

was called off well short of a clear-cut decision either way. I explained why the Canadians of the last century had wished to avoid a complete severance of association with Britain: the fear of a stronger neighbour was a consideration which my Russian audience found it easy to understand. Basically, I pointed out, Canadians got their independence from the imperial power not by violence but by a gradual process of pressure and persuasion and dialogue, leading to a series of agreements and precedents used in turn as a basis for further political development. This particular road to independence by dialogue and agreement was I admitted by no means always possible for all colonial people: whether it proved possible in any particular case depended in part on willingness by the imperial power to be persuaded and to accept changes and make concessions. But I emphasized that in cases where it did prove possible, it had tremendous advantages for both sides. When it was feasible, it was a much better road than the alternative, which some political philosophers had claimed is inevitable or even desirable, of violent revolution. As I told my Soviet friends, the road which we Canadians pioneered has since been followed not only by other ex-European settlers overseas in Australia and New Zealand, but also by the peoples of India, Pakistan and Ceylon, of Nigeria and Kenya, of Jamaica and Trinidad and many other territories in every continent.

The implications of this particular path to independence, by persuasion and dialogue, were I suggested tremendous, not only for doctrines of political science -- they are directly contrary to the theses of classical Marxism and Leninism, for example,