

as Mr. Vishinsky well knows, speaks with an official voice in the U.S.S.R. in a way that no Western publication does for its government:

" . . . war finds its origin in class society founded on private property and . . . war will disappear only when private property and antagonistic classes are destroyed . . . As a consequence, the task of the Soviet people in the field of internal policy is to fight for the further increase of its economic and military might."

Those who really prepare for war are those who believe in its inevitability. We do not believe that war is inevitable: it is a basic principle of our political philosophy that there is no political problem which cannot be solved by discussion, by negotiation, by compromise, by agreement. According to our beliefs, war becomes inevitable only when some nation determines either that it will get what it wants or resort to force. We think the same way about civil war. Our domestic political system is based on the principle that no individual or group in the community will be permitted to have his way by force.

I know that Mr. Vishinsky and his colleagues will be cynical about this aspect of democracy. Their cynicism means only that they do not believe it is possible to govern with the freely expressed consent of the people who are governed. Their own political machinery excludes the possibility of political opposition and provides no means by which the strains and tensions within their society can find expression.

Under the system in the U.S.S.R. it is not possible for a man to make his own decisions. He must accept what is called the party line, which means the decisions handed down by the dictators. It is considered dangerous to the state if a man has an active conscience of his own: such an individual conscience is considered a danger to the rulers, because there is a state conscience. Similarly, personal moral and political convictions are considered dangerous, and a highly organized and pervasive state propaganda system seeks to substitute, for the free mind of man, the pattern of state-controlled thought.

The Soviet Delegates may not really know, therefore, what we are talking about when we speak of government by negotiation and compromise, either domestically or in international affairs, since they consider that force is an inevitable aspect of their government at home. It is not surprising that they also accept the inevitability of conflict in world affairs. The point I am making is of great practical importance. We believe that every problem which now troubles the world can readily be settled. If however, the leaders of the Soviet Union are convinced that war must come, and are teaching their people that war must come, then our hopes are indeed illusions. If the rulers of the U.S.S.R. could bring assurance to the peoples of the world on this point, they would be doing more to strengthen peace than could be accomplished by the signing of a dozen pacts.

Mr. Vishinsky says that he wants peace. But he turns his powers of vituperation—and I must admit that Mr. Vishinsky is very good at vituperation—against all nations who join together for collective security against aggression. Mr. Vishinsky seemed particularly bitter about the North Atlantic Pact. This Pact amounts to a declaration, by a group of peace-loving states, that an attack on one will be treated as an attack on all. It is not aimed against any specific country; it is aimed against any state which commits aggression. Mr. Vishinsky's vituperation on this subject reminds me of the proverb:

"The wicked flee when no man pursueth."