communists who dared to show a trace of national loyalty or patriotism.

Because the facts - those stubborn things - are there for all to see, we have in my country a dread of the aggressive designs of Moscow and less hope, now than before, that negotiation inside the United Nations will result in action that will remove that dread. Other free peoples have been forced to come to the same conclusion. Even in the U.S.S.R. itself, because of the misrepresentation and falsification of events in other countries by a government which has absolute control over what its own people see and hear, that fear of war has now, I think, been driven deep into the minds of people there who want war as little as we do. The vicious circle of fear is now complete.

As one means of escape from this dread anxiety, my country is now forced to increase its armed strength, though there lies ahead of it, as a young country, a tremendous task of peaceful national development to which it desires to direct all its energy, all its wealth, all its resources. Instead, for the very protection of our very existence, we are now forced, by the unfriendly, aggressive policies of the Cominform states, to devote today about 45 per cent of our budget to defence.

History shows, of course, that arms alone have never been able to ensure peace. But what alternative is there, in present circumstances, to that strength from which, alone, the free world can negotiate with any chance of success with those who recognize no other test than power? No words of the kind that Mr. Vishinsky has uttered in this debate, will deflect my own country from this course, because nothing that he has said, or nothing his government has done, has lessened the burden of our fear.

Without military strength, then, we feel that we would be lost. But now our strength is increasing and this is giving greater confidence to our peoples. It should also - and I hope we never forget this - give us renewed determination to use that strength solely for defensive purposes and without provocation; use it as a basis for the negotiation and settlement of differences, whenever possible within the United Nations. It is essential that when a genuine move towards peace and the easing of international tensions is made, we should, as members of the United Nations, meet it half-way, or even more than half-way. But glib words about "peaceful co-existence" are not enough. Hitler promised that to those whom he wished to conquer, if they would only wear a brown shirt and become his slaves.

It is always easy to secure peace and a kind of security on the other man's terms. But we know where that can lead - to the humiliation of a Chamberlain or the death of a Masaryk.

The only peaceful co-existence which we can accept, and which we must never cease to search for, is one in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.