

and security, then its support for international control of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction is hypocritical and meaningless.

The leader of the Soviet delegation also made a vigorous attack against war-mongering, something which, of course, all of us detest and which we must combat from whatever source it comes, whether from a bellicose general or a Cominform agitator. But Mr. Vishinsky ignored completely one despicable form of this crime against peace, civil war-mongering, the direct attempt of one government to destroy the authority of the government of some other state by fomenting civil war. He also ignored that kind of war-mongering which, by state decree and direction, poisons the minds of peoples against each other; which even prostitutes the education of children to the ends of aggressive ideological warfare. The kind of war-mongering which distorts and misrepresents history, science and even letters in the interest of national policy and which prevents international understanding and co-operation by putting a blanket of fear and ignorance and isolation over the minds and bodies of its people.

The leader of the Soviet delegation made a plea for peace and said that his country remains faithful to the principles of international co-operation. He can be assured, I feel certain, of our devotion to those ideals. If some are sceptical of their acceptance by others, that scepticism can be easily removed when performance matches promise. He quoted the leader of his own government when he said "we stand for peace", but we have read other statements from that same source, meant not for foreign but for home consumption, which preached the gospel of inevitable and bitter conflict. Which are we to believe?

We know one thing. We of the smaller powers know it with a special feeling of dread, that there is no real peace, but fear and insecurity in the world today. We know that there is a great menace to our free institutions, and to our security in the aggressive and subversive force of international communism which has behind it all the resources of a great power - the most heavily armed power in the world, where every male inhabitant is dedicated and trained to the military or other service of his government from the cradle to the grave. When some states, knowing that there is at the moment no prospect of universal collective defence through the United Nations, attempt to remove or alleviate this fear by banding together in a pact which will make possible at least some collective resistance against aggression, the attempt is branded as aggressive and against the Charter, and so branded by those who have been largely responsible for making the U.N. so ineffective, a development which in its turn has made these limited agreements necessary. The repetition of this charge does not make it true, especially when it is made by those who have already worked out a whole network of Treaties and Alliances in Eastern Europe, only a few of which have been even registered with the United Nations.

If and when the United Nations can organize effective arrangements for defence against aggression on a universal basis, all other alternate and second-best, very much second-best, arrangements must be scrapped. We must work, in spite of all obstacles, to that end. Until we achieve it, however, we do the best we can to put collective force, even on a narrower front, behind our will for peace. Our actions will be the best proof that our intentions are not aggressive. We are willing to accept that test for ourselves. Others will also be judged by it - and not by words.

We can apply this test, for instance, to the three proposals that have been tabled by the Soviet delegation and which we have before us.

The first, by singling out two member states for condemnation as war-mongers, is obviously meant for propoganda and not for peace.

The second appears to call for prohibition of atomic weapons and the establishment of a system of adequate and rigid international control. The majority of this Assembly has already translated those words into express conditions which represent the requirements for effective control and prohibition. If the Soviet resolution accepts those conditions, progress can now be made in the United Nations, which is the only place where progress can be made. If it does not accept these express conditions, then again, I suggest that we must class this proposal as propoganda.