

foment world revolution. In the autumn of 1947, a wave of communist-led strikes, accompanied by violence and rioting, convulsed France and Italy. The seizure of Czechoslovakia in the following February was a gruesome example of how "the U.S.S.R. and the democratic countries aim at whittling down imperialism and strengthening democracy" to quote the Cominform Manifesto. x Jan Masaryk's death, which followed, was a tragic symbol of the futility of trying to cooperate with the communists. A further concrete example of the Soviet Union's distaste for any form of genuine international cooperation was her refusal to join such United Nations agencies as the I.L.O., ICAO, FAO, IRO, International Bank, International Fund, UNESCO, and the ITO.

Even more serious, however, is the indictment of Soviet methods and intentions supplied by the Soviet leaders themselves. The record is clear, candid and damning. Take the following paragraph from Stalin's "Leninism" in the 1933 edition:

"The victory of socialism in one country is not an end in itself; it must be looked upon as a support, as a means for hastening the proletarian victory in every other land. For the victory of the revolution in one country (in Russia, for the nonce) is not only the result of the unequal development and the progressive decay of imperialism; it is likewise the beginning and the continuation of the world revolution."

Or the following flat statement from the programme of the Communist International:

"The ultimate aim of the Communist International is to replace world capitalist economy by a world system of Communism."

The same attitude was recently revealed in a letter from the Moscow Central Committee, which attacked the idea that there could be "peaceful development of capitalist elements alongside socialism" as "a rotten and opportunist theory." By the communists' own actions and by their own words, the nature and extent of the menace of world communism to the free nations is made clear.

All this has a direct bearing on the answer to the first question about the assumptions underlying the Atlantic Treaty; "how far is the security of America dependent on Europe?" In purely physical terms, and because of the special situation created by the policies of the U.S.S.R., it is no exaggeration to say that the safety of this continent now lies in the security and freedom of western Europe. Anything like international communism, which menaces that security and freedom, menaces America. The American continents standing alone with a population of less than three hundred million could hardly be secure in a communist-dominated Europe and Asia. If this fundamental point is valid, certain conclusions regarding cooperation and mutual aid naturally and inevitably follow. On the other hand, if it is not fully accepted, the whole structure of economic, military and political cooperation, no matter how elaborate or carefully worked out, may well fall to the ground in the face of the first adverse economic or political wind. In that collapse, the Atlantic Pact would certainly be involved.

The immediate background of the North Atlantic Treaty has been reviewed and recorded so often that it need only be mentioned in outline here. Mr. Bevin's momentous speech in the British House of Commons at the beginning of 1948 may be said to have begun it all. At that time he said that he had hoped that when the German and Austrian peace settlements

..... were negotiated

x Adopted at secret meeting in Poland, September 21-28, 1947. Made public in Moscow, October 5.