



Abba Hillel Silver Collection Digitization Project

Featuring collections from the Western Reserve Historical Society and
The Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives

MS-4787: Abba Hillel Silver Papers, 1902-1989.

Series IV: Sermons, 1914-1963, undated.

Reel
163

Box
59

Folder
826

The Cold War, 1950.

149

THE COLD WAR

Can We Go Beyond It?

October 22, 1950

In this series of lectures on "This Hour of Crisis", I have tried to take the realistic approach to the problems of our day rather than the abstract and dogmatic one. I have tried to take the world as it is, as we find it, and within the framework of facts and circumstances, not all of them to our liking, but which cannot by willful thinking be conjured out of existence, to discover some way of living together in the same world, if not in harmony, at least in tolerable and limited cooperation.

In international affairs, dear friends, you cannot think in terms of centuries or millenia. You cannot make arrangements or plans for eternity or any appreciable segment of it. You will recall that it was the Nazis who announced to the world that they had set up a regime that would last for a thousand years. Well, they sort of missed their guess by some 988 years.

If we can make workable international arrangements which will hold good, as far as we can see, for a proximate and foreseeable future, even under conditions of sustained tension, that is the most that we can hope for in the kind of a world in which we find ourselves. And in order to accomplish this, the high and mighty dogmatic approach to the struggle between the East and the West, is of no help whatsoever - in fact, is dangerous in the extreme. It has already led us to the cold war, and it may lead us to the shooting war - to the Third World War.

The dogmatic approach is simplicity itself. The Soviet government is Communistic. The Communist ideology is based on world revolution. The Soviet government is committed to the overthrow of democratic governments everywhere, including our own. It is accordingly engaged in military preparations, waiting for the proper moment to strike. The democratic countries must, therefore, prepare themselves for this certain and inevitable show-down with the Soviet Union, for the sure and certain war with Russia. And as a corollary to all this, there flows what appears to be another logical argument,

the argument for a preventive war with Russia; that is to say, to strike while you have the advantage, while you have the advantage, for example, in atomic superiority - to strike before Russia can catch up in its armaments with us.

Now, once you adopt this very simple dogmatic position, all your future thinking is conditioned by it, and quite naturally any suggestion that is made by anyone for renewed and continuous efforts at rapprochement with Russia must not only be regarded as naive and futile and uninformed, but actually, as harmful, since all such suggestions might put our people off guard, as it were - might relax their military mobilization. In fact, from the point of view of this dogmatic approach, all talk about negotiations spells out nothing but appeasement, and in fact, it may even be motivated by some secret pro-Communist sympathies.

I think it was Oscar Wilde who said that "the fatal errors of life are not due to man's being unreasonable. An unreasonable moment," he said, "may be one's finest moment." The fatal errors of life are due, as a rule, "to man's being logical" - all too logical.

Now the Russians, too, and perhaps more so than the peoples in the democracies, have been avidly fostering this dogmatic approach to the problems between the Soviet and the non-Soviet world. They have been systematically indoctrinating their people with the argument that the capitalist democracies of the earth will never reconcile themselves to the existence of the socialist Soviet Union, that they are determined - and by their very inherent nature and doctrine, they must seek to destroy the workers' and peasants' government, the Soviet Union, and that therefore the Soviet Union must mobilize itself militarily to be strong enough to defeat all these sure and certain conspiracies of the democratic countries. The Soviet Union wants peace - so runs the propaganda within the Soviet Union. It is the democracies who are the war-mongers, just as we say that we want peace and that Russia is fomenting wars and revolutions everywhere.

Now, this dogmatic approach leads you into a cul-de-sac, into an impasse or a stone wall. There is nothing beyond it but war. Now, I think that we can dismiss as silly and groundless propaganda all the violent fulminations and recriminations of the Soviet and other Communist propagandists about the United States being imperialistic and war-mongering. I think that's all stuff and nonsense, and I think the leaders in Russia know it. Our foreign policy may not always be wise or altruistic, for that matter, but it is certainly not inspired by militarism or love of war or the desire for conquest. America is not imperialistic. Our relationship with countries like the Phillipines and others has clearly demonstrated that our desire to restore all peoples as quickly as possible to sovereignty and independence. The United States wants nothing of Russia and nothing from any other country. And I believe that President Truman was entirely right when, in his very important address which he delivered a few days ago in San Francisco, he stated:

Our sole purpose in Korea is to establish peace and independence. Our troops will stay there only so long as they are needed by the United Nations for that purpose. We seek no territory or special privilege. Let this be crystal clear to all - we have no aggressive designs in Korea or in any other place in the Far East or elsewhere.

