

but its advocacy can cover other designs. Indeed, if there were more action for peace, there might be less need to talk so much about it. But here in the United Nations, however, governments have to parade not only their words but their policies, before the scrutiny of the international public, who are becoming more skilful in detecting "false fronts". This important function of clarification, of analysis, of education, is taking place all the time; on every day that there is a United Nations meeting anywhere in the world. This is the kind of open diplomacy which can be healthy and good. Its excesses - diplomacy by "loud-speaker" or by insult - are not so good. But even they tend to correct themselves as Governments come to realize that their ends are not attained by crude and tough talk, by name calling or abuse, by legal quibblings or by procedural wrangling; by twisting and torturing the meaning of words.

This last practice particularly has had a confusing and damaging effect on our debates. Too many good words of respectable parentage - democracy, co-existence, freedom, appeasement, human rights, popular, and above all, peace-loving - have been turned upside down and inside out and made to seem what they are not. What we need as we enter our second decade is a Convention for the Defence of Peace-loving words against Verbal aggression!

When the representative of the Soviet Union says - as he did on Wednesday - that "those who pay lip service to the principle of peaceful co-existence sometimes tend to violate that principle flagrantly in practice", I could not agree with him more. But any satisfaction or comfort I secure from that agreement, however, is removed by the certainty that I could hardly disagree with him more on who are meant by "those".

That disagreement, which makes the other agreement of no importance or even indeed of much meaning, arises from the fears and mistrust that keep us apart: fears that may be strong and genuine on both sides. It is these which endanger the world and they will not be removed merely by repetition of the word "peace".

The people of my own country - like those of many other countries - still have this deep and awful fear of aggressive attack and attack from outside; and by "outside" I do not mean our good neighbour the U.S.A. which we know, from a happy experience respects the rights and honour, the freedom of a less powerful neighbour. To remove the fear, the suspense - and I quote Mr. Molotov again - and with full approval - "what is obviously needed is something more than just verbal recognition of the principle of co-existence and peaceful co-operation between countries with different social structures".

Again unhappily, we cannot agree on how that "something more" can be achieved, or indeed even on what it should be. So the fear of each other persists, and while it does, those countries who believe in coming together for collective security - and who cannot find it at this time in the United Nations - will (let there be no doubt about this) continue to seek it in defensive regional arrangements negotiated and operated in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Our unity in this regard cannot be shaken by untrue and unwarranted allegations that such arrangements are aggressive and provocative. We know that they are not and we will not abandon them. We know that they are not a spearhead - as charged - for attack against one state. They are a shield against aggression from any state. We will not - we dare not - abandon or weaken them until our security can be assured on a broader, and better basis preferably by the United Nations - or until peace rests on something even stronger than force of any kind.