

Therefore, while each of the NATO partners has its own particular and necessarily limited commitments, it is essential, I think, that in the formulation of their plans -- and this is becoming increasingly recognized in NATO -- they should take account of their implications in the global setting. Before that can be done by NATO I think it is fair to say that the strength and the progress of the NATO effort will have to be linked in some satisfactory fashion with the move towards greater European unity.

Last June when I reviewed the European scene I spoke in some detail of the treaty constituting a European Defence Community which had been signed at Paris on May 27 by representatives of the Governments of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and the Benelux countries. At that time there were reasonable grounds for hoping that the treaty would be ratified and in force by the end of 1952. Unfortunately that hope has not been fulfilled. In both France and Germany hesitations and doubts have emerged and persisted, arising perhaps out of the conflict between hopes for the future and memories of the past. These have resulted in disappointments and delays which have possibly caused more surprise and impatience in some quarters than they should have. After all, the decisions to be made in this matter are not easy ones and they involve renunciations of sovereignty that would have been unthinkable even fifteen or twenty years ago.

Those of us who criticize Europeans for being so slow to come together, and who sometimes are tempted to draw what may be misleading historical analogies in urging them to do so, should ask ourselves how readily we would welcome similar renunciations of sovereignty on our own part. Yet while we should understand the hesitations and the difficulties, we should also, I think, clearly realize the desirability, indeed possibly the necessity, for the right decisions to be made soon so that Europe can combine its strength with ours for security and progress. In the darkly menacing picture of our world today, the ancient quarrels of Europe are not important enough to occupy the foreground. The picture must be looked at, I suggest, from a new perspective.

It is unwise to underestimate the depth and sincerity of the national feelings involved, but what alternative is there to European unity of some kind for defence and, indeed, for Europe's very existence? The question that Europeans and ourselves will have to answer is: Is there any solution more acceptable to the parties concerned than the European Defence Community which is now before them for consideration?

The concept of a European army is a bold and original one which will not be easy of quick realization. But I think it is the best and safest proposal yet made to bring Germany into the Western defence system, without which there cannot really be an effective collective defence of Western Europe. That it involves risks I would be the last to deny. Recent evidence of pro-Nazi activities in West Germany points up one aspect of this risk. But there is no course in this matter without risk. We live in times which are not calculated to bring comfort to the timid, and a new world cannot be built in Europe on a foundation of ancient wrongs.

Between now and the eventual ratification of the treaties, I am confident that the statesmen of the free world will find solutions to the difficulties which the European Defence Community faces, particularly in relation to such problems as the Saar and Indo-China.