

theme to remind you that the two are by-products of science - have imparted to diplomacy a hectic air and a sense of urgency which sometimes make it difficult for the diplomatist to play the role which has, traditionally been his.

There are, however, today, as compared with the Nineteenth and early Twentieth Century, more important changes in the conduct of a nation's international relations than in the role assigned to its diplomatic representatives, be they third secretaries, ambassadors or foreign ministers. Just as the ambassadors of an earlier period possessed a much greater freedom of action than they now have, so too it seems to me that the individual states which they represented practised a diplomacy which was much more independent of other nations. There have been, of course, throughout history, numerous alliances frequently changing in composition since most states were vitally interested in making sure that if war could not be avoided, they could at least manage to emerge on the side of the winning international grouping. But such groupings were a far different expression of a nation's foreign policy than the type of alliance which has been emerging in more recent years. There is nothing in history to compare with the present North Atlantic Treaty Organization by which fifteen states have agreed in large measure to pool their military resources and to regard an assault on any one of them as an assault on them all.

In short, what has been happening is simply this: national governments faced with international problems of new and dangerous dimensions have recognized the need for, and they have developed channels of, consultation and co-operation which, had they been proposed a century or even a half century ago would have been regarded as an intolerable infringement upon the almost sacred principle of sovereignty. We have come, perhaps too slowly, to the conclusion that given the facts of our new international life, the decisions which we as nations are called upon to make cannot be made by one man as the ambassadors of an earlier era might have done, or even by one government within whose power, however, responsibility for these decisions still resides. The day may not be too far distant when we shall be ready to transfer much or all of this responsibility to supra-national authorities. I pass over this idea without comment and interject it here only as a possibility, the advantages and disadvantages of which must be carefully weighed as future circumstances may require. In the meantime, however, there has been on the part of national governments a willingness and indeed an eager readiness to discuss and co-ordinate with friendly powers, measures of foreign policy on problems of common interest and concern. This phenomenon, new in the degree of intimacy of exchange, I have designated as fusion in the title of these lectures. In it the peacemaker must find the most effective counterpoise to the fissions, both atomic and political, which have so disturbed the world order of the independent and isolated nation-state.