

spoken publicly about our belief that a military solution is neither practicable nor desirable and we have encouraged the two sides to enter into direct contact to prepare the ground for formal negotiations at the earliest practicable time.

In what might be called a process of public diplomacy, the parties themselves have gone some distance over the past year or so in defining their positions. This open exchange of propositions is, of course, useful in settling international problems, but it must, I think, be accompanied by other, less conspicuous, efforts, since public positions are generally formulated in maximum terms. One aspect of these quiet efforts could be an attempt to develop a dialogue with the parties, stressing to them the urgency of seeking more acceptable alternatives to the means being used to pursue their objectives; another might be an attempt to find channels by which the parties could, in quite confidential ways, move out beyond their established positions, abandoning where necessary, tacitly or explicitly, those aspects of their positions where compromises must be made in the interests of a broader accommodation.

As I have said, I am convinced that the Vietnam conflict will ultimately have to be resolved by way of negotiation. But I do not think that a Geneva-type conference (or, indeed, any other conference) will come about simply because the Canadian Government declares publicly that this would be a good idea. It will come about only when those who are at this time opposed to such a conference can be convinced that it would be in their best interests to attend and negotiate in a genuine desire to achieve results. And, in the process, confidential and quiet arguments by a responsible government are usually more effective than public ones.

Similarly, when it comes to making channels, or "good offices", available to the parties to enable them to make contact with each other, I think that too many public declarations and disclosures run the risk of complicating matters for those concerned.

In short, the more complex and dangerous the problem, the greater is the need for calm and deliberate diplomacy. That may sound like an expression of timidity to some of the proponents of political activism at Canadian universities and elsewhere today. I can only assure them, with all the personal conviction I can command, that in my view it is the only way in which results can be achieved. Statements and declarations by governments obviously have their place and their use in the international concert, but my own experience leads me to believe that their true significance is generally to be found not in initiating a given course of events but lies rather towards the end of the process, when they have been made possible by certain fundamental understandings or agreements reached by other means.

As far as the bombing of North Vietnam is concerned, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that this is one of the key elements, if not the key element, in the situation at the present time. You may recall that I was one of the first to suggest publicly that a pause in these activities might provide openings for negotiations. Subsequently, I have repeatedly stressed that I would be glad to see the bombing stopped, Northern infiltration into the South stopped, and unconditional peace talks begin. This has been and will remain, in broad