No country in the world which really wants peace has any reason to fear the United States. The only victory we seek is the victory of peace.

Now, we may not have made this position quite clear to all our friends either on the continent of Europe or in Asia, and we haven't. There are lurking doubts and fears among them, but I think that by and large they all understand fully that the United States Government is not out to incite war and is not out for imperialistic expansion. And the Russian leaders are doing a great disservice to their own people all along by spreading these fabrications among them, by poisoning their minds against a people which for more than a century and a half has lived in friendly relations with it, and which as recently as five years ago was fighting side by side with the Russian people against the common enemy.

On the other hand, I believe that we would be rendering a great disservice to our people if we adopted or continued to adopt this doctrinaire approach to the problem between East and West, this idea that there is an unbridgable chasm between the two parts of the world, that we simply will never be able to come to an understanding with the Soviet Union, that we will never be able to do business with them.

Now, of course, one can quote chapter and verse from Communist text-books beginning with "Das Capital" down to the latest propaganda book turned out by the Russian press to prove that the Communist ideology is irreconcilable, that it is committed to the idea of world revolution, that it has not deviated from this doctrine by an iota. One can do that, but it is naive to assume that in practice a government remains undeviatingly loyal to doctrines and in practice never deviates from the theories which it proclaims. It simply is not so. And not only governments, but there are religious organizations which for long centuries have maintained undeviatingly certain tenets, certain doctrines touching their right to temporal power, touching their claim to the monopoly of all religious truths and their sole right to existence in the world, touching intolerance to the existence of other religions on the same globe. There are such religious organizations, and these have not altered by an iota these doctrines which they have proclaimed for centuries. It's still in the books. And yet in practice they have adjusted themselves to the realities of a situation. They are living side by side with other religious groups, and in many parts of the world are cooperating with these other religious groups with common ends and common purposes.

There are a lot of things which are written in the Bible which we don't observe, and in the Ten Commandments, though we give lip service to them. There appeared recently a very incisive analysis of this very thing in an English periodical, "The Contemporary Review", and I read a sentence or two from it:

The pessimistic reader may object that a lasting peace never can be reached because Communists aim at a world-wide social revolution by violent means. Certainly there are authoritative texts that uphold this doctrine. There are others, from Marx and even from Stalin, that point in the other direction, notable the latter's thesis that Socialism can be realized in one country. The ablest Soviet economist, Dr. Varga, recently argued that Socialism can be reached peacefully and gradually in the West. Unhappily he has had to recant. In practice Communism, rigid though its dogmas are, is more opportunist and adaptable than any other political creed. It will never formally abandon its basic dogmas, but it can interpret them to mean anything. An infallible religion never unsays what it has once said; it silently forgets. In Galileo's day the astronomy of Copernicus was heresy; gradually it was tolerated and at last accepted. The same fate, under favorable circumstances, may befall the Leninist doctrine of violent revolution. It will be kept alive if the West is unconciliatory. It may be silently forgotten if we can arrange a truce and maintain it for some years.

Now, the history of the last 30 years or 31 years since the establishment of the Communist regime in Russia demonstrates conclusively that the Soviet Government does revise and knows how to revise in practice many of its basic doctrines and attitudes under the pressure of events. One mustn't think of the Politburo, a group of omniscient and omnipotent individuals sitting there in the Kremlin and laying down in fallible and eternally consistent rules for the conduct of the political affairs of the Soviet Union. The Politburo in Moscow improvises quite as frequently and sometimes as blunderingly as our own State Department in Washington or Downing Street in London. In fact, the science of politics known to the Russians quite as well as to ourselves, is the science of compromise and adjustment. It began with Lenin's NEP, the New Economic Policy which he introduced shortly after the Revolution to save the Revolution. The Communists in the Soviet Union have adjusted themselves in spite of their basic dogma of the classless society to a new stratification of Russian society so that Russian society has the same groupings and classes with differing economic levels as we have in our country. Under a political emergency Stalin join hands with his arch-enemy, Hitler, in 1939 against all the proclaimed dogmas and the propaganda of the Soviet Union for years, and sacrificed the German Communists to the Nazis. And shortly

thereafter he switched again when the Nazis invaded the Soviet Union, and he again turned towards cooperation with the West, and a new slogan was invented, that of the Popular Front, to unite the democracies and the Soviet Union. And since the end of the Second World War another switch has taken place in the political formula of the Soviet Union - a sort of an anti-West orientation.

