

the amount of the world's resources that are devoted to armaments. We have a common interest in that and at the moment we seem to allow the Soviet Union to make all the running in the Third World Countries and we have been remarkably unsuccessful in pointing out that the Soviet Union itself is spending a far greater proportion of its own resources on armaments than say the United States or NATO collectively. I think that a more aggressive policy along the lines advocated by the Brandt Report would bring dividends first of all in terms of aid as he argued, but more important, I think, in getting ourselves more involved in the politics of the Third World. This means taking stances I am afraid which sometimes may be unpopular with our American allies, for example, on Central American policy. In all the press that I read in Britain it seems that in the United States a parallel is drawn between the present Administration's approach to Central America and previous Administrations approach to Vietnam, but I think a more interesting parallel can be drawn between the dangers of the Reagan policy on Central America together with the dangers of British policy in Central and Southern Africa of about twenty years ago where we really missed the boat and almost did ourselves enormous damage by failing to identify with the aspirations of the countries there and failing to recognize that often more leftist governments than we ourselves would wish on mature democracies are almost a necessity given the scale of the crisis in these countries.

Secondly, I think we ought to do more internally in the Soviet Union. This may strike you as surprising. The fact is the Soviet Union does spend two to three times more of its Gross National Product on military purposes than we do in the western democracies, and they have economic