

such an arrangement, of which the North Atlantic Pact is an example, is to stop aggression before it starts by convincing the potential attacker that he would gain nothing by a resort to arms. If this can be done, then a better atmosphere can be created for the solution of those international problems which breed mistrust, fear and insecurity. Of course, without such a solution, neither the Atlantic nor any other Peace Pact can in the long run achieve its objectives.

In contrast to this principle of collective action, a premium was put on aggression and the defiance of international authority in the interwar period. Manchuria, the march into the Ruhr, Ethiopia, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia — these names should remind us continually that a policy of vacillation and appeasement is fatal in the tough and lawless sphere of international relations; that collective action, with full national acceptance of risks and responsibility, and on the broadest possible basis, is the best possible defence against aggression.

Unhappily, however, the events of the post-war period do more than justify the principle of collective, as opposed to national, action as the best guarantee of security. They make such action imperative in practice. But just as the peoples of the democracies usually wish to mind their own business without interference from outside, they are loath to impute contrary motives to others. Those, particularly, with a liberal outlook bend over backwards to be fair-minded and give the other fellow the benefit of the doubt. This understandable attitude becomes dangerous, however, when it ignores the evidence. That evidence, which is concerned largely with the actions and policies of the U.S.S.R., provides today ample justification for concentration on the idea of collective defence which lies behind the Atlantic Pact.

The transformation of a great ally in war to a bitter antagonist in peace is always a tragic development. Today it marks also the dismal, if temporary, negation of our high hopes for a "one world" of countries cooperating peacefully within the United Nations. Lamentations, however, will not mend the split in a divided globe. Courage and common sense demand that we deal with the world as it is, not as we wish it were. In spite of the frantic efforts of communist-inspired propaganda to mislead and confuse, we know that the main reason for the present discouraging situation lies in the aim of the U.S.S.R. to fasten the yoke of totalitarian communism on the necks of free people. The facts in this connection speak for themselves and they go back further than is sometimes thought.

As long ago as February, 1945, several months before V-E Day, the U.S.S.R. demonstrated its way of interpreting the Yalta declaration on liberated Europe which had just been signed. That now famous declaration provided for "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live" and the Big Three undertook when necessary to form "interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people". When the U.S.S.R. brutally forced the appointment of a communist-dominated government in Roumania, the United States and Britain, invoking the Yalta agreement, jointly protested the Soviet action and called for joint consultation. This was flatly refused by Moscow. The communists had made their choice of non-cooperation and conflict, which culminated in the formal splitting of Europe into opposing blocks, when Mr. Molotov withdrew on July 2nd, 1947, from the initial conference at Paris on Secretary Marshall's Harvard proposal for a concerted European recovery programme. Then, in September, 1947, the Cominform was established in Belgrade. This so-called information bureau was patently the post-war version of the Communist International, organized by the Bolsheviks in 1919, to

..... foment world