Now all this veering and all this tacking on the part of the Soviet Union is resorted to not so much in the interest of world Communism, or at the dictates or at the behest of Communistic theory and tactics, but by the political exigencies of the Russian state which for some centuries now has been a great power of large imperial sweep and large imperial appetite, whether under Peter the Great or Ivan the Terrible or Stalin, and that state is looking out first and foremost for its own economic and political interests. Their primary concern is a strong Russia, just as the primary concern of France is a strong France, and England, a strong England, and the United States, a strong United States. And insofar as the propaganda for world revolution can help a strong Russia, they will utilize it; when they find that it not only does not help but hurts it, isolates it, weakens it, it will allow that idea to fall into desuetude and silence and oblivion without ever formally repudiating it.

People have stood in wonderment and somewhat in bewilderment against the rising tide of nationalism, for example, in the Soviet Union - of all places - because Communism looked upon nationalism with contempt as an extreme manifestation of bourgeois ideology and sentiment. Communists thought in terms of the international worker, not of the state or of national patriotism. And yet today the spirit of nationalism - I'm not talking now about the spirit of patriotism - the spirit of nationalism is being deliberately rekindled in Russia, fostered, encouraged, and the old dream of a world confederation of Socialist Republics of which Russia would be just one, has been abandoned to a world-wide propaganda for Russia as the heart of such a confederation and for Moscow as the center of world Communism, for a propaganda which proclaims that it is the duty of all Communist states to work for Russia, to subordinate their own interest to that of Russia, and anyone who challenges this new Communist dogma, such as

Tito did in Yugoslavia, is, of course, at once branded as a traitor to Communism and, of course, is a mad dog.

The point which I am endeavoring to make is that Russian policy in international relationships can be adjusted in the future as it has frequently in the past, and wherever flexibility is possible and political fluidity and adjustment, there is a hope of finding some way for living together in the same world. And definitely we can live together in the same world with Russia, not only because Stalin himself has stated that thing time and again in the last few years, but because Russia, in my judgment, has learned some lessons since the end of the last war, lessons which have sobered it a great deal. The failure of Communism, for example, to sweep through Italy and France and Western Europe generally; the steady economic recovery of these countries which recovery dims still further the hopes of a Communist victory in these countries; the failure of the Soviet prediction that the United States economy would soon collapse and break down into a catastrophic depression; the crushing of the North Korean Communist forces; the steady organization and rearming of the Western world against all forms of aggression; the mounting strength of the democracies; the resolution of the U.N. Assembly to go forward with collective action in case of aggression regardless of any stalemate in the Security Council. All these facts, I believe, have alarmed Russian policy-makers, who have been a little too flushed, I am afraid, by the great Russian victory in the World War and with the Communist victory in China and who counted a little too much, as Lenin had counted a little too much, on the weakness of war-ravaged countries and on their readiness for revolution. These political leaders of Russia had hoped, basing their hopes upon these things, to score still further triumphs and quickly after the Second World War for Russian expansionism and for Communist penetration.

I believe that Russia is now ready for a general peace settlement, and I believe that it is likely that serious overtures for such a peace settlement and a far-reaching

peace offer will soon be made. For Russia does not want war, not for any moral reasons, but for practical reasons. Russia has not recovered from the frightful ravages of the last war. When European Russia was practically burnt up, not only by the Nazis but by the scorched-earth policy. It will take years before Russia can build up its industrial and military potential, and Russia is not motivated at the moment by any great need for Lebensraum, territorial expansion. It covers pretty nearly a fifth of the globe, nor is it incited by any spirit of revenge. She has nothing to revenge. She has been victorious in the last war.

Russia is not now feverishly preparing for war. In the last week or two there appeared in the New York Times a series of articles written by Harrison E. Salisbury, who has made a study of present conditions in Russia, and upon leaving Russia, wrote the series of articles for the New York Times. I quote a few of the paragraphs. They are to me very significant.

Whatever may be the cause and whatever the underlying factors, there is not today in Moscow anything that an honest observer could possibly describe as "war scare" or "war hysteria". So far as this observer can determine - and he has carried his investigation as broadly and deeply as is possible - there is no feeling among the people of Moscow that war with the United States is imminent. Nor, so far as I can discover, is there a general conviction here that war between the Soviet Union and the United States is inevitable at some date in the somewhat more distant future.

