

we should not, in our anxiety to contain them, overlook what we are trying to achieve in the United Nations and in the Disarmament Committee by way of more orderly and lasting international peace-keeping machinery. In piecing together the parts of this complex puzzle, I believe we are, during the next months and years, going to have to rethink a great deal of what has been our traditional policy.

Four-Way Relationship

I have just returned from the NATO ministerial meeting in The Hague, followed by a short visit to Germany. Together, these two visits were concerned with most of the fundamental issues in our contemporary international life, our relations with the Communist world or worlds still being the dominant preoccupation. For years, in NATO and in all the Western capitals we have been speaking rather loosely about East-West relations. I think it is time we admitted that this shorthand phrase is no longer adequate. When we use "East-West relations", we imply that we are thinking in terms of a bipolar world between the Communists and the rest of us. In fact, today there is no longer one Communist world and it is quite misleading to equate "East" with "Communism". It is equally misleading to equate "West" with "the rest of us" or even with "NATO". What is actually happening is a more complicated form of competition than our old terminology suggests, a competition in which the Chinese Communists are making a determined takeover bid for the Communist leadership in Asia and Africa. We must think more of a four-way relationship among the West, the Soviet Communists, the Chinese Communists and the non-aligned countries, instead of the old "East-West" terms.

If there is a pause or a détente in our relations with the Soviet Union, based on what is really a common appreciation, since the Cuban confrontation, of the unacceptability of nuclear warfare -- if this is true, we cannot pass the same verdict on our relations with the other Communist world. For the Chinese, nuclear war is certainly unwanted but not unthinkable. Mao Tse-tung has pointed out that after the First World War there were 200 million Communists and after the second 900 million; so he predicts that, after the third, Communism will take over what remains of the world.

I know that, apart from the Chinese Communist invasions of Tibet, India and the troubles to which they are a party in Southeast Asia, there is no reason to believe that the Chinese Communists would deliberately allow theories to push them over the brink. Their bark may, as we must hope, be louder than their bite. We have had experience before -- bitter experience -- of men whose theories were explicit and public, but we were too rationalistic to believe that they meant what they said. I am not prone to believe that we are in the same situation now, but there are similar dangers. It does not appear present that the West's détente with Moscow extends to Peking, but we must continue to test the intentions of the Chinese Communists, intentions little affected by Soviet views or aims, by all means at our disposal. In the meantime it would be premature and irresponsible to dismantle our defences, either materially or psychologically, even though for the time being we think that the Soviet world Western relations are showing some real, though limited, improvement.