

And so, as an alternative, we have fallen back on a regional basis for the collection of this community power; in the circumstances, an effective alternative through arrangements which include those states which are willing to accept firm commitments for collective action.

Above all, of course, there is NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This regional collective security as exemplified in NATO is based on two concepts--not one but two concepts, the first of which is the importance of local defence and, the second, the importance of retaliation, especially from the air, on enemy nerve centres from bases which may be far removed from attack. Both these concepts are, of course, essential to the effectiveness of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Mr. Dulles, himself, talking about this at a press conference the other day, and referring to the necessity for local defence, but also to its inadequacy in present circumstances said:

"With the Soviet-Chinese-Communist world--with its 800,000 people occupying a central location; with its vast land armies--it would be utterly impossible to have local defences all around that 20,000-mile orbit sufficient to stop any blow that might come at wherever they might choose to make it. So that you have got to find some way whereby that type of local ground defence can be supplemented."

And he went on:

"Now that doesn't mean that you eliminate wholly, by any means, land forces--it means you do not necessarily make them your primary reliance because, as against the kind of danger which threatens, it is impossible to match your potential enemy at all points on a basis of man-for-man, gun-for-gun and tank-for-tank."

And so, local defence, while important, has to be supplemented by this other concept of retaliation. And yet, if we relied too much on that and depreciated the importance of local defence, that would be interpreted in many countries as meaning that some countries were expendable. And I doubt if we could maintain a coalition, even NATO, very long, on that basis. Inevitably there would be a retreat to isolation. There would be a move towards what sometimes is called continental security, both in North America and--and this is sometimes forgotten--in Europe itself.

But security of this variety, continental security, is a delusion, because, and I think the House will agree with me, there can be no continental security without collective security. And there can be no collective security without collective arrangements for collective action. And no such action can be effective without close and continuous collective consultation. There are then, as I see it, two deterrents against war, and we must be clear about them both. Certainly I believe we are clearer now about the importance, the significance, and indeed even the limitations of the deterrent of massive retaliation than we were a few weeks ago.