

The nature of and the experience gained from Canada's national development, and the circumstances under which it took place, have taught us two things, at least.

One, the inevitability, and the permanence, of gradualness.

Two, an awareness that national freedom is not enough; that independence and interdependence are inseparable.

As to the first; "gradualness" is not now a popular principle in political evolution or, indeed, in any other manifestation of modern life. A wave of impatient and insurgent nationalism, especially throughout the Asian and African world, has resulted in the emergence, in some case the very sudden emergence of new independent states. This has created unrest and confusion in some areas; and, indeed, has prompted some premature and unrealistic decisions in those international agencies, especially the United Nations, where national feeling now has a powerful platform on which to express itself. In the name of the sacred principle of independence, the United Nations, for instance, has decided that a former colony like Italian Somaliland, weak and poor and primitive, is to be given in seven years the privilege and the responsibility of governing itself as a sovereign state. It may prove to be unequal to the responsibility, in which case the ultimate result would be a set-back for national freedom itself.

This national urge cannot be stopped, nor should it be, though it might usefully be guided and its pace controlled in some cases. Perhaps, however, it is right, as it is probably inevitable, that nationalism must find its expression in political freedom before its limitations are realized, and its relationship to international co-operation fully understood.

This is, I think, more easily appreciated in a country like Canada which has developed slowly towards freedom, without losing its political and sentimental contacts with the older lands which had once directed and assisted its growth and gave that growth depth and stability.

The other lesson we have learned from our own history is that independence is not enough, and that isolation from international developments is impossible. If our history has taught us this, geography and the emergence of our North American neighbour, the United States, as the greatest of the world powers, has driven home the lesson. It may have been possible for the United States to be isolationist in the XIXth century. It is not possible for a neighbour of the United States, in the last half of the XXth.

No country in the world, in fact, through the inescapable facts of history, geopolitics and economics has less chance of an isolated national existence than Canada. No country, therefore, has more cause to be concerned with her relations with other countries.

Today, we in Canada and you in the United States find ourselves in a world in which narrow nationalism - an insistence on the full recognition of every aspect of national sovereignty - could spell disaster. It would certainly make international co-operation, if not impossible, at least unrewarding and sterile. The value of such