Having just returned to Moscow after several months spent in the United States, this correspondent is aware that some of the statements in this dispatch may come as a surprise to most Americans, and that they may be some who will view several of these assertions with considerable skepticism. Perhaps it is well, therefore, to emphasize that these are observed facts, not all the facts, to be sure, but sufficient to provide important conclusions regarding the mood and temper of the Soviet people and their Government.

The atmosphere of Moscow and of the part of Russia that I crossed in traveling here from Poland, is not one of war nor of preparation for war. There are no recruiting posters in the streets nor have there been any appeals for recruits in the public press. During World War II, Soviet Mobilization was carried on through public announcements in the form of posters and notices in the press, calling specified military classes and categories to service. Today, no additional classes have been called to the colors. No reservists have been summoned to duty. No classes have been kept in the Soviet Army beyond their normal release dates.

There are in Moscow today no signs of hoarding or panic buying of foods or consumers' goods, as might have been expected if the general public felt that war was near or likely. Nor, so far as this correspondent can discover, has there been any such movement in the course of the summer. The prices of butter, sugar and shoes remain unchanged from the reductions announced last March.

Possibly more important than any of these facts is the evidence that exists on every side that the Soviet Government has made no radical alteration in its economic program as a result of the war in Korea and Soviet-United States tension.

Food supplies in Moscow markets are as ample as they were last spring, but more varieties are now available, etc.

Again, I say I cannot vouch for these facts, but they are evidently the observations of a responsible newspaper man reporting for a responsible newspaper.

The conclusion seems to be, to me, justifiable - a conclusion which someone put this way: "For some time, therefore, if we want war, we will have to start it."

I believe that the time is ripe for renewed exploration for a possible understanding and arrangement with the Soviet Union, to go beyond this impasse of the cold war. Neither our friends in Europe nor our friends in Asia are prepared to accept the thesis that war with the Soviet Union is inevitable. Prime Minister Nehru the other day in India declared:

We do not think it is inevitable for world conflict to take place between the democratic world and the Communist world. Every effort should be made to avoid it because the result of such a major conflict will be disastrous - for the entire world.

Given a period of peace, the inner weaknesses of any system will show themselves and there will be a tendency for each country to evolve on lines best suited to its existing conditions and genius.

"Giving a period of peace" - a breathing space.

I was delighted to read this morning that the United Nations Assembly adopted unanimously a resolution calling upon the Big Five to meet to solve all their difficulties, if possible. That is the mandate of the conscience and the will of mankind. They want the Big Powers to meet and negotiate. They don't want the world to build itself up into two armed military camps, waiting impatiently for the crack of doom!

Negotiation is not appeasement. Nothing can be lost by trying again and again to come to an understanding. There is always time for war and disaster and catastrophe.

People talk about preventive war with glibness. General Eisenhower the other day declared:

Possibly my hatred of war blinds me so that I cannot comprehend the arguments they (that is, those who talk about preventive war) adduce. But in my opinion there is no such thing as a preventive war. Although this suggestion is repeatedly made, none has yet explained how war prevents war. Nor has anyone been able to explain away the fact that war begets conditions that beget further war.

This isn't a rabbi speaking. This is the military leader of the Allied Forces of the last war.

Let us not talk lightly of a war with the Soviet Union. A war with the Soviet Union is not a war with North Korea. The general commanding the United States forces in Korea said the other day that we must draw no inferences or conclusions from our victories in Korea. If the Koreans had airplanes, he said, we would not now be in Korea. Russia has airplanes - a lot of them - and jet planes, tanks and submarines, and the atomic bomb. Russia has known how to absorb and destroy the greatest military force in Europe in the 20th century, Hitler's Germany, and in the 19th century, Napoleon's France. The Russian people are not averse to tremendous sacrifices to defend their country, and let no one count on the lack of patriotism of the Russian people. They may not be very enthusiastic about their government - I don't know - but they are certainly very enthusiastic about their country. If they had not been in the last World War, Russia would have been atomized and fragmentized by revolutions, instead of which that people stood by their country and their government, and while the United States suffered in the last World War 295,000 casualties and the British Commonwealth some 452,000 casualties, the Russian people suffered 7½ million casualties.

A war with the Soviet Union would be a war of exhaustion for everyone. Nobody would win, a war of universal disaster.

