

co-operation, for instance, in deterring aggression or defeating it if it occurred, would be greatly reduced if insistence on the formal and legal equality between states were pushed to the point where it prevented any delegation of authority, which might be required to make collective action effective. On the other hand, co-operation which means that the weaker members of a coalition of free states must automatically accept all the decisions of the leader or of any smaller body, without adequate consultation, is not reconcilable with national freedom and is inadmissible.

Soviet Communism has its own solution to this problem, its own simple blueprint for unity. The design is found in the rigidity of Communist orthodoxy, and the strict obedience of communist satellite states and communist satellite individuals to the Kremlin. Within the Soviet state there is a unity superimposed from the top through party discipline; in the Soviet borderlands there is a unity through the subservience of the "people's democracies" to Moscow.

According to Lenin's interpretation of Marx - an interpretation taught as gospel to millions of young communists - our Western civilization has reached its inexorable climax and is bound to achieve self-destruction in a succession of internal capitalist crises and wars. The only escape route is through proletarian revolution. After its violent triumph, world unity will be achieved in the form of a global union of communist states.

The nations of the non-Communist world, however, demand other terms than these on which international co-operation and unity can be achieved. They reject this blueprint which provides only for the loss of their freedom and their absorption in a swollen and monolithic empire.

In seeking their own form of unity the nations of the free world are not, however, wedded to any single formula. Their outlook is based on the principle that there is not a simple and single answer to every question, that all human solutions are fallible, and that the right answers can often only be found through practical experience.

The United Nations action in Korea is one such experience in the field of international collaboration. It also illustrates the complexity and the difficulty of such collaboration when it expresses itself in collective military and political action, and not merely in words.

The problem, however, as we have faced it in Korea, however, is to some extent modified by the fact that because of the exigencies of military operations, the full consultation and participation in decisions, which would be essential in an international association for non-belligerent purposes is not in all cases demanded.

The action against aggression in Korea is in theory and in principle United Nations action. But that theory is substantially modified by fact. To begin with the Soviet Communist group in the United Nations have from the beginning opposed this United Nations resistance to aggression and have actively assisted the aggressor. Then