

immediate outbreak of war, I would say the Israel-Arab dispute is the more dangerous at the moment but they are both bad enough.

Revised NATO Concepts

Press:

Mr. Pearson, I am wondering if this new Russian economic and psychological offensive you have mentioned has to some extent invalidated the military concept on which NATO is based and whether we do not now need to put our emphasis on something else entirely?

Mr. Pearson:

I agree entirely that, to some extent, not only new Russian tactics but also our new military tactics, atomic military tactics, have invalidated many old concepts of NATO military defence. They recognize this in NATO. There was a military conference of the NATO nations last month in which they went into this question in great detail.

Press:

Just on that point, could I ask you does this mean that we can possibly do without the German army or German rearmament?

Mr. Pearson:

I don't think we can do without a German defence force as long as Germany is in NATO. Germany is a member of NATO and Germany should participate in collective defence in NATO. When we met at Lisbon, however, three or four years ago, we talked then about a NATO defence force in Western Europe of 95 to 105 divisions. Even the generals do not talk about that now. They will settle for 50 or 55. So they have adjusted their own methods and their own plans to the new tactics. That is one change. But we have got to change in other respects too. Economic assistance and psychological warfare and all that; this is also part of our defence. We have got to put more emphasis on that from now on in NATO and outside NATO and we are recognizing that fact.

Press:

Can you suggest a general framework, something like the NATO military framework in which we could work cooperatively?