

'I don't see how a strong foreign policy can be built around a wild flag which is the same for everybody,' complained the Latvian. 'It can't be,' said the Chinese. 'That is one of the virtues of my little flag. I should remind you that the flag was once yours, too. It is the oldest flag in the world, the original one, you might say. We are now, gentlemen, in an original condition again. There are very few of us.'

The German delegate arose stiffly. 'I would be a poor man indeed,' he said, 'did I not feel that I belonged to the master race. And for that I need a special flag, natürlich.'

'At the moment,' replied the Chinaman, 'the master race, like so many other races, is suffering from the handicap of being virtually extinct. There are fewer than two hundred people left in the entire world, and we suffer from a multiplicity of banners.'

The delegate from Patagonia spoke up. 'I fear that the wild flag, one for all, will prove an unpopular idea.'

'It will, undoubtedly,' sighed the Chinese delegate. 'But now that there are only a couple of hundred people on earth, even the word "unpopular" loses most of its meaning. At this juncture we might conceivably act in a sensible, rather than a popular, manner.' And he produced eighty-two more shoeboxes, and handed a wild flag to each delegate, bowing ceremoniously.

Next day the convention broke up and the delegates returned to their homes, marveling at what they had accomplished in so short a time. And that is the end of our dream."

Finally, I would wish my "Great Issues" students to think hard and straight through the most difficult project of all "The Search for Security".

Economic Security. Is it a gift that the state owes us, or something we must seek for ourselves? If we rely too much on the state for this security, may we not lose the freedom without which our security may easily become that of the jail or the concentration camp or the regimented robots of the communist state. But, if we cling to our unrestricted freedom, to every last tattered remnant of laissez faire, may not great numbers of our fellow citizens be left merely with freedom to remain unemployed, or cold, or hungry?

The same dilemma confronts us in the search for political security. How can this be attained by peaceful peoples for whom there is now no refuge in remoteness and no safety in harmlessness.

In the past in democratic states we have accepted relative security in return for fundamental liberties and national sovereignty. The consequences of conflict are now, however, so terrible that we insist on complete security against complete destruction. The danger here is that this gives power and encouragement to those that insist there can be no complete security without complete authority. We must not permit freedom to be used to destroy freedom but neither must we lose our liberty in the name of safety.

Even if we avoid this tragic dilemma, -and we must avoid it the problem, how to achieve national security remains. By armaments - or by disarmament? Certainly the latter - disarmament - is no guarantee of security in the suspicious, divided world of today. Indeed, it would probably provoke war by providing an irresistible temptation to an aggressor. On the other hand, superiority, even overwhelming superiority