



# STATEMENTS AND SPEECHES

INFORMATION DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS  
OTTAWA - CANADA

No. 53/31      Text of Commencement Address at  
Dartmouth College delivered by the  
Secretary of State for External  
Affairs, Mr. L.B. Pearson, at  
Hanover, N.H., Sunday, June 14, 1953

... Today I want to speak to you for a few minutes about one sector of this world community, the Atlantic sector, and about the attempt that is being made to build it into a closely knit, co-operating group for preserving the peace and advancing human welfare. Whether the attempt will succeed, I do not know. I do know that it is heartening and supremely important that it is being made.

Out of the chaos and destruction of the Second World War from which we were able to emerge only by linking our arms, our resources and our national destinies in a great allied coalition, we won for ourselves a second chance to create a new structure of peace.

We sought first a blueprint for this structure in the United Nations Charter; the most far-reaching instrument for international co-operation ever conceived.

However, in the years after 1946, our hopes for achieving co-operation and security through a universal organization were blasted - at least temporarily - by the reality of a divided world; of which a divided Germany and a divided Korea were the tragic symbols. The legend of the traditional jewel which your President is wearing today reads, as you know, "unanimity is the strength of society". The United Nations (perhaps not unexpectedly) was not able to gain this strength. As a result, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization linking North America with Western Europe was formed. Today, this Atlantic Organization stands as the most important international agency for the defence of the free world and the preservation of international peace. It is an instrument, moreover, which does not operate by vote or veto (though every one of its members, and this is sometimes forgotten, has a veto.) It operates through the examination and reconciliation of differing viewpoints; through decisions based on the general will and accepted as such.

In these discussions, and in the resulting decisions, special weight, of course, attaches to the opinion of those governments who carry the greatest share of the burden and the greatest responsibilities. But these, in their turn, do not ride roughshod over the opinions of the other and smaller members. In short, NATO is a partnership of members with a will to work

together as freely co-operating states. That is why it has been successful in coming to agreed decisions on questions of vital importance to us all. On no other basis could NATO work satisfactorily - or, indeed, work at all.

The solemn covenant to which the Atlantic governments subscribed in 1949; the steady progress which has been made in strengthening our defences, and in developing the institutions and practices of Atlantic co-operation, are among the most remarkable developments of a remarkable era.

Striking as this development has been, we should not forget that if the Atlantic coalition remains merely an improvised reaction to post-war perils; a by-product of a cold war; it is not likely to survive the emergency which created it. Its foundations must go deeper than that. They must reflect the enduring links which bind the old world and the new. I think that they do.

The Atlantic peoples have common traditions and spiritual values derived from the same ancient sources. There has long existed a natural and permanent foundation for a community of interest and action. Over many centuries - through exploration, through settlement, and in peace and in war, we have drawn not only the material elements from a common civilization, but, more important, the same basic principles of social and political belief, the same fundamental freedoms of speech and worship, the same practices of tolerance and respect for the rule of law, and the same indestructible belief in the inherent worth of the individual and his right to freedom, even the freedom to be wrong. Fear is not the only thing holding us together.

It is not, however, easy to live and work in a world whose future is darkened by the lengthening shadow of man's growing capacity for self-destruction. It is not easy for free democracies in peacetime to devote large proportions of their energies and resources to defence. It is not easy to maintain an 'alert' which in the nature of things must last for many years. Nor is it easy in the absence of all-out war for proud and sovereign states, whether great or small, to adapt their national policies to the wider interests of a larger international community.

It is only by identifying and taking the measure of these difficulties that we can combat and overcome them. To ignore them, to pretend that they do not exist, would be to jeopardize the great task to which we have put our hands. Certainly the disciples of the philosophy of world domination know that they exist, and are determined to do everything possible to exploit and exaggerate them, in the hope that they will ultimately destroy the unity we have achieved and which they fear so much.

Since the death of Stalin, our coalition has also had to face a new complication "peace offensive". This may bring its opportunities, which we should exploit. But it may also bring new tests and even dangers which, on our part, will call for steadiness and patience. We

know that military force, or the threat of it, is only one of the weapons in the armoury of those who would seek to achieve world domination. There are other weapons, less obvious but no less powerful, which will be employed in the hope of dividing us.

One of these is the economic weapon. We must see to it that disunity arising out of excessive economic nationalism does not do the job that military force has so far been unable to do. Here too we must "go it together". There would be no surer way to dismember our coalition than to permit the flow and volume of trade between the free nations to start on a downward spiral with countries again resorting to extreme restrictive measures against each other. The success of the free world in solving its economic problems may, in fact, be of decisive importance in the struggle against Soviet imperialism.

