

about the desirability of bringing Greece and Turkey into closer association with North Atlantic defence plans. In recent years these two countries have stood in the forefront of the common defence against communist imperialism and aggression. They have given proof of their devotion to the cause of freedom and collective security, not only at home but on the hills and plains of Korea. I believe it is true to say that a full-scale attack on either of them would vitally weaken the defence of Western Europe, and would probably mean a general war.

The problem, then, is how to remove the temptation for such an attack by building up collective defence arrangements in the areas of the Mediterranean. It was felt by some members of the North Atlantic group that probably the best way to do this would be by agreement on a Mediterranean security pact which could have some form of association with the North Atlantic pact. That was a non-NATO solution, and was attractive to some members of the Council but was opposed by others, more particularly the United States of America. Indeed, it was opposed by those countries most concerned with this matter, Turkey and Greece, as well as by the military authorities of the North Atlantic Organization. It may be argued that the full membership of these nations in the North Atlantic group will mean the extension of our commitments. In theory, that is the case, but I suggest it is more than compensated for by the deepening of our security, adding greatly to our collective defensive strength and thereby making an attack on any one of us less likely.

In any event, the extension of our commitments in this way is more theoretical than actual. If an attack took place on Greece or Turkey, it would not really make very much difference in regard to the extension of the war whether or not they were members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, whether or not they belonged to a Mediterranean pact, or indeed whether Turkey or Greece had only their existing treaty obligations. I, for one, agree it is normally unwise to extend the specific commitments of this country, in contrast with our general commitments under the United Nations Charter which, as we know from Korea, can be specific enough. I agree it would be unwise to extend these additional specific commitments, unless such extension is effective from the point of view of enlarging the defensive strength of the coalition and strengthening peace. It was felt by the Council that the admission of Greece and Turkey to the council would have this result. It is not, I submit, a provocation to any power that does not contemplate aggression, any more than the membership of Norway on the north flank of the North Atlantic community is a provocation.

In any event the greatest provocation to Soviet imperialism is not strength but is weakness. It was Karl Marx himself who said that the Russian bear is capable of anything, especially when he knows the other animals are capable of nothing. Well, the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will be capable of doing much more for the defence of peace with Greece and Turkey as members. I hope, therefore, that the Russian bear will be capable of doing much less against us.

Other defence questions were discussed at this Council meeting. The Council received the report of the Financial and Economic Board and the Defence Production Board, which were concerned with two more forms of the problem of creating the necessary military strength for General Eisenhower's integrated force in Western Europe. It was realized by the Council that the studies which had been under way in this field through