

in arms, under national control, never has ensured and never can ensure that permanent peace of which men have dreamed and for which they have died. It may be argued that it is only commonsense to be supreme in arms. But, as it has been put, "one nation's commonsense is another nation's high blood-pressure". Your security becomes your neighbour's insecurity which forces him frantically to search for arms to remove that insecurity. And the inevitable and fatal race is on.

Superiority in arms can do this, however. If it is possessed by a group of free, peace-loving states, it can act as an effective deterrent to war - something not quite the same as maintaining peace - and thereby give the statesman and diplomat time to solve the problems that make armaments seem necessary.

That, I suggest, is the situation today. In the absence of any confidence between the two great groups of powers, the democratic and the totalitarian; with the United Nations completely powerless to prevent the aggression of any powerful state, arms are as necessary as ever before in peace time in order to prevent any existing threat to the peace exploding into war.

The potential aggressor must not be given any encouragement to exploit a situation, which may seem to him to offer tempting opportunity for conquest. He must be confronted and contained by overwhelming force, military, political and moral. Thereby an opportunity is given us to create a healthier political atmosphere where peace will rest on a surer foundation than an atom bomb.

The containment of a possible aggressor in this way however, cannot be made effective by national action and with national arms alone. It can be done only by an association of free states who are willing to pool their forces and use them only to discharge their obligations under the United Nations Charter. Collective action of this kind can however only be accepted on the part of nations who have confidence in each other's good will, who are willing to work together as a group in peace, and in war to fight together as a group against the aggressor.

That is the only sure foundation for security in the circumstances of the present; the steady, determined and collective resistance to all acts of aggression anywhere; honest and complete recognition of the fact that an unprovoked attack on one is an attack on all.

I would like my Great Issues student to be very thoroughly soaked in that doctrine.

There are other things that I would like to see discussed in my Great Issues course. In fact the problem would be one of what to exclude, not what to include. But above all, I would hope that my student would as a result of this course, leave college in a better position than he would otherwise be, to think clearly and to think dispassionately about the political and economic issues of the day, and thus be better able to take his place in an alert and vigilant democracy.

Believe me, this is no easy goal to achieve in the educational field. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes once said to some graduating students "I say to you in all sadness of conviction that to think great thoughts you must be heroes as well as idealists". The student and the citizen of today must learn that kind of heroism; and in the learning he will require the highest qualities of heart and mind. This will be difficult but this is not enough, for education must express itself in action as well as in thought if, to use Justice Holmes' words again "dreams are to be more than dreaming,