

EMBAR GO: Simultaneous release in London. Not for publication or broadcast before 1.15 a.m. Tuesday May 17th.

THE FIRST SMUTS MEMORIAL LECTURE

by The Rt. Hon. R.G. Menzies, C.H. Q.C., M.P., Prime Minister of Australia at the University of Cambridge Monday, 16th May, 1960

THE CHANGING COMMONWEALTH

Jan Christian Smuts was one of the most remarkable men in modern history. He was a scholar in the finest sense; a soldier of remarkable distinction; a South African statesman who made an imperishable contribution to the history and institutions of his own land; a Commonwealth Statesman whose towering abilities made him a commanding figure, the trusted confidant and adviser of the giant of the age, Winston Churchill; a world leader "the very wind of whose name" - if I may borrow that great phrase spoken by J.M. Barrie about the Scots - "has swept to the ultimate seas".

I feel it a great and unmerited honour that you should have chosen me to deliver the first "Smuts Memorial Lecture" in this ancient university of which, in the course of his incredibly versatile career, he became Chancellor.

Oddly enough, though I have had a "walking-on" part in some of the world dramas of the past quarter of a century, I never met him except through reading and report. But such is the force of personality that I always felt that for me he was a living presence.

In spite of past events, or perhaps because of them, he became a great champion and expositor of the British Commonwealth, and had at all times clear views about the changes wrought in it in and since 1926. It is for this reason that I have chosen to say something to you, in honour of his memory, on "The Changing Commonwealth".

You will remember Lloyd Osborne's story of the writing of "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde"; how Robert Louis Stevenson wrote it in a few days, had it sharply criticised by his wife, was enraged by the criticism, and then accepted it, and then tossed the manuscript into the fire, and then in another few days re-wrote the whole thing in its present immortal form. It is a great story. But why should I begin by reminding you of it? Certainly, not that I can write like Robert Louis Stevenson, nor, indeed, that the story has any parallel with mine except in one respect. I began to write this lecture on a quiet weekend in Canberra. I thought that I knew something about J.C. Smuts in a broad way; that in theory and practice I was not unfamiliar with modern Commonwealth constitutional development; and that the political Smuts fitted into that development in a way which was intelligible to me. And so I wrote on, increasingly more interested in my own ideas than in those of Smuts until, finding it necessary to consider the basis of Commonwealth changes, I laid my writing-pad aside, and began to re-read Smuts. I even essayed "Holism and Evolution", whipped on by Peter Drucker's "The Landmarks of Tomorrow", in which he describes Jan Christian Smuts as "that astounding South African, the closest to the "whole man" this century has produced".

The more I read, the more I marvelled at the genius of the man whom this lecture commemorates. Who was I to speak to his name and memory? How superficial were my own views: how shallow my own intellectual experiences. Why not toss my draft into the fire and, unlike Stevenson, write no more?

And yet, the more I thought about it, the more I realised that the researches of Smuts, leading him away from the static properties of matter and the disciplines which static considerations impose, to the dynamic post-evolutionary concepts of the growth from "whole" to "whole", provided a key to the problem of Commonwealth evolution, in the solving of which, as a practical man of affairs, he had much to do. The Commonwealth, as I shall endeavour to show, is the best proof of Smuts' central thesis, that "the whole is greater than the sum of its parts".

Further, if there is, as events have shown, nothing static about our great association, we must be prepared for changes in the living organism. It must contain within itself not only the past, but the present and the future. There must be room for the ascertainment of basic principles, but there must be no room for dogma. We must not be merely the historians of the Commonwealth, but the creators of its future form. If, in the course of my remarks, I refer to past events, it will not be to engage in the vain task of wishing them undone, for the clock does not turn back, but to try to see where we have gone, and where we are going.

