

we are to remain free we must solve those problems and correct those wrongs, without destroying the basis of our freedom. We don't want either the liberty of the jungle or the security of the jail. Fascism is one, and communism is the other.

A distinguished English journalist, Edward Crankshaw, in a recent book entitled "Russia and the Russians", which I am sure you will find is an objective and even sympathetic effort to understand the Russians and their system of government, portrays life under communism in the following terms:

"Violence, arbitrary law, sustained privation and undernourishment, blind, trampling stupidity, the uttermost harshness of rule over body and soul impartially, bodily slavery with no compensating freedom for the spirit, forced atrophy of the independent mind without bread and circuses to fill the gap, physical drabness and squalor over all, reflecting perfectly a mood of hopeless apathy".

In the field of international affairs, it seems to me also that confidence in our own methods, our own institutions and in our plans for collective security are a primary source of strength. I do not think that in the long run if we stick to our convictions, and act on our belief we really have much to fear in the contemporary world. One of the greatest successes of Soviet propaganda since the war has been to spread abroad the idea that the world is divided into two parts of relatively equal strength and power. Far too many people have been willing to think that there are the Russians and their satellites on the one side, and all the rest of us on the other, and that these two opposing political forces are approximately equal in strength. If, however, we assess the real strength of these two parts of the world, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that this assumption is quite fantastic. We can make one computation on a purely physical basis and come to that result. Better still, however, we can take into account the total strength of our two communities, in terms not only of physical resources, but of training, experience, technical skill, ingenuity, the ability of the public to understand and support -- yes, and to criticize the policies of their governments, the freedom of scholars to push out new frontiers of knowledge -- all the incalculable elements which go together to make up the physical force and moral strength of any community.

Furthermore, there are plans now being put into operation which will increase the strength and stability of the Western World and which will, if carried out with determination and imagination, make a great contribution towards peace and progress. They are embodied in the United Nations, in the Marshall Plan, in the Brussels Treaty, in the Atlantic Pact, and in various other instruments of international co-operation. They are already producing results, and will continue to do so, though there are dangers ahead. One, and a very important one, is the danger of allowing short-range political considerations to obscure the desirability of making at times what may seem to be immediate concessions in return for ultimate advantages.

Another danger is that we should allow either communist threats or communist olive branches to divert us from the line which the democracies are now following with such success. The danger has been extremely well defined in an article which appeared recently in The London Economist, which I should like to quote:

"The western powers are engaged at the moment on an arduous and in many ways perilous task. They are building for the first time in their joint histories a regional structure of security, political unity and economic co-operation.

.....Its