

adequate for the purpose. To this end, we must be willing to merge our own strength with that of the United States under the United Nations, thus ensuring that these measures are genuinely collective. Otherwise, the United States may be driven to isolated action in Asia. But isolation, like peace, is indivisible. There cannot be unity of action in Western Europe and disunity in Asia.

If, however, we are to work together in this way, and if isolation is to be avoided, the other members of the alliance must have confidence in the objectives of American policy in Asia and confidence also in the methods by which those objectives can be realized.

What should be the basis of a policy which will inspire this confidence and make this cooperation firm and effective?

We must not compromise with Communist aggression. This does not mean, however, that we should assume that every anti-colonial, nationalist or revolutionary movement is Russian Communist in origin and direction, any more than we should assume that with patience and sympathy every Asian Communist leader can be turned into a Tito.

We must avoid taking up rigid and inflexible positions based on emotion rather than intelligence, on short term rather than long term considerations.

We must convince the Asian peoples that democracy can do more for the individual than Communist tyranny can ever hope to. We can do this in many ways, by constructive policies in our own countries, by plans for mutual aid, and also by removing the impression that the Western allies are, in the East, associated only with regimes and societies that do not meet the desire for change of the awakening masses.

Our policy in Asia must be more than a policy of mere opposition to communism. It must be constructive; and anti-communism should not be the only claim to our assistance.

The new Asian countries have problems of a magnitude that would stagger a Western statesman. These countries may be old in the arts of civilization and steeped in ancient culture, but as political entities they are new and are faced with the problem of building in a few years cohesive and stable national societies which will provide a good life for hundreds of millions who have known little but distress and want.

We should remember this when we tend to get impatient at what we consider to be the "neutralism" of a country like India in what is to us a desperate conflict between the forces of Communist imperialism and free democracy. The conflict may not seem so simple to people who are preoccupied with the struggle for self-government and economic progress, millions of whom live under the recurring threat of starvation and who may be pardoned for thinking that hunger and servitude are worse enemies than Marxism.

We should recognize that new forces - economic, social and national - are at work in Asia, forces that would have erupted in disturbing ways even if there had