When the Balfour formula was evolved in 1926, many thought that the new Commonwealth had acquired definition and historic form. "Empire" had been taken by some to connote the subordination of the Dominions; this notion was now swept away. The Dominions were declared to be "autonomous communities", "in no way subordinate one to another". There it was, plainly stated. We in Australia, characteristically enough, had not for many years thought ourselves subordinate, but still, there was no harm in the fact being expressed. The formula then went on to use what I have myself on an earlier occasion described as "three expressions of great cohesive significance". They were -

"within the British Empire"
 "united by a common allegiance to the Crown"
 "the British Commonwealth of Nations".

Here, we said, was "unity in diversity", a unity possessing a slightly theological flavour, it was true, but nevertheless expressed in a new formula which would, once and for all, convert the mystically unexpressed into lucid form, establishing equality but preserving structure; opening up a new era for self-government and development.

Four years later, the Prime Ministers at their 1930 conference, evolved what became the Statute of Westminster 1931, clearing up a few technical matters of power, but reciting in its preamble that "as the Crown is the symbol of the free association of the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and as they are united by a common allegiance to the Crown..."

So there it was, complete and tidy; and to a monarchist, all compact of a superb blending of heartening emotion and enduring structure. Unlike that peculiar product of the British inductive genius, the non-existent British Constitution, the Commonwealth had a written charter for all to see. Only thirty years ago; but in those years the great definitive formula has become largely obsolete, true only in a fragmentary way, in many respects altered beyond recognition.

I will take the "three expressions" in their order.

1. The expression "within the British Empire" has ceased to have acceptance, partly because the notion of a group of completely self-governing nations existing within "an Empire" was not in its nature one which could long endure, and partly because the word Empire itself has fallen from grace. We now

leave the creation of colonial or satellite empires to the Communist powers, and have been talked into believing that "imperialism" and "jingoism" were synonymous.

2. The second expression, "united by a common allegiance to the Crown", is no longer accurate, nor should we pretend that it is.

Great Britain, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, Ceylon and Ghana are at the moment united by a common allegiance to the Crown. But Ghana and Ceylon are designed to become Republics, like India and Pakistan. Malaya is no Republic, but has a monarch of its own, to whom it owes allegiance. The Government of South Africa has made no secret of its Republican objective, and even now the Crown is less "visible" in South African administration and affairs than it is in, say, Australia.

All this means that at some future time there may well be only Great Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand who could be described as united by the common allegiance, the remaining Commonwealth countries having a measure of unity with us and with each other established on a quite different foundation.

This is much more than a change of form. I am going to say a little more about it, because it seems to me to be very important that we in the Crown Dominions should not weaken our own principles by pretending that they are not matters of substance.

Republican membership of the Commonwealth was accepted by the Prime Ministers in April 1949 in a Statement which merits complete quotation.

"The Governments of the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan and Ceylon, whose countries are united as Members of the British Commonwealth of Nations and owe a common allegiance to the Crown, which is also the symbol of their free association, have considered the impending constitutional changes in India.

The Government of India have informed the other Governments of the Commonwealth of the intention of the Indian people that under the new constitution which is about to be adopted India shall become a sovereign independent republic. The Government of India have however declared and affirmed India's desire to continue her full membership of the Commonwealth of Nations and her acceptance of the King as the symbol of the free association of its independent member nations and as such the Head of the Commonwealth.

The Governments of the other countries of the Commonwealth, the basis of whose membership of the Commonwealth is not hereby changed, accept and recognize India's continuing membership in accordance with the terms of this declaration.

Accordingly, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, Pakistan and Ceylon, hereby declare that they remain united as free and equal members of the Commonwealth of Nations, freely co-operating in the pursuit of peace, liberty and progress."

Note that at the time of the declaration India had not actually become a republic; the opening paragraph was therefore a correct statement of the then position. The

statement as a whole makes it quite clear, if it needed to be made so, that India as a Republic, would no longer owe allegiance to the Crown. But she accepted "the King as the symbol of her free association... and as such the head of the Commonwealth".

