

provocative action from the other side with respect, for example, to Berlin would be resisted. It has also made clear that, in the end, only negotiation would bring about a real European settlement and with it, perhaps, measures of arms control or disarmament in the world generally.

The interests of Western Europe and North America in these ultimate questions of security and political settlement are inextricably mixed. It has been of the greatest importance, therefore, that the Atlantic states, through NATO and in other ways, should maintain unity and develop their common interests as a means of eventually achieving a broad European settlement with states to the East.

If the final purpose of the NATO arrangements is to be seen in these terms, then any major military or political move affecting the alliance must be considered, first and foremost, in terms of whether it will facilitate or hinder that ultimate European settlement. The disruption of existing military arrangements, the misunderstandings or difficulties between members of the alliance, are really secondary to this overriding question.

From this standpoint, we are concerned that the French decisions announced last month might prejudice negotiation towards an eventual European settlement. We cannot yet, of course, foresee all the political consequences of the French move. I recognize that there are those who see in the French action in making substantial changes in the nature of their participation in the alliance the possibility of somehow facilitating a European settlement.

It is difficult, however, to find satisfactory evidence that the measures of military integration involved in NATO have really prevented movement towards a European settlement. It is equally difficult to find evidence for the belief that what the French have done could be a breakthrough on the very difficult questions of European security in the broader sense and of German reunification.

We must pose the question whether more progress towards a settlement with the Soviet Union can be made by the action of an individual nation or by action based on policies agreed to beforehand and co-ordinated among members of the alliance.

It has been emphasized a good deal both in France and elsewhere, in support of the recent French actions, that general international conditions have changed a good deal since NATO was created in 1949. This is true, but not necessarily relevant to the basic question of whether the pooling of resources and the creation of an effective international defence system in peacetime serve the long-term military and political interests of the participating states. Perhaps in recent years NATO has been too hesitant in bringing about changes in the existing arrangements to reflect changes in the relative strength of some members and new military and political developments. Surely changes are possible, however, without requiring withdrawal by one member from peacetime military integration.