

Even in those economic affairs which affect North Atlantic countries most of all we may promote our ends through other organs as well as in NATO itself. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation is a well-established and efficient body, with a tried and able staff and with interests that, in many ways, are closely parallel with those of NATO. Many of us have welcomed the recent initiatives of the United Kingdom and United States Governments to ensure a fuller use of the OEEC for certain very important work that we have in NATO. Thus, at this minute, the OEEC is pressing forward with an examination of national economies which will provide the essential basis for NATO's annual review of build-up of forces. In fact, these two operations in OEEC and NATO have been planned by much the same people with an eye to maximum efficiency and minimum waste.

What I am suggesting is that, in other than military affairs, and particularly in economic, social and cultural matters, we members of NATO should try to co-operate, not solely, or even primarily, through the machinery of NATO when there are already in existence other international bodies with more appropriate organization and membership.

By no means do I intend to imply that, in this non-military field, there is no place for NATO. One very important activity of the Council, for instance, is that of "political consultation", the provision of an intimate, friendly forum where problems of foreign policy can be discussed; here substantial progress has been made, even in these past few weeks. Again, one should, I think, contemplate the possibility, under special circumstances and for particular purposes, of NATO considering problems normally within the sphere of other international bodies -- where, let us say, a stalemate has been reached and where discussions, in a group such as the North Atlantic Council with its continuous and wide-ranging contacts, might serve the common good. For in the NATO forum, with the Soviet menace ever actively present in our minds, there may well be a greater will and a greater willingness than elsewhere to press forward towards agreement. Therefore, while the opportunities for "non-military co-operation" may, in fact, be more frequent outside NATO than within, we must certainly not miss any chances that may arise inside. We who have been especially concerned with this vital element in our association are heartened by the frequent references to these matters by our Secretary-General. I have no doubt that, as time goes on we shall increasingly think of Article 2, not as a separate little treaty within the North Atlantic Treaty to be "implemented" by a particular branch of NATO, but as an attitude of mind enlightened and enlivening the work of the whole of our alliance and of other international bodies as well.

Here, I come back to what I said a while ago. NATO is not the North Atlantic community, neither is the North Atlantic community NATO. It seems to me that, with this distinction made, many things become clearer and many contradictions are resolved. We fourteen countries who presently make up NATO may be the beginning of the Atlantic community, we are certainly not the end of it.

So much for my reflections on the nature of our alliance and our community.

To many of you this must have seemed a pretty bleak summer for NATO. Speculation and public comment have given the impression that NATO was not fulfilling and would not fulfil its primary task of building up the force which could prevent a third world war. Now we all know that, from time to time,