

That there are still many sceptics who doubt whether these political assemblies are really contributing as much as they should to a "one world" outlook, is ample evidence that Universities still have a job to do. That they are trying to do it, our programme here today will testify.

I would like, if I may, to interject a personal word at this point and express my admiration for the work in this field which the University of Syracuse and its School of Citizenship and Public Affairs has done. My personal association with Syracuse has, I fear, been confined to encounters with some of your most stalwart athletes on the lacrosse field. But I know and am grateful for the emphasis you have placed and the work you have done on Canadian-American relationships. Those relations bear study in their connection with the larger field of international relations generally. Too often they are dismissed by graceful phrases about the "unguarded boundary" and "the hundred and twenty-five years of peace". Their real significance is deeper than that and lies in the fact, not that we have had peace - any one or any nation can keep the peace when there is nothing to quarrel about - but that we have had friction without fighting. In the past the interests of our two countries have often diverged, and even clashed, but the clash of interests has not degenerated into the clash of arms. We in Canada have, so we think, been more than once the victims of the play of forces between the United States and the United Kingdom. You may remember, for instance, the Alaska boundary award, by which Canada lost territory which she thought was hers and which was an arbitration in name only, because your President had let the British-Canadian side know that if he didn't get what he wanted by an arbitral decision, he would take it anyway. Canada was bitterly disappointed at the time over this decision, but no "terra irredenta" result. No Canadian now stands to attention, salutes, and sings a martial song every time the "Panhandle" is mentioned. The friendship between our two countries has become too strong to be spoilt by temporary set-backs. We have, in fact, acquired the habit of peace to such an extent that the idea of war between us has no meaning. The process by which this has been achieved is worth careful study by the social scientist.

May I add one further personal word. I can think of no better man to build on the traditions which he has inherited in Syracuse, than my friend Paul Appleby, who has already done so much - in a very practical way - to orient the social sciences to the world order.

Now I still retain enough of my academic training to be extremely tentative in discussing in the present company the subject you have given me. Scholars, while they can be very charitable towards human weaknesses, are notoriously tough on loose thinking. The method they like to adopt for avoiding one another's censure, I notice, is to put forward one or two hypothesis. I will do the same. But in this case not to avoid criticism - to look for it. The subject is just about the most important of our time and if any remarks I can make will provoke a more thorough examination of it, I will be more than content.

My first postulate, which must seem an obvious one, is that the great problem of our day, the problem of peace or war, is basically a political one. No one who has seriously followed the events of the last few years can dispute that. I am naturally not unaware of the extremely important economic and other factors which complicate the political problem. No one could attend the meetings of the United Nations and its specialized agencies and remain unaware of the other factors which are constantly bedeviling the hopes of a political solution. No one who from the early days of UNRRA has had some opportunity of observing what happens when we attempt to apply relatively pure economic solutions to critical problems of widespread human distress, and who has seen the political factor creep in and take over, can doubt that it is basically in the political area that a solution must be sought.

From time to time I have heard complaints that the very important work of the Economic and Social Council, Food and Agriculture Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, World Health Organization and the