

in a sober and objective manner what he regards as the major issues in world affairs which threaten the peace, and if he had given us some practical suggestions of ways in which these problems could be solved on a basis of compromise and negotiation. We should probably have disagreed with his analysis, and I feel sure that we should probably also have had many reservations about his suggestions for settlement. If, however, these suggestions contained the slightest indications that some flexibility existed in the Soviet position on any of the problems which we now have reason to fear, my Government, at least, would certainly have put its full weight behind any process of negotiation by which settlements might be reached. This would have been a practical and substantial contribution towards relieving the fears which Mr. Vishinsky has drawn to our attention by putting this item on the agenda.

We must regret, therefore, that all we have before us in the Soviet resolution is a proposal in the most general terms for a pact of peace amongst the five permanent members of the Security Council. It seems strange that in asking these states to join his country in a pact of peace he has denounced two of them, in the text of his resolution, and again in his statement, in the most violent terms. This is scarcely the method best calculated to create the confidence that would give substance to the treaty he proposes. Does he really expect that a pact signed under these rude auspices will help to keep the peace?

The signature of the Foreign Minister of the U.S.S.R. already appears, alongside those of the Foreign Ministers of other great powers, in a whole series of documents which contain the pledge, either in general terms or in particular terms, that international problems will be settled peacefully. We do not need any more signatures: we need some settlements. If Mr. Vishinsky wants peace all he needs to do is to call upon us to use the instruments for peace already in our hands; the best way in which to make that call would be to put forward concrete proposals about specific problems that gave some hope of a negotiated settlement, based on mutual confidence and tolerance.

We can only conclude that Mr. Vishinsky has put this resolution forward and has opened this discussion not for the purpose of strengthening peace at all, but for quite a different purpose. He has given himself the opportunity again of putting on the stage his familiar comic misrepresentation of Western civilization and, in particular, of the policies of the Governments of the United States and the United Kingdom. This form of entertainment has some of the qualities of the hall of mirrors at a country fair. The Western Powers are sometimes made to appear thin from the evils of a shaky economic system or, alternatively, fat with their gluttonous exploitation of each other's resources. Sometimes they are so tall that they dominate the world, and sometimes so short that their pygmy-like power or influence can be treated with contempt and ridicule.

What can we take from all this? Mr. Vishinsky has found from experience that the platform of the United Nations gives him a good opportunity to put on this familiar act. To him, therefore, it does not really matter what happens during this debate. He does not care what reply is made to his speeches. He is not troubled about the form of resolution we finally adopt. All he wants is to get something on the record. He is not concerned if other delegations here challenge the distorted and even dishonest analysis he gives of world affairs. The only thing he cares about is that the Communist press the world over should carry the account of Mr. Vishinsky, unchallenged