

and to build up our strength to deter, and, if need be, to fight together against aggression. But, if it is difficult to delimit in terms of strategy the extent of our community, how much more difficult is it to set geographical boundaries to the spiritual community of free men?

I am not suggesting that there is no essential unity, no political or other logic in the present grouping of nations in NATO. Much less am I suggesting that NATO should put on a drive for new members! Of course the present composition of the alliance makes sense -- but it is primarily military sense at the present stage of events. All that I am trying to say is that we should remember that NATO does not comprise the whole community of free men. And we should look forward to the widening, as well as the deepening, of our association, particularly in those fields of endeavour associated with Article 2 of the Treaty which, in NATO parlance, have come to be known as the "non-military aspects".

In the comradeship of arms, NATO has already made solid progress towards the establishment of an Atlantic community. This sense of comradeship will, no doubt, spread gradually, but surely, into other fields. In a hundred different ways, economic and social and cultural co-operation will emerge. Unfortunately, up to now, it is not unfair to say that our preaching about this sort of co-operation has outrun our performance. There has been a lot of oratory, some of it pretty good oratory, about "the Atlantic community". But lip service never built a community. We need to act as well as to talk; and before we act, we must think. Nowhere, perhaps, have we need of more hard and discriminating thought than in our efforts to give substance to the undertakings we have given in Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

I am going to suggest to you tonight that we shall make our best progress toward the objectives stated in Article 2 if we are willing to look beyond the North Atlantic Organization for areas and opportunities of non-military collaboration. There is nothing in our Treaty to suggest that NATO is the only means by which we are to build our community. Quite the reverse. Indeed the adherence of all of us to the United Nations itself is reaffirmed in the very first article of the Treaty. Let me explain what I have in mind:

In building up our community, as good neighbours, we have many different jobs that must be done. We shall build most quickly and most surely if we use the right tool for the job in hand. There are already many tools available; we should seldom have to take time off to fashion new ones. This is specially true in the economic field where there are many well-oiled tools ready to our hands. If we, North Atlantic countries, want to co-operate in affairs of, say, civil aviation, we would not normally look to NATO in Paris; we should look to the International Civil Aviation Organization in Montreal. The fact that the membership of ICAO is wider than NATO is no disadvantage; indeed, it is a positive advantage, because we want our aeroplanes to fly all over the world. If we want to promote worldwide trade should we not more normally work together in the organization under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, GATT - rather than in NATO? If we have financial matters to discuss which run beyond the bounds of our membership, which has naturally been determined largely by the immediate needs of defence, should we not normally look to the International Bank and Fund?