

are patient and realistic schemers, with a sense of historical inevitability which derives from their reading of the Gospel of Marx. With the Atlantic Pact and the atomic bomb in mind, they may have ruled out, for the time being, direct armed aggression against free Europe. They may have replaced it by a campaign to sap our strength, weaken our resistance; undermine our resolve to get strong and keep united. Such a campaign could operate in various ways. By phony but specious "peace" campaigns designed to lull us into a false security and make the burden of defence expenditures seem unnecessary. By malicious propaganda designed to show that these unnecessary expenditures, imposed, as they will allege, by the United States, remove all possibility of an improved standard of living. By exploiting national prejudices, jealousies and envies; stirring up class against class, nation against nation, by working on France's fear of Germany, Britain's worries about closer European ties, Europe's hesitations over American strength; America's doubts of Europe's resolution. We must defend ourselves against these tactics, and that is not going to be easy, because this is a campaign in the war of ideas. The defence must therefore be positive and constructive.

One important part of this defence is so to conduct our NATO rearmament programme that it does not remove the hope (indeed, the certainty) of greater human welfare for those people who are to be protected by it; by hammering away at the idea that NATO stands for peace alone and that without the security it will provide, there can be no progress.

It would be folly, of course, if we invited military attack by weakness, if we slackened in any important respect our defence effort. But it would also be unwise if we brought about economic and political weakness by trying to arm too quickly, too extensively everywhere. This is the lesser danger, I admit, but it is certainly a danger in Europe where the economic and social foundations on which a military defence structure must rest are not so strong as they are on this continent; and where termites are patiently but persistently gnawing at them.

This, then, is our dual problem, the search for military security with economic stability.

That is a difficult enough problem for a single state to work out. For a group of states who wish to act collectively but preserve national control in doing so, it is - as I know from my own experience - far more difficult. It is the sort of problem we are continually discussing at our NATO meetings and there is never an easy or a final answer to it. Conditions change and our diplomatic and military plans often have to be changed with them. Satisfactory solutions will only be reached by patience, understanding and good will.

They will be reached, I am sure, because we have the greatest compulsion to do so; our very existence as free nations and free men is at stake. Because, let us not fool ourselves, if we fail to make ourselves secure, militarily, economically, politically, our weakness may end in disaster. That will give an opportunity for aggressive Communism to march in and take over, for that doctrine and its adherents are always the beneficiaries of chaos and despair.