

individuals even in the same society. How long, for instance, would a citizen of Moscow co-exist with our Muscovites if he mounted a soap box in the Kremlin Square and called for a change of government by peaceful means?

"Out of this concept of co-existence there has come a perplexing new query which tends, in certain quarters, to become almost a challenge or an accusation: 'Do you believe in the possibility of peaceful co-existence with Communism?' It reminds one of the old question, 'Have you stopped beating your wife?'. You are condemned by your own mouth whether you answer 'yes' or 'no'."

"If you answer 'yes' to the possibility of peaceful co-existence, this might seem to imply a softness towards Communism at home and abroad, an unawareness of its menace, a willingness, a readiness to relax one's guard. 'Live and let live' is generally sound doctrine, but it can suggest a tendency to minimize a danger, to become less alert, to turn our attention elsewhere. If we believe that we can live and let live, surely (the argument would run) we can abandon some of the precautions against danger and ease some of the burdens of defence. Weary of the effort which seven years of cold war have involved, we can now afford to be distracted, for 'peaceful co-existence' has arrived!

DESPAIRING ANSWER

"But if saying 'yes' to this loaded question about peaceful co-existence is apt to be risky and confusing, saying 'no' is worse. It is a wrong and defeatist, a despairing answer, for it assumes the inevitability of war. Furthermore, if Western Governments return a short 'no' to Moscow's declared belief in the possibility of peaceful co-existence, they would be attacked as intransigent warmongers by friendly neutrals and the well-intentioned uncommitted. . . ."

"We would be wrong to under-estimate the power and the danger of this loaded question about peaceful co-existence. The measure of that danger is the fact that it has become the keynote of all recent communist propaganda. Communist dictators are good at using semantics as weapons. The debasement of good words by 'double-talk' is one of the main characteristics of totalitarian tactics and propaganda. But 'double-talk' can be just about as dangerous as 'double-think'. Indeed, the two go together."

"Though the question about co-existence, then, is so phrased, so contrived, that a short 'yes' or 'no' answer is confusing, it is, I think worth trying to clear up the confusion, and to examine the real issue which it raises. It is an issue central to many of the problems of our time, as we face the menace of the international communist conspiracy."

"A first point to notice about this question of co-existence is that we have, in fact, been co-existing with Communism for the past thirty-five years."

"But another and more significant point is that a good many countries, such as the Baltic States, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and the democratic regimes in Poland and Czechoslovakia, which co-existed with the U.S.S.R. for some years, have now ceased as free nations to exist at all. Co-existence is no problem for them. It has become the co-existence of Jonah and the whale that swallowed him. . . ."

"There is plenty of evidence that communist dictatorships tend to expand, and that as they do, they will destroy the 'co-existing' possibilities of free regimes in other countries wherever and whenever they think they can get away with it. It is something to remember."

"The moral of this is plain, that adequate defensive strength and eternal vigilance is the price to be paid for 'co-existence'. In the world in which we live it is dangerous to try to secure it on lesser terms."

"If we lack power and vigilance, if we become careless and disunited in the free world, 'co-existence' could soon be replaced by 'non-existence'. But if we follow steadily but persistently the other course, peace through defensive collective strength, and patient, persistent diplomacy, I don't see why we shouldn't continue to exist along side the communist world."

LESS DANGER

"There is, I think, because of our growing collective strength, less danger at this time of a deliberate frontal aggression than a few years ago."

"The Soviet leaders are realists. They know that such an attack would be met by swift and annihilating atomic retaliation, which would leave their great cities in ruins. For this reason, they may be quite sincere when they advocate co-existence in present conditions, because they know that the alternative in case of war is co-destruction."

"But they undoubtedly also hope that we may ourselves weaken the strength, unity and resolve that make co-existence as essential for them - as for us. They will certainly do their best to encourage us in this suicidal tendency."

"Even, however, if we can successfully hold off deliberate and full-scale aggression, war could come in one of two other ways. It could come by accident or miscalculation; a war which neither side intends, but which might result from a misunderstanding of current moves, and a tragic misinterpretation of each other's intentions."

"This could happen. To avoid it we should, among other things, keep our diplomacy active and flexible; keep open the channels of com-