

advance has been made in that direction. There is another difficulty which is retarding the essential advance towards European unity. When Prime Minister Nehru spoke in New York in October last on the causes of war he named as one of these the desire of one nation to dominate another. Nowhere are his words more clearly to be tested and proven than in Europe itself. For some time now it has been quite obvious that Soviet Russia is inflexibly set upon imposing its will by force and fear upon a wider and wider area totally regardless of the sovereign rights, the religious traditions or the social organization of the peoples involved. This unswerving purpose poisons and distorts the aspirations of those who seek for a peaceful way of life everywhere.

In Yugoslavia, for instance, it has been made quite clear by recent exchanges of notes between that government and the government of the U.S.S.R. that Russia is exerting every effort, short of actual war, to bring the government of Yugoslavia to heel, and to extract from it the kind of unquestioning and slavish obedience that the Kremlin demands. In Bulgaria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia and in Poland where a Russian marshal has recently been made minister of national defence, communist pressure to liquidate every element of national independence, and every trace of opinion or feeling which is not abjectly subordinate to Soviet Russia, has, during recent months, been much accelerated.

Finally in the Russian zone of Germany the Soviet military authority in October last brought into being by a sort of ukase a state and government whose only claim to popular support was the carefully managed election of last May when, however, the communists, in spite of careful management, did not do very well. The constitution of this puppet regime was submitted for ratification not to the German people but to the Soviet government.

From all this the only conclusion we can draw is that the purpose of Soviet Russia is to expand its power by increasing the number of Soviet republics, and this evolution of policy since the days of Yalta now seems quite clear. At the Yalta conference Russia insisted merely that, to use the words of the declaration, "friendly governments" should be established on her frontiers. Two years later, when the new democracies were renamed peoples' democracies, all non-communist parties were rooted out or placed under communist leaders.

In the latest phase of this development the emphasis has now changed from the creation of "socialist" or communist regimes, in which there may still linger tendencies to independent or nationalist thought, to complete identification of these states with the Soviet Union. As a Moscow journal has recently pointed out, and it is a significant quotation:

"Deep devotion to the cause of socialism and communism is inseparable from an equally profound devotion to the Soviet Union."

These systematic measures for installing completely servile governments in the satellite states have been accompanied by less tangible but an insidious and menacing trespass on the sanctity of human rights. A regular feature of Russian totalitarianism is the purge, collective and individual, by which society is reminded of the ruthlessness and power of its government from which there is no appeal. Innocent and guilty alike live in fear of the informer, of the knock on the door in the small hours, of the sudden unexplained accusation of some alleged political crime.

Then there is another stage in the subjugation of states by soviet communism. Not only must their party rulers, their constitution and their legislation conform to the ways of Moscow, but even the minds and thoughts and actions of their individual citizens, their humble men and women, must be harshly disciplined into the narrow groove from which no deviation is permitted.

As one of their spokesman has warned:

"Anyone who has deviated, however slightly, from Marxism-Leninism is bound to be dragged into the capitalist camp."

This camp of course is the hell fire of communist theology.