- What other alternatives are there to negotiation? I don't know of any. Are we to keep implementing the Truman Doctrine indefinitely and seek to contain, as we put it, Communism all over the world, wherever there is an outbreak? The Truman Doctrine failed in China. We did not even make the effort to apply the Truman Doctrine in China because we realized that China is not Korea.

What other alternative is there to negotiation? Are we indefinitely to ~~pour~~ out our wealth to arm half the world against the other half? How long can we keep it up? And for that matter, are the European nations quite as excited about rearming as we are? Are ~~these~~ they as eager to go over to a wartime economy as we are? Evidently, they are not. They feel that they cannot achieve economic solvency by again going on a war economy. Quite a number of our friends in Asia are unwilling to be drawn into this cold war which would lead to a shooting war.

Former President Hoover the other day sharply criticized the European nations for "having failed to do their share in mobilizing against the threat of Communism". He doubted whether they had the will to fight or, as he put it, even "the will to preparedness". He stated that the results from almost 20 billions of dollars in post-war gifts and loans which we made to Europe had been deeply disappointing. He declared that the pressures from the United States military program have resulted in taxes here in the United States greater than in most Western European countries, and have put the United States, as he put it "in the midst of a disastrous wave of inflation". How long can we keep this up? There is no other alternative to continued and sustained effort at finding grounds for agreement. We must not shout down every effort that is made and every suggestion that is made that the leaders of the Great powers or the leaders of the United States and Russia should meet. What's wrong with it? We must not spurn every Russian effort which may be made in the near future for fear that that would put us off guard, that we would relax our alertness. We need not! We need not be fond and foolish about lowering our guards in the kind of a world in which we

live. No one suggests that America should be weak in a military sense. Weakness in the world today spells failure. On the other hand, out of a baseless fear that the possible result of negotiation may be to soothe us into a mood of relaxation, we should reject and spurn every effort that is put forward to meet and negotiate. That, I think, is terrible folly. We must make such opportunities and welcome such opportunities, not because we are weak but because we are strong.

The role of the real statesmen in the world today, my friends, is not to beat the war drum. Anybody can do it. It's the easiest thing in the world. More appropriations for the military, more young men drafted - that's all. That's not difficult to advocate in the world today. But where does all this lead to? The task of the real statesmen today is laboriously, painstakingly, but with deep religious fervor and ~~xxx~~ deep loyal convictions, to search out every crevice, every loophole, every chink in the international situation that promises the possibility of an adjustment, however, temporary, a breathing spell which may lead eventually to a more enduring peaceful order for humanity.

The less talk about cold war, preventive war, war generally - the less talk about the horrors of Communism and its oppressions and suppressions - we can accept them all 100% - but having done so, you have done very little to solve this problem. And the more talk of urging our leaders, directly or through the United Nations, to prosecute energetically and vigorously every chance for working out all the post-war problems, of aiding the peace treaties which have not yet been effected, resuming inter-communication and free world trade in the East and the West - every such effort is today, in my humble judgment, morally mandatory and represents the height of political sagacity and true statesmanship.

, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1950.

RS EISENHOWER URGES RY ARMED ALERTNESS

to But Bars 'Brutish Militarism'
te at Home—General Speaks
At Carnegie Institute

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

The PITTSBURGH, Oct. 19 — These
ruc- are times when Americans must
nced regard an armed force of 3,000,000
In- as reasonable, universal military
of sacrifice as inevitable, Gen. Dwight
e to D. Eisenhower declared here to-
in night. Yet, he warned, "we must
uar- never tolerate in this country even
ern- a shadow of brutish militarism."

ttton The World War II commander
re- and Columbia University president
di- was the speaker at Founder's Day
ome exercises of Carnegie Institute in
kish the Carnegie Music Hall.

in "Our problem," said General Eis-
sion enhower, "is to defend freedom
nat, against the announced purposes of
e of communistic fanatics, and to do
New this in such a fashion that we do
not, ourselves, suffocate freedom
in its own dwelling place."

a of Noting that "some have sug-
rest gested a plan called preventive
be war," the general said:

im- "Possibly my hatred of war
rent blinds me so that I cannot com-
vate prehend the arguments they ad-
loan duce. But, in my opinion, there
sion is no such thing as a preventive
ecial war. Although this suggestion is
onal repeatedly made, none has yet ex-
be- plained how war prevents war. Nor
has anyone been able to explain
xpe- away the fact that war begets con-
ians ditions that beget further war."

l to Our task has been made the
for greater by your own "zeal for peace
In- and our confidence in the good
as a faith of all nations."

