

which would exploit their national feelings for the purposes of Soviet imperialism and harness their discontent and distress to ends which have nothing to do with the welfare of the people, but they are morbidly touchy about help with strings attached. It is important to remember, as we build up the North Atlantic community, or as we work out our policies inside the United Nations, so that aggression may be prevented and security achieved, that we will not succeed unless we understand the problems of these new Asian nations and assist in their solution. That is why the development of defensive military strength must go hand in hand with programmes for economic and technical assistance, for rehabilitation, and improvement in those regions of Africa and Asia where man lives on the very borderline of existence with his only certain companions hunger, deprivation and disease.

There is a third revolution, and as important as the other two, which has occurred in recent years, the revolution in science and technology. Here the problem is to try to reduce the gap which has been created by man's startling material advance and his much less impressive progress, if, indeed, it is progress at all, in the social, political and moral fields. It is a subject about which one could talk for hours without coming to any easy or satisfying conclusion. But I think that we would all at least agree on this one thing. If man's social development does not soon catch up to or at least narrow the gap between it and his material progress, he will ultimately be lost in the chasm between scientific brilliance and moral imbecility.

It is against a background such as this that those of us who are charged with responsibility in international affairs have to face the problems ahead.

Are those problems going to overwhelm us and lead to war? If not, how are we to avoid this result? Above all, and more specifically, what policy should we adopt in the cold war so that it will be replaced by peace and not by an atomic explosion.

These are questions which I keep asking myself, as I know you do too. If it is difficult to find the right answers in our own minds, you will realize how infinitely more difficult it must be to get a number of separate governments to agree on those answers. Yet such collective agreement is essential if there is to be effective action. No one can "go it" alone.

I feel myself, and this feeling has been expressed recently by others whose experience and wisdom in these matters is greater than mine, that we can look into 1952 with somewhat less anxiety than gripped us a year ago. Having said that, I should add that we had a very great deal to be anxious about then, and that there is nothing in the present international picture, especially in that part of it which covers Asia, which should lead anyone to think that defence expenditures can now be converted into income tax exemptions!

The coalition for peace, based now on NATO, has, however, made progress through its increasing strength and developing unity. That gives ground for hope in the year ahead. Those who might be tempted to substitute armed