

and colonial; but to intervene in favour of democracy and to help Asian governments build up free and stable institutions which will defeat Communism by doing more for the welfare of the under-privileged and undernourished millions of the East than Communism can ever hope to do. We should also, according to this view, not expect Asian governments or Asian people automatically to accept our Western views of the cold war and the Kremlin conspiracy.

Those are the two viewpoints, each of which has its advocates within our Western coalition. The latter may not always take sufficient account of the aggressive nature of Communism or of the efforts that are being made by the United States to build up a democratic security system in the Pacific. But I also believe - and firmly - that there can be no effective or successful collective action or policy on the basis of the first concept. I believe this because such a policy would have to be worked out and agreed on at the United Nations or in the North Atlantic alliance, and, frankly, I can see no possibility of such agreement.

It would mean that we would have to extend our specific obligations to the removal of Communist governments in North Korea and Peiping, and not merely to the defeat of military aggression. There are few countries inside the Western alliance willing to accept this obligation, especially in the terms in which it is sometimes presented in this country.

Now that the signing of an armistice in Korea will soon mark - as we hope - the end of aggression there, this particular problem of our general policy towards Asian Communism becomes one of immediate urgency. The armistice in Korea is to be followed by a political conference on Korean and possibly on related problems. At this conference, the United Nations will be represented. But so will Communist Asian governments. We are moving from the military to the political aspect of Far Eastern problems and it is to be hoped that we on the United Nations non-Communist side, can move in unison. I can think of no more important subject for discussion at the forthcoming three-power conference in Bermuda than how to ensure this unison. The other free countries who will not be at the Conference, but who cannot escape its consequences or isolate themselves from its decisions, will hope that those consequences will be good and those decisions wise; as we now face the political problems of an Asia which is in ferment and whose stirrings and yearnings cannot be ignored.

I have already exceeded my oratorical time limit, Mr. Chairman, and I apologize. The other day, an American newspaper, the "Philadelphia Bulletin" editorialized to the effect that Foreign Office people talked too much these days. True. The newspaper went on to fix the blame for this unhappy development on the introduction to formal diplomatic wear of the soft collar which allowed the speaker "to wag his jaw freely".

"In the old days" it went on, "whenever an Ambassador (and I suppose also a Foreign Minister) started to say something, the sharp points of his starched wing collar scratched his throat, reminding him that nobody ever put his foot in his mouth with closed lips".