

assistance. And in a real sense, he is right. The Communist method is harder on its own people, but calls for relatively little from despotic leaders beyond ruthless brutality and some organizing efficiency. The democratic method, with international assistance, makes incomparably greater demands on the spirit of millions of free men.

The sort of figures Prime Minister Yoshida referred to are, of course, fabulous, if you think in terms of intergovernmental action. One of the problems is that private investors understandably hesitate to invest money in backward areas, partly because of the general lack of facilities, and more because of the political instability and ferment created by the natural aspirations of the people for social improvement and change.

But another of the problems which has discouraged and almost dried up the inter-continental flow of private capital has been the damage done by superficial, false or phony ideas. For example, about the beginning of this century, an economist named Hobson propounded the idea, in a book on imperialism which has become famous, that investment of private foreign capital in a relatively undeveloped country usually brings in its wake political dependence on the country from which that capital originates: so that the more foreign capital you have invested in your resources, the less independent you are likely to be. This idea was adopted by Lenin, but during the past fifty years it has become widely believed not only by Communists but by non-Communist public opinion in many of the unindustrialized parts of the world.

The theory is I think standing precisely on its head. Common sense would suggest, as our own Canadian experience has proved, that the investment of private foreign capital, by helping a country to build up its own economy, allows it to stand more firmly on its own feet, and thereby to become more rather than less independent, more rather than less able to chart its own political course and to make its own political views felt in the councils of the nations. But the harm done by the false theory of imperialism during the last few decades has been, and still is, incalculable.

I have been speaking of the problems of neighbourliness chiefly in terms of material help from those more fortunate to those less so. But such help is in itself only a small part, and by no means the most important part, of good neighbourly relations. More fundamental, of course, is a recognition of common interests, the acceptance of a sense of community, a readiness to cooperate in dealing with problems of common concern. The starting point, I suppose, is the ability and willingness of men to talk to each other.

Internationally, this fundamental point of talking to each other is of course the primary raison d'être of my own profession the diplomatic service. The most important function of diplomacy