"
per
can
fen
ner

yo
po
ab
fi
re
po
fo
co
a
l
r

m
s
r
a

ti
la
a
e
tl
C
a
st
di

er
ho
of
m
tic

"in
on
to
na
ple

of
wor

Th

an a
"enti
nation
the "

repea
for dis
tempt

age. Let this be crystal clear—we have no designs in Korea or in any place in the Far East or elsewhere.

No country in the world which really wants peace has any reason to fear the United States.

The only victory we seek is the victory of peace.

The United Nations forces in Korea are making spectacular progress. But the fighting there is not yet over. The North Korean Communists still refuse to acknowledge the authority of the United Nations. They continue to put up stubborn, but futile, resistance.

The United Nations forces are growing in strength and are now far superior to the forces which still oppose them. The power of the Korean Communists to resist effectively will soon be at an end.

U.N. Extending Relief to Ease Suffering

However, the job of the United Nations in Korea will not end when the fighting stops. There is a big task of rehabilitation to be done. As a result of the Communist aggression Korea has suffered terrible destruction. Thousands upon thousands of people are homeless and there is serious danger of famine and disease in the coming winter months.

The United Nations is already extending relief to ease the suffering which the Communist invasion has brought about and it is preparing to help the Koreans rebuild their homes and restore their factories.

Gen. MacArthur and Ambassador Muccio gave me a vivid picture of the way in which the process of reconstruction has already begun. Railroads are being restored, bridges are being rebuilt, and public utilities are beginning to function.

We will use the resources of our army and our Economic Co-operation Administration to meet the immediate emergency. We will give our strong support to the United Nations program of relief and reconstruction that will soon be started. The United States will do its full part to help build a free, united and self-supporting Korean republic.

In a very real sense the unity of the free nations in meeting the aggression in Korea is the result of a firmly held purpose to support peace and freedom—a purpose which the free nations have pursued together over the years.

The name "United Nations" was first used in the dark days of the second world war by the countries then allied to put down another aggression.

From that day until this, the cause of peace has been strengthened by an active policy of co-

Korea is independent—there are no needed for that territory or

Text of Nehru's Statement

NEW DELHI, India, Oct. 16 (AP)—The text of a news conference statement by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru today on the Far East situation:

[1]

As there has been some misapprehension about our policy in regard to Korea and the situation in the Far East, I should like to make this clear.

[2]

First of all, I would like to repeat what I have often said before, that we are not seeking or attempting to achieve leadership of Asia or of any group of nations. Asia is a vast continent, including in its scope great countries with ancient cultures with many dynamic movements and different problems in different areas. To talk of Asia as a political unit is misleading. It is our good fortune to be on friendly terms with various countries of Asia, even though we differ with them in many ways and sometimes pursue different policies.

We seek to understand each other and we feel that perhaps we are in a better position to have that understanding than the people of other continents with entirely different backgrounds. The common features of Asia today are a reaction from the previous colonial regime, a resurgent nationalism, agrarian movements, a desire to get rid of our economic backwardness and a passionate urge for freedom. In varying degrees, these urges are found in different parts of Asia.

[3]

Generally speaking, countries of Asia are developing, or wish to develop, democratic institutions. Most of them are opposed to totalitarianism as represented either by communism or fascism. The idea of social justice as embodied in communism attracts many people, but at the same time the ideology and the methods of Communist parties have been greatly disliked and have come into conflict with democratic nationalism.

World communism in its expansionist aspect, just as any other expansionist movement, is considered a danger to peace and freedom. It appears, however, sometimes, in the guise of a liberating movement.

[4]

This problem has at times its military aspects, but fundamen-

tally we feel that it is a problem of winning the understanding and goodwill of the masses of the world. Unless people have some hope in the future held out to them, they seek other remedies. To think of the military issue only is to misunderstand the problem.

[5]

We do not think it is inevitable for world conflict to take place between the democratic world and the Communist world. Every effort should be made to avoid it because the result of such a major conflict will be disastrous—for the entire world.