Ever since this historic decision, the Crown ceases to have any internal significance in a Republican member. The Queen disappears from Parliament, the Courts of Law, the armed forces. In Australia, by way of comparison, the Governor-General is the Queen's representative, I am the Queen's Prime Minister; my ministers and I are the Queen's servants; our Statutes are enacted by "the Queen's Most Excellent Majesty, the Queen, and the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Australia". All members of Parliament take oath or affirmation of allegiance. Legal process issues in the name of the Queen. The judges are the Queen's judges. In short, our whole structure, legislative, executive, and judicial, is built around the presence of the Crown.

Nobody remained unmoved when the Queen, in opening Parliament at Canberra on February 15, 1954, stated the matter quite simply -

"The first Section of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia provides that the legislative power of the Commonwealth shall be vested in "a Federal Parliament, which shall consist of the Queen, a Senate, and a House of Representatives".

It is therefore a joy for me, today, to address you not as a Queen from far away, but as YOUR Queen and as part of YOUR Parliament. In a real sense, you are here as my colleagues, friends, and advisers.

When I add to this consideration the fact that I am the first ruling Sovereign to visit Australia, it is clear that the events of today make a piece of history which fills me with deep pride and the most heartfelt pleasure, and which I am confident will serve to strengthen in your own hearts and minds a feeling of comradeship with the Crown and that sense of duty shared which we must all have as we confront our common tasks.' "

The Prime Ministers in 1949 were clearly not unconscious of the fact that they were creating two relationships instead of one; preferring this duality to the contraction of Commonwealth membership. Note the words -

"The Government of the other countries of the Commonwealth, the basis of whose membership of the Commonwealth is not hereby changed, accept and recognise India's continuing membership in accordance with the terms of this declaration".

Was this duality affected by the phrase "Head of the Commonwealth"? That it was a valuable and significant expression nobody would deny. It had far-reaching effects. But what does it mean? It does not mean that the Sovereign is "Queen of the Commonwealth", for she cannot be the Queen of a Republic. What it does mean is that the member Republic says, in effect, to the Crown members - "We recognise that the Queen, though she is not our Queen, occupies a position at the centre of the Commonwealth which permits us to regard her as a symbol of our association with other Commonwealth countries, whether republic or monarchies". This means that the relationship is external, and not internal.

One interesting thing about this historic decision is that Smuts was dismayed. As his son says in his biography -

"My father declared that this 'violated every concept of the Commonwealth...' You are either in the Commonwealth or out of it. If the Commonwealth concept is tampered with or destroyed, and it is still proposed to continue the Commonwealth system, there would have to be a new basis of agreement between the member States, with a written constitution on the lines of the League of Nations or the organisation of the United Nations... What India appears to wish is therefore not compatible with the Commonwealth, and cannot be achieved in terms of it".

He went on to warn -

"Great care should be taken not to empty the concept of the Commonwealth of all substance and meaning, and not to whittle it away until nothing but the word remained with no real meaning or significance. Far better would it be to drop it altogether."

At the time when the declaration was announced by Mr. Chifley at Canberra, my own views as Leader of the Opposition were not dissimilar. I prepared what I thought to be a powerful and pungent speech. Chifley, who, to use the homely phrase "didn't come down in the last shower", guessed my intentions, and, with studied calm, left the item at the bottom of the Notice Paper. When months had gone by, I naturally felt that the incident was closed, and tore up my undelivered speech. I had, not for the first or the last time, learned the discipline of past and unalterable events.

The great purpose of my present address is not to sit in vain judgment upon the past, but to ascertain the present nature of the structural and dynamic elements in Commonwealth development. What I have to say to you is designed to be not censorious but explanatory, not gloomily retrospective but optimistically forward-looking.

3. The third expression: "the British Commonwealth of Nations" has also fallen into partial disuse. It is still the natural expression for the Crown Dominions, or at least for those who by derivation are British. But it clearly is not acceptable to the newer Commonwealth nations. This fact clearly emerged in the Declaration of the Prime Ministers in 1949. As we have already seen, that declaration, in its opening paragraph, in which the Governments concerned were speaking before the Indian Republic, described the declaring governments as "members of the British Commonwealth of Nations". The later operative clauses dealing with the republican status of India referred to "the Commonwealth of Nations". This was no accident. It was fully discussed at the Conference. It recognised, so to speak, the facts of life and of popular sentiment in the new nations. Faced with these facts, even I can call my lecture "The Changing Commonwealth" without it being thought that I am speaking of the Commonwealth of Australia, while the Empire Parliamentary Association has become the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association almost by default of opposition.

