

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 war-mongers; 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 co-operate 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:

"To the same group of examples of the concealment of predatory ends behind noble principles also belong the instances of the exploitation of the idea of disarmament and pacifist propaganda in the broad sense of the word for one's own purposes.

From time immemorial, the idea of disarmament has been one of the most favoured forms of diplomatic dissimulation of the true motives and plans of those governments which have been seized by such a sudden love of peace. This phenomenon is very understandable. Any proposal for the reduction of armaments could invariably count upon broad popularity and support from public opinion. But, of course, he who proposed such a measure always had to foresee that his intentions would be divined by the partners in this diplomatic game."

We must, however, do our best to draw some permanent benefit from the long and arduous debate in which we have been engaged. With this in mind, I wish to draw the attention of the Assembly to two or three points which have emerged and which seemed to me to point to practical measures which could be taken to restore the confidence which we so greatly need.

When he opened his remarks in the Political Committee, Mr. Vishinsky spoke of a reference which I had made to the growth of what I termed a new imperialism in the East of Europe. This was one of the occasions on which he said that I had been trying to confuse the issue of the debate. If, however, Mr. Vishinsky really wishes to do something about the preservation of peace, he should persuade his government to pay some attention to the fear in the world of this new imperialism; to the concern -- deep and wide-spread -- about the methods which it adopts to spread its influence, and the threats to peace which are inherent in those methods. Within the U.S.S.R. sphere of influence -- the new Soviet Empire -- have been included many peoples who previously had their own free governments: Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Poles, Roumanians. Not all the impassioned eloquence of Mr. Vishinsky or Mr. Manuilsky can convince us that these peoples, of their own free will, happily and confidently have entrusted their destinies and their persons to the U.S.S.R. The fact that the Soviet government find it necessary to cut off their inhabitants from all normal contacts with other countries; to distort and manipulate information about other peoples in order to create misunderstanding and fear is convincing evidence to the contrary.

The methods used to create and maintain this Soviet sphere of influence have converted it into one of the most unstable, restless and