Given a period of peace, the inner weaknesses of any system will show themselves and there will be a tendency for each country to evolve on lines best suited to its existing conditions and genius. Therefore, it is of paramount importance to avoid world war. In avoiding it, any aggression cannot be tolerated because that in itself leads ultimately to the war we wish to avoid. Aggression has to be met by military or other means, but military means should only be used when other means are not available. Otherwise, a war mentally comes into play and takes command of the situation, and other methods are ruled out. Our country's history during the past thirty years shows that we do not follow a policy of appeasement and that we stand up against what we consider evil, whatever the consequences.

But we have always left the door open for conciliation and a peaceful approach. We try to adapt this policy in the international sphere.

[6]

We have attached great importance to the United Nations because it held out hope of international cooperation. This organization was started by President Roosevelt and others as a special forum where all nations, even those holding different and contrary views should meet together and try to find some common way of action. Any attempt to change the basic provisions of the Charter or to exclude any

**WHY WASTE TIME?
USE YOUR CHARGA-PLATE**

NO WAR PANIC SEEN IN MOSCOW STORES

**Correspondent Finds No Sign
of Soviet's Cutting Civilian
Output in Favor of Arms**

This is the third of four articles on the Soviet Union written by the Moscow correspondent of THE NEW YORK TIMES on his return to his post after a vacation in the United States. As is the case with all news dispatches from Moscow, these articles were subject to Soviet censorship and were written with that fact in mind. The correspondent reported unusual cooperation in transmitting these particular dispatches; however, THE TIMES did not receive certain requested material to make them more complete. THE EDITOR.

By HARRISON E. SALISBURY

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

MOSCOW.

There are no queues today in front of food stores in Moscow. The price of butter has not risen. There is no hoarding of sugar. There are more shoes for sale in Moscow stores than there were last spring. Prices are lower and quality has been somewhat improved.

Those statements are not Soviet propaganda. They are plain truths, vouched for by this American correspondent. Nor is that a series of isolated and non-significant items. The list could be extended indefinitely.

For, whatever may be the cause and whatever the underlying factors, there is not today in Moscow anything that an honest observer could possibly describe as "war scare" or "war hysteria."

So far as this observer can determine—and he has carried his investigation as broadly and deeply as is possible—there is no feeling among the people of Moscow that war with the United States is imminent. Nor, so far as I can discover, is there a general conviction here that war between the Soviet Union and the United States is inevitable at some date in the somewhat more distant future.

Basis for Conclusions

Having just returned to Moscow after several months spent in the United States, this correspondent is aware that some of the statements in this dispatch may come as a surprise to most Americans, and that there may be some who will view several of these assertions with considerable skepticism. Perhaps it is well, therefore, to emphasize that these are observed facts, not all the facts, to be sure, but sufficient to provide important conclusions regarding early date.

the mood and temper of the Soviet people and their Government.

The atmosphere of Moscow, and of the part of Russia that I crossed in traveling here from Poland, is not one of war nor of preparation for war.

There are no recruiting posters in the streets nor have there been any appeals for recruits in the public press. During World War II, Soviet mobilization was carried out through public announcements in the form of posters and notices in the press, calling specified military classes and categories to service.

Today, no additional classes have been called to the colors. No reservists have been summoned to duty. No classes have been kept in the Soviet Army beyond their normal release dates.

Military Service System

Under the present peacetime system, youths enter military service for training at the age of 18. Their length of service depends upon which branch of the armed forces they enter.

The infantry requires two years' training, the air force three years and the navy four years. The youths must have completed their required schooling before induction. Students in higher educational institutions are not inducted into the army.

There are in Moscow today no signs of hoarding or panic buying of foods or consumer goods, as might have been expected if the general public felt that war was near or likely. Nor, so far as this correspondent can discover, has there been any such movement in the course of the summer.

The prices of butter, sugar and shoes remain unchanged from the reductions announced last March.

Possibly more important than any of these facts is the evidence that exists on every side that the Soviet Government has made no radical alteration in its economic program as a result of the war in Korea and Soviet-United States tension.

Food supplies in Moscow markets are as ample as they were last spring, but more varieties of foods are now available. This is true, for example, of meats and vegetable oils, two categories that are extremely sensitive in any shift from a peacetime to a wartime economy.

The same thing is true for textiles and leather goods. There has been a steady increase in the quantity of pots and pans, copper and brass samovars, lighting fixtures, radios and electrical equipment. Here again the items that are listed are good barometers. If the Soviet Government is making available to ordinary citizens increasing quantities of items made from cotton, wool, leather, brass, aluminum and steel, it would appear the Kremlin does not anticipate requiring these basic materials for war production at some early date.