So far, I have been concerned to point out the nature and to try to estimate the significance of the structural changes which have occurred during my own political life-time. I have done this principally because I want now to direct myself to two major questions.

1. What is the significance of the Crown in the new Commonwealth?
2. Apart from the Crown, what are the elements which mark out the Commonwealth from other alliances or organisations of Nations?

I cannot deal, however briefly, with the significance of the Crown in relation to the Commonwealth without first saying something about its significance to those who are within the allegiance. Are we the Queen's men and women because, as the fact is, we love and respect her? Or because, out of long experience, we find in the Monarchy as such a focal point, unmarred by political controversy, for our national tradition, consciousness, and ambitions? Or because we are snobs, and love an hierarchical society? Or perhaps, though citizens of a monarchy, we are not the Queen's men and women, and therefore think that the best way to get rid of monarchy is to vulgarise the Crown, to treat the Royal Family as if they were stars in a public show, to deny them any private life and probe into their real or imaginary emotional experiences, to remove the mystery of monarchy, to destroy the swift impulse in the loyal heart when the Queen passes by, to make all commonplace when the national symbol of the Crown should and must have a moving splendour of its own.

The British people, not discouraged by Republican examples, have a deep instinct for the monarchy. This instinct, oddly enough, does not depend upon the personal character and popularity of the Monarch alone. The Georgian era provided some evidence that the people of Britain thought it a better thing to have an indifferent or incompetent King (or even Regent) than no King at all. Queen Victoria and King Edward VII had varying popular fortunes, not necessarily for the same reasons.

The great King George V came to the throne amid murmured and sometimes loudly spoken criticism. He survived both, and a great war, and grew into the hearts of his people. When the war was over, a great stirring began, which transformed the conception of Empire and produced the new Dominion Status and the Statute of Westminster. The King shrewdly saw the implications. He accommodated himself to the new Democracy and the new Commonwealth. He saw vividly the technical limitations on his own official power, but with great penetration saw that his own personal influence and experience were not irrelevant. He secured the friendship of Tory and Socialist alike. He on occasion affected their conduct without assertion of prerogative. He lived to be a much loved man, with a much loved wife. He asserted few or no rights, but he was nevertheless the centre of constitutional government. He was, in my opinion, the first great Constitutional Monarch.

His relationship to his subjects will now be recalled by fewer and fewer people, for he died in 1936. But I will recount two stories, at first hand, which may serve to illustrate my text.

1935 was the year of his Jubilee. His Prime Ministers had gathered from around the world. The South African Prime Minister was the celebrated and controversial Hertzog, by history and conviction a Republican, not by nature or experience disposed to love the British. I had various discussions with Hertzog (I was present as Attorney-General of Australia) about the conflict between my own conception of the Crown as a single indivisible unifying element and his own quite different ideas. I respected and admired Hertzog very much; he was a man of great courtesy and of great integrity. But I wondered what he would do on the great day when the Prime Ministers were to attend at St. James's Palace to present their loyal addresses to the King and the Queen.

Hertzog was immediately preceded by my own Prime Minister, J.A. Lyons, a clear King's man, who spoke movingly, and, as always, with simplicity and charm.

Hertzog came next. He had seen something of the

King and the Queen. He had fallen under their influence, and had learned to regard them with affection. To my great joy he began by saying:-

"It is my pleasure and honour to present to Your Majesty and" (with an old-world bow) "to Her Majesty the Queen, the loyal homage of the whole of the people of South Africa."

It was an unforgettable moment. For the time, at least, history was being written.

My second story is of a much more homely kind. I went to have a haircut at a little barber's shop up an alley off the Strand. The barber was a museum piece, with a friendly manner and a fine quiff of hair falling over one side of his forehead. Naturally, he did not know me from Adam, and spoke as he thought. Brandishing the cutting implements of his trade, he said:-

"Did you see the procession to St. Paul's yesterday, Sir?" I had. "Did you notice what a lovely day it was?" I did. "You can't tell me God didn't have a hand in that Sir!" I agreed. And then I said, may I be forgiven, "Do you believe in all this royalty business?" It was a deliberately discouraging question, but the answer was superb. "Well, you see, it's like this. When I knock off work, I go up to a pub in Holborn, and have a couple of pints with some of my friends. We argue about a lot of things, but we're all for the King!"

By the force of his own personality George V did much to preserve the true significance of the Crown and to make his many millions of subjects think of the Crown, not as an obstacle to democracy but as a living element in it. This example was superbly followed by King George VI and his great Queen, and, of course, by our Sovereign Lady of today.

Does our great good fortune, to which most of us have become accustomed during our adult lives, mean that we are for the Crown because of the personal quality of its wearer, and that one misfortune could destroy it? I hope not, and I believe not. Allegiance to the Crown will remain, intangible, not susceptible of legal definition, the most profound of all the unifying influences for the Crown dominions.

But, even for those Commonwealth countries which are not within the allegiance, the Crown has, I believe, more than a mere symbolism of friendly association. Last week, the Prime Ministers met in London, Monarchists and Republicans. In the past, they have always met in London. This is not just because London is a convenient meeting place. It is, indeed, not the most convenient place for those who come, as I do, from the far corners of the earth. But London is at the heart of world affairs. The tides of thought and of international relations beat strongly, even if sometimes unsuccessfully, on the shores of Whitehall and Westminster. But, more significantly, London is where the Queen is. Some place or places other than London may in future be chosen; but only, I hope, if the Queen is there. For when a Republican Prime Minister clasps hands with the Queen, I warrant that he sees her as no theoretical emblem, but as something special for him and his country.

I have spoken at some length about the Crown, and have suggested that while its place among the Crown Dominions remains unaltered and vital, its broad significance for the Commonwealth at large has been changed and qualified. We have seen what has happened to the other elements of 1926 and 1930.

Under all these circumstances, what are the operative

factors which have continued to make the Commonwealth, in spite of all its structural changes, a special association of nations with a mutual relationship which distinguishes it from other world groups?

My answer is that the sense of community between the Crown members and the Republican members if preserved and fostered, not only by the great things we have in common, such as our desire for peace and freedom and resistance to aggression, (for these ideas we share with many others), but also by our frequent meetings and personal exchanges at Prime Ministers' Conferences, at meetings of Trade or Finance Ministers, in committees of officials, and in the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. On all such occasions we may meet as debaters or contestants, but we meet in a special atmosphere which induces both frankness and friendliness; with a feeling that we have a special relationship of mutual respect and common interest. I have, I think a longer experience of Prime Ministers' Conferences than most men. I will therefore speak about them in particular, though I could with great advantage expand upon the growing significance of the Parliamentary Association. But I speak of those meetings of Prime Ministers which I know so well, because I believe them to be almost the greatest element in the "workability" and special character of the modern Commonwealth.

When we meet, we have no set agenda. We move no resolutions, and we have never cast votes. But we learn a great deal about the world's problems and our relations to them. The intolerance engendered by long-range and imperfect knowledge is tempered. From time to time, as I well know from experience, we influence each other's thinking, without the discords of public controversy. We have, after all, some community of history and ideas. We no longer aim at producing a common foreign policy, nor do we any longer find ourselves able to envisage the Commonwealth as a "world power". But if we can achieve a common philosophical approach to world problems, there is life and virtue in our deliberations.

We do not meet as a tribunal, to sit in judgment upon each other, or to ventilate and pass upon intra-Commonwealth issues. We are not a super-state.

