

may present to break through the vicious circle of suspicion and fear in the "cold war", in an effort to test Soviet aims and to bring about genuine negotiation. If we cannot do this by a forward looking and flexible diplomacy, and without yielding to the temptation to relax our defence effort, (though we may have to alter its character), then NATO will hardly survive.

Testing Period

We cannot move, of course, from open hostility or sterile "co-existence" to constructive international co-operation without the searching testing period which would be provided by attempts to settle the several important issues which still unhappily divide the Communist and non-Communist world. These issues will not settle themselves; nor will they be settled either by brandishing our swords, or by throwing them away. We must be certain in NATO that if they are *not* settled, it will not be *our* fault.

The unification of Germany by the free choice of its people; effective and agreed disarmament, the right of captive European peoples to decide their own future; a European security system; a united effort by the major world powers to make the United Nations work as it was originally intended to work; all these are the testing grounds of the future on which the Soviet peace offensive must be judged.

It would be rash indeed to be dogmatic, either positively or negatively, about the real significance of the changes which have taken place in Soviet policy since the death of Stalin. We should avoid unreasonable optimism, for orthodox communist revolutionary tenets may still be dominant in Russia, and there is no peace in them. But also we would be unwise to reject out of hand the possibility that a new and pragmatic approach to internal affairs may be developing among the Soviet leaders, combined with a desire on the part of their peoples to return to a more normal relationship with other peoples. If this tendency were to extend, or could be made to extend, to the conduct of Soviet foreign relations and to the many problems which still divide us, we could at last begin to see more solid grounds for hope and confidence than we have now.

Therefore without illusions or without despair we must hold ourselves ready to strengthen and encourage any elements which wish to deal with the world as it in fact exists rather than as Marxist dogma pictures it. We must also be prepared, however, for the contingency that no such elements do exist, at least in a form seriously to influence policy.

This process of testing—of examination and discovery may be a long and difficult one. During it there is an obligation for NATO to maintain itself in readiness to deal with any emergency, military or diplomatic. By doing so, by steadfastly maintaining its basic purposes, and by demonstrating to the world that its continued existence is essential to the future of free men, it can play a vital part in leading the way forward from the bleak prospects of "cold war", or of a harshly "competitive co-existence", to the more distant horizons of world co-operation.

Mutual Assistance

There is one other problem that I would like to mention, which these words, "world co-operation", bring to mind. It is that of international economic assistance. The problem here is to reconcile our obligations to the international community with those to our own people, to whom a government owes its first duty. But it is more than that. It is a problem, not only of what to do (and no country in the world has ever done as much as this country); but of how and why to do it.

The need for assistance to those countries which have not shared in our industrial and technical advances is real and demanding. It will never be satisfactorily met, however, merely by pouring in assistance in a form which, economically, may be a way of putting people on the dole; politically, may give rise to suspicion that there are strings attached to it; and technically, is beyond the capacity of the receiving peoples to administer effectively.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations uttered some wise words on this subject the other night when he said:

"We should not forget that it may be more difficult to live on the dole than to pay it. Few friendships survive a long drawn-out economic dependency of one upon the other. Gratitude is a good link only when it can be given and received without an overtone of humiliation."

A cynic might doubt whether gratitude, so often a "lively anticipation of favours to come", is a good link at all. The feeling of mutual assistance and co-operative effort is surely better. But that requires careful and sensitive planning; a clear understanding of why you are helping and are being helped.

This understanding can surely best be achieved by using the United Nations more and more as the clearing house for all forms of such assistance; as a place where plans can be discussed and related to each other; where purposes can be clarified and, if necessary,