

or indirect aggression where the circumstances may be blurred and decisions cannot be so easily and quickly made. In that kind of situation a question at once arises as to the application of this doctrine. Against whom will the retaliation be made? Where, how, and when? The difficulty of course in getting out of that situation is that you cannot find any cut and dried formula to cover all these cases, and if you did have one you would not want to give it away by unnecessary publicity. Yet, having regard to that difficulty, there is the other difficulty, because this kind of blurred situation is exactly when co-operation and consultation with your friends is most essential and when it is of vital importance to act together as much as we can and plan as far in advance as possible.

Then there is the phrase "by means". That has been interpreted in certain quarters, and understandably so, to give some weight to the fear that the application of this kind of strategy might involuntarily convert small wars into a world war. The Secretary of State of the United States has been trying to clear up that misapprehension in recent days by emphasizing that "means" do not include any single means, let alone atomic means, that the means would have to be adapted to the circumstances and that there would be many occasions--indeed probably most occasions, even of aggression--when it would be unwise politically and strategically to use atomic means at all. Then there is this final word "our choice". Of course there were some worries about the interpretation of that word "our". Those who worried felt that they had some cause to do so because of the ambiguity of the language that was used and because it was felt--I think rightly--that if collective security is to work, the word "our" in that context must mean the free world coalition. Mr. Dulles, in his Foreign Affairs article to which I have already referred, agreed with this interpretation when he wrote:

"The main reliance must be on the power of the free community to retaliate with great force by mobile means at a place of its own choice."

On March 19 this interpretation was made even clearer when Mr. Dulles appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was asked this question by Senator Smith of New Jersey:

"As a result of your January 12 speech, that is when you first spoke of this capacity to retaliate, there have been fears expressed that the United States would not consult our allies in the event of an attack...These fears are based on the words in your speech "by means and at places of our choosing". Now I interpreted that when I read it to mean that you were referring to our choosing rather than to the enemies choosing. You would not say our choosing exclusive of our allies? I am correct in my interpretation? "

Mr. Dulles replied in words which were very clear and to the point: