

Sooner or later, we must have a free world or what we will have is a world in chains. But, for the time being, I believe the first task of statesmanship is to maintain that balance, though it should be our supreme aim to try by every honourable means, to ensure the ultimate peaceful triumph of freedom in the world.

Now it is hardly possible to exaggerate the difficulty of achieving that aim. To succeed we, in the free world, have to create now, and then to maintain, military strength too substantial for our opponents to dare challenge it with any prospect of final victory.

At the same time we must continue to develop our free way of life and to demonstrate its superiority, not only for the favoured peoples of the western world, but also for those countless millions in other continents who are confused and uncertain in the present situation. And while that is being done we are also faced with the problem of living in one world with the great nations behind the iron curtain where long years of intellectual, social and political servitude have undermined the aptitude and perhaps even the desire of many for what we regard as freedom.

I say this is a hard programme. It is the most forbidding prospect which has faced any generation since our European ancestors first settled in the new world. One reason it is hard is that we cannot expect, and indeed, we dare not even hope for quick results.

There is no short and easy way to make the world free or even to make our own freedom secure. It may well be that the greatest of all the dangers we face - greater even than the danger from Russia or from China - is the danger of listening to those who think they have a quick and easy solution to this terribly difficult problem.

There is a great temptation to say: Communist imperialism is an evil thing bent on extinguishing freedom in the world. Let us extinguish it first. Let us get it over with. That temptation will grow greater as the military strength of the free world increases.

This danger is all the greater because acts of Communist aggression like that we are now opposing in Korea inevitably arouse strong feelings and a natural inclination to use our growing strength to hit back at the very source of the trouble.

But statesmanship does not consist in yielding to impulses, however righteous, without reckoning the consequences. To hit back now at the source of the trouble is to start a world war. And that is what we are trying to prevent.

Ambassador Philip Jessup has said that "the United States will fight, if necessary, to preserve freedom and justice, but it will not make war merely because the road to peace is inevitably long and hard and tiresome". That I believe is the right attitude for all free nations.

Now I am personally convinced that our greater industrial strength, our greater initiative and know-how and the greater moral resources of free peoples would enable us to win a world war if such a war got started. But I am just as firmly convinced that the wholesale and appalling destruction of human lives and - perhaps even worse - of the