During the recent tragic episodes in South Africa, there were not wanting suggestions that South Africa should be expelled - presumably by majority vote - from the Commonwealth. Any such suggestion, in my opinion, misconceived the nature of our association. We do not deal with the domestic political policies of any one of us, for we know that political policies come or go with governments, and that we are not concerned with governments and their policies so much as we are with nations and their peoples. If we ever thought of expelling a member nation of the Commonwealth it would, I hope, be because we believed that in the general interests of the Commonwealth that nation as a nation was not fit to be our associate.

The Prime Ministers' Conference would break up in disorder and the new Commonwealth would disintegrate if we affected to discuss and decide what we thought to be the proper measure of democracy in our various countries; whether particular groups should or should not have the vote; whether oppositions should be respected; whether a Parliament should control the Executive. On all such matters, "autonomous" or "independent" nations must have the right to manage their own affairs in their own way.

We are not a court. We are brothers in a special international family. We have done well so far because we have nurtured our elements of unity with loving care and have sought to resolve our differences in a friendly and mutually helpful way. There is, in brief, a quality of intimacy about our

meetings which relegates the protocol of diplomacy to its proper place; induces personal friendships; and enables us, between conferences, to communicate with each other without hesitation or reserve.

I know of no other association which possesses these attributes to anything like the same degree. When we meet, we are much more than a group of individuals; we are conscious of the fact that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts.

Contrast all this with the United Nations, where large numbers of delegates to the Assembly meet, of necessity, almost as strangers; where, of necessity, resolutions are tabled, amendments drafted, votes canvassed, and majority decisions taken; where the inevitable bargaining tends to weaken mutual trust. These things must be so in great multi-national meetings, where there are no old ties of friendship to preserve, and no great or comprehensive tradition of well-remembered and well-loved association in peace and in war.

Do you feel that this approach is sentimental? I admit it. Indeed, what I have just been saying amounts to this; that it is a cynical error to suppose that when the first Republic entered the Commonwealth door the old sentiment flew out of the window. We still have an attachment to each other which none of us would deny. That is why we see in our newly independent nations such eagerness to remain in the Commonwealth. That is why I can sit in a Prime Ministers' Conference and feel instantly as much at home as if I were sitting in my own Cabinet.

Last week some of the principles I have recalled were under great strain.

We were not discussing the tragic incident of Sharpeville, for post-war history has seen many bitter events arising from religious or political or racial hostilities in many lands. But Sharpeville had brought up into the public mind the whole problems of apartheid, or separate development of separate races within the one country. In the result, apartheid, which has been the accepted policy of South African Governments for many years and has never previously been brought up at a Prime Ministers' Conference, flared into the news and into debate.

When the Conference began, there was a sharp challenge. But, quite quickly, we re-affirmed our practice that the domestic policies of member nations are not matters for debate or decision by the Conference. Though private and informal talks occurred, as they were bound to, the practice was confirmed.

In this way, we have passed again through a constitutional crisis. The highly emotional atmosphere engendered by the South African controversy, though it is intelligible, is not conducive either to clear thought or to objective judgment. But the point to be made is that the Prime Ministers' Conference is not a quasi-judicial body. Nor is it a Committee of the United Nations. Nor is it under some duty to discipline its own members into obedience to the Charter of the United Nations.

These ideas are not novel; they are sanctioned by past practice. I take leave to mention an issue which arose nine years ago over the India-Pakistan difference regarding Kashmir; a difference as yet unresolved. The then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Liat Ali Khan, wanted Kashmir to be listed for the then approaching Prime Ministers' Conference. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Attlee (as he then was) acted upon the unwritten rule that the Conference was not a tribunal, and refused. Mr. Nehru concurred. Mr. Liat Ali Khan ultimately came to London when it had been agreed that private and voluntary conversations could occur, not as part of the Conference procedures but as incidental to the fact that Prime

Ministers would be meeting in London and would be privately available to each other. Private talks occurred. They related to a matter of considerable international importance, but they formed no part of the official record.

As our numbers increase, and the close personal contact which we now enjoy becomes less close and less personal, we will encounter dangers which we must be careful to avert.

I state my own faith in this way.

