

if we do not achieve agreement in our approach to them, our unity will be weakened and prejudiced.

The basic requirement for such agreement as I see it, is to recognize the distinction between Communist military aggression which, as members of the United Nations, we should always be prompt and united to resist; and Communism as a social, economic and political doctrine which, abhorrent as it is to free men everywhere, must be resisted and eradicated - by other means than bayonets or atom bombs. This can best be done by making our own democracy work, and assisting and encouraging Asian democracy to work, in ways which will do more for the welfare and happiness of men than Communism can ever hope to do.

These are some of the problems ahead for the coalition. Clean-cut solutions for them are not always possible, and distant ones cannot be realized in the present. They present, I repeat, a challenge to us all. National action, moreover, is inadequate to the dimensions of this challenge. International action is essential and it must operate through consultation, persuasion, agreement. In such co-operation we have no alternative but "go it together", in the clear knowledge of where we are going, how we can most surely reach our destination, and how much strength we can gather from each other on our journey.

As we march together, we may occasionally, because we are free men and not regimented sheep, get out of step. When we do so, of course, it is regrettable, and to be corrected as soon as possible; but it is far better than Communist unity where the leader relies on a pistol at the back to keep sullen or reluctant followers in line.

On the part of the United States, the acknowledged leader of our band of free countries, this "marching together" will require patience, consultation with her friends on direction and objectives, and, at times, concessions to their viewpoint.

For the other members of the coalition there is an equal and parallel obligation to recognize frankly and ungrudgingly the tremendous contribution to the common effort which the United States is making and the special responsibilities it has undertaken. We can best do this by making our own concessions, when necessary, to common agreement.

Furthermore, we cannot be united in one area of the world and divided in another. No one has explained this better than President Eisenhower did at Minneapolis last Wednesday when he said:

"...there is no such thing as partial unity. That is a contradiction in terms.

"We cannot select those areas of the globe in which our policies or wishes may differ from our Allies - build political fences around these areas - and then say to our Allies:

'We shall do what we want here - and where you do what we want, there and only there shall we favor unity.'