

"by so much as one step" towards that aim. In the President's view, the Fourth Assembly had the opportunity to do just that, for the session coincided with a "turning point in postwar international relations". The danger of a new war had abated; the struggle between East and West, having reached a high tide at Berlin, was now in a state of ebb-tide which gave promise of prolonged peace.

In the general debate which followed, it became clear that the "Peace Assembly" would by no means be free of controversies similar to those which had been aired in previous sessions. The Delegate of China complained that, although the North Atlantic Pact and the Marshall Plan had checked the advance of communism in Western Europe, the flood of international communism was threatening to engulf infinitely wider areas in the Far East because the "dyke" there had been allowed to fall into disrepair. Representatives of the Arab states spoke bitterly of their "betrayal" in Palestine by the Great Powers and of the need for recognizing the "full rights of the Arabs of Palestine", if peace were to be preserved in the Middle East.

As his contribution to the general debate, the Representative of the Soviet Union introduced his Government's remedy for the world's ills. After a caustic criticism of the North Atlantic Treaty, the Marshall Plan, and what he termed the United States and United Kingdom foreign policy directed toward the "undermining of the United Nations", the Soviet Delegate submitted a draft resolution calling upon the General Assembly to condemn the preparations for a new war, "which are now being conducted in a number of countries, particularly in the United States of America and the United Kingdom"; to declare as inadmissible "any further delays in the adoption by the United Nations of practical measures for the unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons and for the establishment of an adequate and rigid international control"; and to express the wish that the five Great Powers, mindful of their responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, should conclude between themselves "a pact for the strengthening of peace".

At first there was in some quarters a fleeting hope that the Soviet Union was offering a new approach, and that by a face-saving device it was introducing the resolution in order to provide the Assembly with a means for reaching a general settlement of the differences which had bedevilled its debates during the past four years. It was not long, however, before the supporters of the proposal—the representatives of the Soviet Union and of the satellite states—made it clear that they were repeating a familiar device and reiterating old arguments. To give an air of originality to the debate, however, the supporting speeches contained frequent references to new conspiracies against the Soviet Union, additional claims concerning the number of bases controlled by the United States, and about the number of dollars spent on armaments, and allegations of warmongering from the pages of the American press. The U.S.S.R. Delegation claimed that the United Kingdom and the United States had sabotaged the most sincere efforts of the Security Council, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Commission for Conventional Armaments. In short, although the agenda item bore a new name, and the background of international affairs had changed considerably, the Soviet arguments were essentially the same as those used in 1947 when the Truman Doctrine was branded as a deliberate American commitment to gain world domination; in 1948 when the members of the United States and United Kingdom Delegations were called "the tools