In resisting this evil Communist combination of military might, political infiltration, economic and psychological pressure, we do not forget that along with the external threat of Communism there is also the internal threat of subversion which requires vigilance and, wherever necessary, effective action to counteract it. If, however, we were to exaggerate this internal threat, and in meeting it, if we were to abandon or weaken our adherence to well-tryed principles of justice and the rule of law, of tolerance and understanding, which are the basis of the democratic tradition, we should find only that we had created a tyranny in defending ourselves against one. We must not compete with Communism in elevating fear into a civic virtue, in making denunciation the test of loyalty, in exalting violence as a badge of patriotism, or in making a sterile conformity the test of good citizenship.

Nor is this the only pitfall. In each country of the coalition - especially in those which speak the same language - voices are raised in our midst, calculated to exaggerate the differences which arise between us. Irresponsibility of this kind can undermine the mutual understanding on which our Atlantic community rests.

As a Member of Parliament, I may refer, without impropriety I hope, to what Lord Acton has described "the never-ending audacity of elected persons". Some of this verbal audacity on both sides of the Atlantic consists of appeals to passion and prejudice by men whose horizons are circumscribed only by their own ambiguous purposes. We will be wise, I think, not to confuse these sounds with the voice of the people, or to mistake calculated and theatrical outbursts for frank and honest criticism.

But perhaps the greatest threat to the unity of the Atlantic coalition lies - paradoxically - across the Pacific. New forces have swept across the Far East, some of them reflecting the pulsations of aggressive Communism, others related to the surge of nationalism which has marked the 20th century. We have been as one in supporting the principles on which we believe an honourable and just armistice can be arranged in Korea and which we have reason to hope we are on the verge of reaching. But this will bring to the fore new and challenging Pacific political problems so grave that,

if we do not achieve agreement in our approach to them, our unity will be weakened and prejudiced.

The basic requirement for such agreement as I see it, is to recognize the distinction between Communist military aggression which, as members of the United Nations, we should always be prompt and united to resist; and Communism as a social, economic and political doctrine which, abhorrent as it is to free men everywhere, must be resisted and eradicated - by other means than bayonets or atom bombs. This can best be done by making our own democracy work, and assisting and encouraging Asian democracy to work, in ways which will do more for the welfare and happiness of men than Communism can ever hope to do.

These are some of the problems ahead for the coalition. Clean-cut solutions for them are not always possible, and distant ones cannot be realized in the present. They present, I repeat, a challenge to us all. National action, moreover, is inadequate to the dimensions of this challenge. International action is essential and it must operate through consultation, persuasion, agreement. In such co-operation we have no alternative but "go it together", in the clear knowledge of where we are going, how we can most surely reach our destination, and how much strength we can gather from each other on our journey.

As we march together, we may occasionally, because we are free men and not regimented sheep, get out of step. When we do so, of course, it is regrettable, and to be corrected as soon as possible; but it is far better than Communist unity where the leader relies on a pistol at the back to keep sullen or reluctant followers in line.

On the part of the United States, the acknowledged leader of our band of free countries, this "marching together" will require patience, consultation with her friends on direction and objectives, and, at times, concessions to their viewpoint.

For the other members of the coalition there is an equal and parallel obligation to recognize frankly and ungrudgingly the tremendous contribution to the common effort which the United States is making and the special responsibilities it has undertaken. We can best do this by making our own concessions, when necessary, to common agreement.

Furthermore, we cannot be united in one area of the world and divided in another. No one has explained this better than President Eisenhower did at Minneapolis last Wednesday when he said:

"...there is no such thing as partial unity. That is a contradiction in terms.

"We cannot select those areas of the globe in which our policies or wishes may differ from our Allies - build political fences around these areas - and then say to our Allies:

'We shall do what we want here - and where you do what we want, there and only there shall we favor unity.'

"That is not unity. It is an attempt at dictation and it is not the way free men associate."

Those are good and true words. They derive from the recognition of the fact that policy - like peace and prosperity - is indivisible and that there is a strength in the co-operation of free men that slave societies can never hope to attain.

In this co-operation, difficulties often daunt us - and trials oppress. The long and hard ascent to friendship and better understanding between peoples often seems like the last 1,000 feet to the summit of Mt. Everest; a peak, incidentally, which was finally scaled by a Nepalese and an Anglo-Saxon, a Buddhist and a Christian, working together.

In our slow march forward and upwards we meet frustrations and we have our setbacks. These, however, mean no disgrace, and are no cause for despair, as long as we do not allow them to drive us off our course or destroy our resolve.

If we, whose graduation date seems now a depressingly long way behind us, falter in this striving for better things among and between men, well, the class of '53 will soon be on the scene in more than 53 free countries.

I know that you of the Dartmouth division of this great, reinforcing army, whatever the work that you are called on to do, whatever your responsibilities may be, will add your strength, your energy and your mind and heart to the effort that is being made in so many lands to bring peace and decency and some tranquillity to this tortured and frightened world.

---

S/C