We of the Commonwealth are no longer a single integrated structure, with a common foundation and a powerful organic association. Our strength is that we meet as equals, without vote or lobby; we speak to each other with freedom and friendliness; we seek to understand each other, but we do not sit in judgment on each other; we take an interest in each other but respect the fact that each member has achieved self-government; hence we seek to co-operate with each other but not to invade the sovereignty of each other. We seek agreement on purpose and principle, but leave to each the decision on how to achieve or apply them.

For, though so much has changed, the nations of the Commonwealth remain "autonomous" and "freely associated". We derive strength from the knowledge that we are not like other associations, that our rules may be unwritten but our true relations written into our hearts and consciousness.

I conclude with two mercifully brief homilies.

The first is this. In the old Commonwealth, and under the Crown, the great traditional expression of constitutional monarchy was Parliamentary self-government. So much was this "bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh" that we have been tempted to regard it as an essential part of the Commonwealth inheritance. Most of us have, in post-prandial speeches, succumbed to the temptation. But, as we look back and around us, is this true? Our British institutions of democracy have grown from the soil, over long centuries. But they cannot be easily transplanted.

Modern history proves this. They were tried, and failed, in Russia and in Germany. They have had a chequered history in France. They suffered a long occlusion in Italy. They have been swept aside, by force majeure, in the historic countries of Middle Europe. They do not exist in Continental China. They are now struggling to life in Japan. What of the new Commonwealth countries? If we survey Commonwealth mankind from Ghana to Malaya, we will begin to understand that one of the great implications of independent nationhood is that when people win to self-government they choose or permit their own forms of government. It is one of the many errors of modern emotional thinking, or of emotion at any rate, to believe that when a former colony becomes free of foreign rule, all that needs to be said is "Now, elect your own Parliament, have a Government and an Opposition, make your laws democratically, and all will be well!"

The truth, as I see it, is that each new Commonwealth country, as it achieves complete independence, tends to begin its adventure by developing a higher degree of executive authority at the centre, and correspondingly a lower degree of parliamentary power, than we are accustomed to. Parliamentary government is not an artificial creation which can be established in a new country by a mere act of law. If it tends, with us, to give expression and protection to individual rights, that is because we have a passion for individual freedom, of which Parliament has become the expression and the guarantee. The historic movement has been, in the famous phrase, "from status to

contract". Our parliamentary system is based upon the free individual. If we occasionally respect our governments, and always, or almost always, obey the laws passed by Parliament, it is because the body of citizens, with equal political rights, have chosen our ministers and legislators, and can dismiss them; though this, to one who has survived five successive elections, is a sobering reflection.

I turn to my second homily.

I have spoken about "unity in diversity", and have dwelt at some length and with some emphasis upon the increased diversity which has arisen since 1930. It is not to be thought from this emphasis that I think diversity a bad thing. It is, on the contrary, as good constitutionally as it is agriculturally. The old British Empire had great diversities of institutions, creed, tradition, culture, and race. The new Commonwealth has, as we have seen, added some of its own. Such diversities, so long as they give rise to different points of view and promote the frankest exchanges of opinion, and do not give rise to hatreds, are good. Properly dealt with, they promote true friendship and co-operation by widening the boundaries of understanding and tolerance and serving to create a sense of the interdependence of independent minds and nations. A sound individualism is not anarchical, but democratic.

As a wise observer said to me recently - "If organic unity in the old sense is gone, a new unity must be sought for. It cannot be achieved in a hurry, any more than its predecessor was".

In truth, and in the world in which we live, absolute independence, as some speak of it, is impossible. We all value its form, and do our best to achieve its substance. But without economic aid, technical assistance, foreign capital, and in most cases military or material alliances, there can be few, if any nations in the world that could hope to maintain their independence.

If we are to enjoy the co-operation and respect of each other, we must get to know each other better, be more tolerant of what to us are strange ideas, bury old prejudices, and seek to achieve that understanding intimacy which recognises differences but learns how to live with them.

The most remarkable expression of this vital human truth is our Commonwealth of Nations, changed and changing, but, so long as we see clearly, destined to endure.
