

hoped to develop a strong and independent European third force of which it would be the leader.

In short, the political and military realities on which NATO was originally founded have changed. The threat to Western Europe was, if not superseded, at least supplemented by tensions and conflicts in other parts of the world, in the Middle East, in Africa, and, above all, in Southeast Asia, where these tensions exploded into bloody and confused war in Vietnam. There was no Atlantic solidarity in policy for these areas and, to this extent, NATO ceased to meet the vital requirements of some of its members.

NATO, in short, having accomplished its original strategic purpose, as it did (and thank God that it did), has not yet been able to adapt itself adequately to changing conditions both strategic and political. But the need for such adaptation is recognized and is now being faced. If any changes are to be effective, they must take into account the fact that Western Europe has emerged from the postwar condition of political and economic weakness into a position of strength and confidence, grateful for the American support and assistance which has done so much to bring this about but with the desire for a greater share in the control of the alliance and its policies.

Undoubtedly, a greater immediate menace to NATO is the threatened conflict between two of NATO's members, Greece and Turkey, over Cyprus, which is a member of the Commonwealth. It is to be hoped that this conflict, senseless as it would be, can be averted. I think it can, on terms honourable and acceptable to the three governments concerned. We have more hope than we had a day or so ago that this can be done. If it were not averted, then armed conflict between two NATO members, using military equipment provided by other members for other collective defence purposes, could have a fatal effect on the NATO alliance.

One other point. If arrangements are agreed on to avert conflict which call for a stronger United Nations force (and both our countries are serving in that force now) to supervise their carrying-out and to maintain security on the island during that period, then these arrangements must also provide that this United Nations force has the necessary authority and support to discharge its mandate. We must not again have the United Nations force called on to discharge a new responsibility without adequate means for that purpose - political, juridical and military.

I have been talking about NATO and a changing Europe, and a changing world. These changes are not only a challenge for NATO. They are, as I see it, also a challenge for progress toward a European unity which would include Britain - a Europe with a political, economic and defence role of its own, but one which should remain closely associated with the United States and Canada in a European-North American partnership.

The idea of a strong and united Europe is surely a wise one, but only if it can be worked out without isolation from North America. That is why, as I see it, Britain should be a central and integral part of the new Europe, politically and economically. I see this as something which need not weaken ties across the Atlantic or with the rest of the Commonwealth. I see it rather