

- How will the responsibilities of the alliance develop over the next decade?
- What estimates can be made of changing military requirements?
- How can we ensure that military requirements are co-ordinated with, and yet do not submerge, our political aims and objectives?
- What more can be done to ensure that progress achieved in military co-operation is not discounted by economic or political rivalries which weaken the collective effort?
- How can NATO's purposes be explained to the uncommitted nations so as to reduce suspicion and misunderstanding of why the alliance exists and what it stands for?

All of these and many more questions demand the active attention of member governments. I believe that they should be studied with a sense of urgency over the next several months in the NATO Permanent Council.

I further believe that, as this preparatory work develops, the member states should give serious attention to the calling of a NATO conference at heads-of-government level, so that those who have the responsibilities of leadership might join in a carefully-prepared, collective effort to chart new courses for NATO in the years ahead.

While this process of re-examination is going forward it will at the same time be essential to deal purposefully and intelligently in our relations with the Soviet Union. We must not be blown off course by Mr. Khrushchov's bellicose verbosity, ominous as it may sound. The language of insults is best answered with restraint. The repetition of military threats has not proved effective in the past and will not in the future. I do not know what Mr. Khrushchov hopes to achieve by delegating to his generals the authority for world destruction. Such words underline the wisdom of strengthening the unity of the Western alliance.

Whatever the interpretation given to Mr. Khrushchov's tactics, a renewal of the state of frigid mutual isolation which marked East-West relations during the cold war must, if it is humanly possible, be avoided. Mr. Khrushchov must know that in a nuclear war the Soviet Union would suffer indescribable destruction. But events cannot always be controlled even by the most dominating of dictatorial leaders, and sometimes I wonder if Mr. Khrushchov realizes how damaging to peace, and how self-discrediting, is the language of vilification.