

This was very well put in an editorial in The Economist magazine last November, which reads:

"Cold war" is an even more misleading phrase than most of the monosyllabic slogans that headline writers love. It is commonly identified with such rudeness and crudeness as the Russians practised until lately. For those who make this over-simple identification, the "cold war" presumably ended when Vishinsky's diatribes gave place to Mr. Khrushchev's waggery, . . . "Cold-war" in that sense need not now return, and it probably will not . . . But the phrase "cold war" was originally coined with reference not to a form of etiquette but to a policy-- the policy of "struggle", to borrow a communist keyword. This "struggle" is basically a contest for power over men's minds, a political contest in which economic and military pressures are auxiliary. The "cold war" in this deeper sense never ended, and can never end while the communist rulers cling to their aim of worldwide victory. All that can change is the tactics employed, both by them and by the nations that are ready to defend their liberty.

These are very wise words indeed. But tactics, even on this interpretation of Soviet policy, have changed, and in one sense at least I think the change of tactics has effected a change of strategy, and in a sense that is very important indeed.

I believe myself, and I share that belief, of course, with many others, that the deterrent effect of the hydrogen bomb is now recognized in Moscow. It is now admitted there as in other places that hydrogen warfare means universal destruction, and it is now accepted in Moscow, as in other places, that a balance of terror has been achieved. No one, however, can take much comfort out of it as a solid foundation of peace.

I think, as I said a few moments ago, that the Soviet leaders do want peace in the sense that they do not want atomic warfare, and that they will not deliberately provoke or risk that kind of war with the certainty of mutual destruction. Yet I add that in my view their policy is still conflict short of war that is what they mean, surely, by competitive coexistence; not friendly co-operation.

It is always wise to go to the Soviet leaders' own words to get inside their minds, especially the words they are aiming not at their potential enemies outside, but the words which they use for their own friends, their own people. In that connection, Mr. Stalin himself expressed what he meant by coexistence, and it is a definition that has never been disavowed by his followers, when he said: