

much political skill to Moscow. Western policy, then, must not abandon containment, but it must look well beyond this, to encourage and to exploit the political maturation of the Soviet body politic in the interests of the West and of the world as a whole. It must help Moscow to recognize the impossibility of total solutions, the disadvantage of cynicism, the incompatibility of absolute sovereignty and international co-operation, the naivety of a view which equates the decline of Western influence with a simpler Soviet future, the utility of integrity and compromise.

To do all this, the West must first accept the fact of Soviet power, and seek to distinguish the legitimate interests and requirements of a great power. It must give clear recognition to the fact that Moscow has already begun to move tentatively toward compromise, and it must seek in its own interests to exploit the enduring, practical interests of the U.S.S.R. Of these interests, the most important is the recess of Western power from the borders of Western Russia. The U.S.S.R. has implied that it accepts containment in Europe. The time has come for the West to seek some formula by which some degree of disengagement may be gradually traded for a formal recognition of containment, if the Soviet notion of non-aggression pacts is unacceptable. And the West must help the U.S.S.R. in its new effort to think in genuinely global terms, it must lure the U.S.S.R. out of the simple world of isolation and to involve it in the complex world of global politics. The best prospects for achieving this lie in the economic context, for the U.S.S.R. must expand its commercial horizon, and material involvement will most quickly multiply those situations in which Russo-Marxist hostility clashes with Soviet self-interest, and will most quickly place manifold limits on the Soviet range of action. It is only by direct experience of such clashes that the U.S.S.R. will acquire a greater interest, if not a greater stake, in stability beyond the borders of the bloc, and it is only with such an interest and such a stake that it will come to co-operate with the West and to accept responsibility. The time has come to seek a formula by which the U.S.S.R. will be slowly forced to abandon its hostility to Western interests in the less developed areas, in return for a share of influence and responsibility in these areas.

The problem does not lend itself to a supreme political fiat, despite the fact that Khrushchev's headlong drive toward the summit suggests that he himself is convinced of this. It has taken ten years to induce the U.S.S.R. to propose a solution for its security problem in Europe which, from the Soviet point of view, is less than perfect. It will almost certainly take as long to bring the U.S.S.R., under the pressures of reality, to actual, if not admitted, co-operation with the West. A patient and piecemeal approach is the only one possible; but the essential requirement is for a grand and imaginative design, which will exploit the practical motives and interests of the U.S.S.R., and which will supplement containment with a more positive objective.

[CLIFFORD WEBSTER]<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Clifford Webster, expert de l'histoire économique soviétique, entra aux Affaires extérieures en 1956 et avait travaillé à la Direction européenne au moment où il a écrit ce document. Webster a visité Londres et Paris du 10 au 22 novembre 1958 pour discuter du contenu de son mémoire avec les fonctionnaires anglais et français. Pour un compte rendu des discussions, voir la communication de Webster à Léger, MAE/50128-40, 18 décembre 1958.

Clifford Webster, an expert on Soviet economic history, joined External Affairs in 1956 and was serving in European Division at the time he wrote this document. Webster visited London and Paris from November 10-22, 1958 to discuss the contents of his memorandum with English and French officials. For an account of these discussions, see DEA/50128-40, Webster to Léger, December 18, 1958.