

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 mis-representation 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 pigmy-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 and uncontradicted, sitting in the committee room at Lake Success, telling the rest of us that we are to blame for the fears which grip the world. Perhaps the best judgment to make on this performance is one taken from the Moscow newspaper Izvestia of October 23 last. In that journal on that date a correspondent, signing himself "Observer", said:

"It has long been known that abuse on the lips of a statesman is a sign not of strength but of weakness before historical facts."

We could, therefore, dismiss as inconsequential propaganda the whole debate which Mr. Vishinsky has commenced. But instead of doing that, let us try to take it seriously and really talk about the things which Mr. Vishinsky has taken as the pretext for his attacks on the Western world. The real problem is not the preparations for a new war. The real problem is the fear and insecurity which lies like ice in the hearts of men everywhere. I wonder if Mr. Vishinsky will listen when we tell him what our reasons are for having this fear. In a recent statement in this committee, when the Greek question was under discussion, Mr. Vishinsky said that he was in favour of compromise, but that you could only compromise upon wrong, you could never compromise upon right. His remarks carried a strong implication that he and his

/Communist....