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DISSENT FROM THE SUMMIT

In the last few weeks freedom and peace-loving people throughout the world have been bitterly disappointed that the long awaited summit talks between the great Powers ended so tragically. Indeed, the talks never even began. The world's leaders did not even sit down to discuss the problems which cause tension throughout the world, and which cause people to fear that a war may one day start - a war that would end civilization as we know it.

Every person who had hopes for some results from the summit, even if these were merely a feeling of greaterfriendliness between the great Powers, has a perfect right to ask why did the summit talks fail, why did they never begin? As a result of the failure of the talks what is the outlook for the future?

We all have our own ideas about some of these things, but there are certain facts that stand out clearly. An American reconnaissance machine was somehow forced to land deep over the heart of Russia.

The point here is that this gave the Russians first hand evidence of American spying. Of course, all the great Powers spy on each other, that is well known. Generally that spying has taken a form that is much more unpleasant than flying an aeroplane across a country with cameras in it.

During a recent debate in the United Nations the Americans revealed that the Russians had given their Ambassador in Moscow a small carving which would be placed on his desk. It was later found that while this carving was present in the Ambassador's office every conversation that took place was recorded by a secret wireless to Russian Agents in Moscow. The carving concealed a secret wireless mechanism.

Because of this, and hundreds of other incidents throughout the Free World, it seems incongruous for the Russians to take a high moral view when another country is caught out spying. Indeed, of all the countries in the world that have some cause for spying America is one, because it was a lack of an efficient spy network that led to the destruction of her Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbour by the Japanese during
the second world war. If America had had a good espionage service she would probably have had some warning that this attack was to take place. Indeed, in view of her own history of espionage in other countries it is nonsense for Russia to use the U.2 incident to destroy the Summit talks.

In the first place this would have appeared to be Khrushchev's own view, because on the 12th May he said he would not allow this incident to destroy the talks. However, when he came to Paris it was quite clear that he had other instructions from Moscow; it was quite clear at this stage that the Russians did not want the talks to begin or to make any progress.

This was because Mr. Khrushchev demanded from President Eisenhower an object and humiliating apology for what had happened. Mr. Khrushchev demanded an apology in terms that no leader of any great country could ever comply with. The President of the United States said all he could say in saying that the flights had been suspended and would not be resumed during the course of his Presidency. This was not sufficient for Mr. Khrushchev, who continued to demand an object apology from the President; this could not be given - and rightly so.

An interesting point in regard to this apparent change in Khrushchev's attitude is to try and find out what had caused him to change his mind regarding the talks. Why, on May 12th, did he say he would not allow the talks to destroy the Conference, and why when he went to Paris did he make it plain that he was using the U.2, incident to destroy the Conference? The answer to this probably lies inside Russia. Ever since Khrushchev destroyed the image of Stalin two or three years ago he has had opposition from inside Russia, but the opposition has not been strong enough to deter Khrushchev from his own chosen path. In recent months, however, this opposition had been strengthened by Khrushchev's own policies. Russia has, in recent years, been paying much more emphasis on ballistic missiles and rocket weapons of one kind or another. This meant that she has felt it possible to reduce the number of armed personnel in her military forces even though the reductions would still leave Russia with the largest army outside of Communist China.
However, a part of this demobilisation plan involved the retirement of some quarter of a million officers. Quite clearly some of those officers would be highly placed, and quite clearly some of them would have pressure brought to bear to see that those policies were not executed; this would create a powerful influence inside Russia working against Krushchev and against the policies for seeing the Cold War.

The second influence involves the Chinese.

The Chinese had never been happy with Krushchev visiting Western countries, and talking over problems with them. The Chinese have shown quite bluntly that they would not be bound by any agreement that might be made at a Summit Conference.

The Chinese have shown for some time that they did not like Krushchev’s attempt to replace military conflict with the west with economic competition, the competition in which Krushchev thought that Russia would win as assuredly as communists believe Russia would win in a military conflict. For the Chinese there could be no question of an economic struggle with the Western democracies; the struggle of communism with democracies to them means a military conflict.

In terms of pure communism, they believe that a military conflict with the democracies is inevitable. They believe that the policies that Krushchev has been following in recent months deviate from the true course of communism.

The Chinese have said quite plainly that a nuclear war would not destroy communism, that it would destroy only the democracies and that communism would survive. The Chinese might take this view because of their own indifference to the loss of human life and because they are the most numerous country on earth, with one of the highest birth rates in the world increasing their population by fifteen or eighteen million a year. This is a view that I understand Krushchev had previously publicly repudiated.

The world has been bitterly disappointed by Krushchev’s attitude at Paris. We can only look with some scepticism on Krushchev’s claim that he will be prepared to consider Summit talks in six or eight month’s time. The Western leaders would need more than a little evidence to show that Russia is sincere in wanting
to have talks that could be sensible and realistic and do something to ease tensions rather than do much to make tensions greater and worse than they have been for a considerable time.

Whether there will be another attempt to climb to the summit in the not too distant future, or whether it will be left to discuss matters concerning international tension through the auspices of the United Nations it is too early to foretell.

Even though our relations are worse and gloomier than they have been for a considerable time, even though no progress has been made on outstanding problems, I am very certain that Western Leaders are doing all they can to negotiate for a peaceful solution to the great problems that trouble the minds and hearts of men.