

military aggression is ever present, while economic and social difficulties remain a constant threat to stability, and one which the forces of Soviet imperialism are exploiting and will continue to exploit to the limit. Furthermore, if the strictly military picture has improved in the European area, that has been, I think, owing to the certain realization by any country which may now be tempted to break the peace that a group of free countries stand together in resistance to any such aggression, and that the ground on which they stand is becoming firmer. The moral to be drawn from this is therefore not that we should slacken our efforts, but that we should go ahead steadily and with determination to complete the job.

However, there are two types of aggression that we have to fear. There is military aggression, expressing itself in armed action, but there is social and economic aggression which expresses itself through the subversive activity of international communism. As to the first, military aggression, our military weakness - and in the face of Soviet land and air strength it is still a weakness - has been a standing temptation to Soviet attack. In strengthening ourselves, as we have done, and rightly so, to remove that temptation, we have, of course - and this I suppose applies particularly to the European countries - to be careful not to weaken ourselves unnecessarily in the economic and social field, and by doing so encourage the other kind of aggression. How to maintain this proper balance in the days ahead between military power, economic stability and social progress is probably the paramount problem of the free world today and will only be solved by co-operative action which takes into account every factor, moral, social and economic, as well as military, that makes for strength.

It may well be that the Soviet Union, impressed by the action of the United Nations in Korea, and aware of the far greater residual strength of the West, will now wish, for tactical reasons, to avoid an open conflict, and try to sap our strength by other means. It may even attempt - indeed it has already attempted and with some effect - to deceive and divide us by false peace campaigns, by exploiting economic and social difficulties. In short, as it has been put very graphically, it may put poison in our soup instead of cutting our throats.

It is, I think, necessary for free countries to take counter measures against this danger as well as against the danger of military aggression. We should, for instance, never lose a chance to drive home the fact - it may be more obvious to us than it is to others - that we are for peace alone; that while we in NATO, for instance, are determined to press forward with our defence programme, undeterred either by threats of war or phony promises of peace, nevertheless our primary purpose is always to prevent war and not to fight one; to ensure that D-day like tomorrow never comes; to underline our desire to use our energy and wealth not for arming but for peaceful, social and economic progress in a world where armaments will not be necessary.

In the kind of situation with which we are faced today, it may be that if we have achieved our defence objectives by, say, the end of 1954, we will have surmounted the most acutely dangerous period; but that in its turn may be followed by the longer term phase of the conflict, the marathon race as opposed to the sprint, and that may last for many, many years. It will require discipline, steadiness and perseverance; a refusal also to yield to the temptation to adopt the policies or even the