

Therefore I am sure we all agree that this imposes on the peoples of all free states a special obligation to face the problems of their mutual relationships with candour and frankness, but also with a firm resolve to understand each other's points of view. It seems to me that the unity of the free world would be in real jeopardy if there were no free discussion of our common objectives and of the possibly different means by which they can best be reached. Much of that discussion will and should be carried on confidentially between governments, but the people have a right to be kept informed of the problems involved and the principles of action which the government may think to be necessary for their solution. Therefore honest discussion of the issues before us, so long as it is conducted in cool and reasonable terms, will not weaken the free world. I am convinced on the contrary that it is an indispensable part of the process of developing our united strength, although of course in this kind of discussion one always runs the risk of misinterpretation and the placing of a wrong emphasis on what may have been said.

In all these relations between the governments in our alliance of free countries, no single government can of course surrender its judgment into the keeping of any other government, however close and friendly that government may be. It may at times, however -- and I have said this before, although it is sometimes forgotten -- have to yield to the collective judgment of the group reached after discussion and consultation. That is the only way that democracy can be carried on within our own country. It is the only way that democracy can be carried on internationally. The decision when to hold out and when to yield is often a terribly difficult one to make. Yet it is on that decision that the unity and close co-operation among members of our alliance will so often depend; and on that so much else depends. Over-sensitiveness and obstinacy, on the one hand, over the maintenance of national rights and national sovereignty, and arrogance or carelessness, on the other, in over-riding them, might in either case produce serious and even dangerous division among the countries of the world.

That division, which would lead possibly to disunity and even disruption, gives the foe that threatens us his greatest comfort and his greatest opportunity. Particularly during these times -- I am sure we all agree with this -- must the United Kingdom, the United States and Canada maintain and strengthen their special ties of friendship within the larger group. It would be folly to think that any one of us can go it alone. It would also be a fatal error, made previously by two dictators, for any potential enemy to think that we intend to take that course, folly also for him to draw wrong conclusions from that mistaken interpretation of our democratic differences of opinion. On the big issues we stand together within our countries as well as between our countries, even though we may sometimes, seem verbally separated. It is, I think, as much the responsibility of public and press opinion as of governments to keep these differing voices from resulting in different policies. Policy for the free world must be forged not on a shifting basis of emotion but on the hard anvil of facts. Only in that way can it be well-tempered and strong.

One of the most important of these facts is that of persistent Soviet communist hostility. Another is, as I