

I venture, therefore, to suggest a few criteria which must be fulfilled before there can be any hope whatever that such talks would lead to anything. In the first place there must be a sound basis for consultation agreed on in advance. There is not, for instance, such a basis when the Soviet Union proposes, as it recently has at the meeting in Prague, that the representatives of eighteen million Germans, chosen arbitrarily by a Communist machine, should be considered on an equality with the democratically-chosen representatives of forty-five million Western Germans.

In the second place, there must be a real willingness to compromise and a genuine desire to find just solutions to problems. This does not mean that if one party does not get its own way from the very start, it is entitled to apply the methods of a Berlin blockade.

In the third place, the consultations must not be simply occasions for propaganda where one party harangues audiences outside the Council chamber and publishes in its own press truncated and distorted versions of what took place.

In the fourth place, no agreement between the Great Powers must be at the expense of the interests and freedoms of other nations which are not represented.

Above all, we must not allow talk to become the delaying substitute for agreement. And we must not forget that peace talks - in an atmosphere of dissension and distrust - may encourage the foes of peace by disarming mentally, morally and physically those who believe in peace and desire to defend it.

Therefore, it seems to me that the prerequisite for fruitful consultation is some action which would increase international confidence, something that would make the international climate a little less frigid, so that this delicate peace plant may have a chance to grow. Otherwise, we would be wasting our time over talks. If this debate has shown nothing else, it has shown that. It has also shown how tragically wide is the gulf that divides the two worlds, and how deep the fear that prevents that gulf being bridged.

Mr. Vishinsky, speaking the other day, if I may adopt a favourite expression of his, "on behalf of the ruling circles" of the Soviet Union, pins the responsibility for all this fear and division on the United States, the leader of what he calls the Anglo-American bloc. To support this charge, again to use some of his own adjectives, "this monstrous, slanderous" charge, he produced the usual newspaper and magazine reports of speeches and statements by Americans. This device has long since ceased to be convincing. Just as much of the historical and political evidence adduced in these debates by Mr. Vishinsky and his friends is, again to use his words, "a crude distortion and falsification of fact", so also their press clippings and magazine articles give a grossly distorted impression of the people and policies of this country. This is a free country, and if some person makes a fool of himself in a university, or even in Congress, there are a thousand to tell him so in language that is almost as strong as Mr. Vishinsky's. It is, of course, difficult for persons brought up in a totalitarian police state, where dissent is heresy to be liquidated at any price, to understand this simple but basic fact.

The truth is that the nations of the world outside the Soviet bloc know that the power of the United States will not be