

out disastrous economic consequences, is now, in practice, limited to two or three states. Even with those, the consequences of nuclear victory would be about as disastrous as those of nuclear defeat.

Doctrine of Nuclear Deterrent

Realization of this fact has put an effective curb upon the freedom of choice and, therefore, the sovereignty of even the super-states. The concept of power-balance has given way to the doctrine of nuclear deterrent. Even the Soviet Union, rather belatedly, seems to have realized that it is not entirely free to throw its atomic weight around and, making a virtue out of necessity, is offering us 'peaceful co-existence'.

If the great have been limited in this way, how much less freedom of choice remains for smaller states. Indeed, whatever power these states now have can perhaps be most effectively used by the influence they may exert, either alone or even more in association with others, on the policy of the super-power. I suppose, in essence, that—and fear—are the main reasons which now hold coalitions of free states, such as *NATO*, together.

Smaller and newer states are often more sensitive about their sovereign rights even than larger and older ones. That is understandable. If a smaller power were not jealous of what it has, it soon might not have anything. And it is not surprising if a country which has only recently gained freedom and sovereignty is not as aware as an older state should be of the limitations, as well as the responsibilities, of that freedom.

I do not suggest, of course, that nationalism should not find expression in political freedom until these limitations and responsibilities are sure to be accepted. Nevertheless, if they have any sense of political or economic reality, smaller powers must recognize that isolation or neutralism or whatever they may call it, is today not likely to get them very far in controlling their own destinies. It is primarily by working with others that smaller countries can exercise influence on the big decisions by the big powers which so largely determine their own fate. This should strengthen their belief in international co-operation and international organization. It may also make them insistent on a voice and authority within this co-operation and these organizations, in the effort to recapture some of the control over their own fortunes which they may once have possessed but a large part of which, it must be admitted, most of them have now lost. While this is true, the atom bomb has also become itself a leveller

even among those states that possess it. It has for instance, because of its total destructive effects for which there is no adequate defence, made military superiority almost meaningless and armament races irrelevant. As Mr. L. L. White has put it in his wise little book *Everyman Looks Forward*:

"The bomb has exploded the concept of quantity in the military field. Belief in military power may continue as a comforting conviction, just as men still believe in gold and move it carefully from place to place. But the real contest for supremacy will meantime be carried on in the field of policy and ideas.

"With the discovery of the bomb power itself has become powerless before the will of a few. The human mind, by discovering prodigious destructive power within an ounce of mineral has recovered its mastery over quantity. From 1600 to 1945 physical power grew in arrogance, and policy often became the servant of the needs of power. But the bomb has burst the myth of power. It is policy not power, human motive not quantity, which is ultimately decisive in human affairs.

"To be a great power no longer means to be secure. Small nations have never been secure, nor will great nations be so in the future unless their policy is wise. Competition in military strength may continue, but it will no longer dominate world politics. Those who have no policy are at a loss, and have to do some hard thinking.

"While power was dominant, those who lacked an adequate policy could sit back and blame power-politics. But now the bluff of power has been called, and the choice is race-suicide or race-policy. Can it be that the future lies with those who can best think?"

Supra-national Communities

It surely does not take much hard thinking to come to the conclusion that in their own interest, nation states should work together toward supra-national communities.

Such communities can grow in different ways and from different sources. Our Commonwealth of Nations, for instance, has evolved from an imperial centre through the transformation of colonial dependencies into free states who have chosen to remain in political association with each other and with the parent state. Evolution without revolution has been of unique value not only to the nations most directly concerned, but to the world at large. That world should not forget