

here we know that France and Germany can, of course, "co-exist" there, even if the problem of their association together in EDC or in NATO is left entirely unsolved. But it might be co-existence without confidence, where controversy and competition might easily replace collaboration. It might delay and even prejudice both European co-operation and growing unity and the development of the Atlantic coalition. The opportunity to write a shining new chapter in history would, for the time being at least be lost. One cannot help but feed deep anxiety at the possible failure to exploit this great opportunity for peace that may not soon or easily recur. But one can also hope that this anxiety will be removed by the action of those in Western Europe who would be the first to suffer from the consequences of failure.

That hope is not by any means destroyed - so far as I am concerned - by the decision of the French Parliament not to ratify EDC. One method of solving this problem - a method originally worked out by the French Government itself - has now been discarded. That may be disappointing, but it is certainly not any reason for despair. The free nations of Western Europe, including Germany, will, I feel sure, wish now to try to accomplish their objective of closer co-operation for collective defence and unity, by some other method. The other members of the North Atlantic coalition, the United Kingdom, United States and Canada, will, I am sure, wish to assist in this process, and the best way to do that, in my view, would be to look at the whole problem in an Atlantic context.

Today, however, the word "co-existence" has acquired a special and narrow significance which has nothing to do with the family, the nation, or even the European or Atlantic communities. It has become a promise - or a lure - by the men in the Kremlin that their world, their system, can live, and desires to live, peacefully and amicably with ours.

Perhaps it is not surprising that this appealing but ambiguous slogan, "co-existence", should have been launched by men who have inherited and maintain the device known as the "iron curtain", that complex of ingenious barriers, physical and psychological, designed, organized and administered to deny and prevent normal relations and friendly intercourse between men and between nations, and, incidentally, to poison the free and frank relationship between individuals even in the same political society. How long, for instance, would a citizen of Moscow co-exist with other Muscovites if he mounted a soap box in the Kremlin Square and called for a change of government by peaceful means?

Out of this concept of co-existence there has come a perplexing new query which tends, in certain quarters, to become almost a challenge or an accusation: "Do you believe in the possibility of peaceful co-existence with communism?". It reminds one of the old question, "Have you stopped beating your wife?". You are condemned by your own mouth whether you answer "yes" or "no".

If you answer "yes" to the possibility of peaceful co-existence, this might seem to imply a softness towards communism at home and abroad, an unwariness of its menace, a willingness, a readiness to relax one's guard. "Live and let live" is generally sound doctrine, but it can suggest a tendency to minimize a danger, to become less