

I can assure Mr. Vishinsky that no one who does not intend to commit aggression, or who does not plan to dominate the territory and people of other countries, need have any fear of the North Atlantic Pact.

I will tell Mr. Vishinsky just what the North Atlantic Pact does mean. Let me quote a statement delivered in the Canadian House of Commons, on March 28 of this year, by Mr. St. Laurent, my Prime Minister:

"The purpose of the treaty is to preserve the peace of the world by making it clear to any potential aggressor that, if he were so unwise as to embark on war he might very well finish up in the condition in which the Kaiser found himself after the first great war. He might very well find himself in the position in which Hitler and Mussolini found themselves after the second terrible war. They were not told in advance what they would have to take on and overcome. I think it is fair, both to ourselves and to any possible aggressors to tell them in advance that, if they attempt anything, they will have to overcome those who were great factors in preventing the realization of the hopes of the Kaiser and of Hitler and Mussolini."

No, Mr. Vishinsky, the North Atlantic Pact is not a threatening factor on the international scene. On the contrary, it is a stabilizing factor—one of those instances of cooperation among nations through which free countries believe that they can find security and progress in a troubled world.

The Soviet Government, I suppose because it prefers the maximum division, isolation, and hence weakness, among all peoples outside its own borders, criticizes these efforts to organize collective security—just as it stands aloof from efforts, through the specialized agencies, to organize collective prosperity and welfare in the economic, social, and cultural fields.

This Soviet rejection of cooperation among the nations troubles us profoundly.

Let me give an example, in a field to which the Soviet resolution itself calls our attention. Several times during the past few days Mr. Vishinsky and his representatives have reiterated, in the Ad Hoc Committee of this Assembly, their refusal to cooperate with the rest of us in a world-wide organization to develop atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and to ensure effectively the prohibition and elimination of atomic weapons.

Mr. Vishinsky explains this refusal by asserting that international cooperation in this field would be incompatible with Soviet sovereignty. He says that a United Nations atomic control agency would be nothing more than a super-trust dominated by the United States.

This charge is of course quite untrue: but it may throw a revealing light on Mr. Vishinsky's mind, and the minds of his colleagues in the Soviet Government. They seem obsessed with the idea of domination: their internal government, it seems to me, is based on the concept of dominating rather than serving the Russian people. And they seem incapable of imagining an international organization which they do not dominate, unless it is one which would dominate them. Is this delusion, that they must dominate or be dominated, the real explanation of Soviet opposition to international organizations in which they do not have a veto?

True peace, Mr. Vishinsky, involves true community. Community is a matter of give and take: it is a matter of mutual service and understanding. Domination has nothing to do with it.

This refusal to cooperate with the rest of the world to control the fateful powers of atomic energy involves a grave responsibility. Mr.