they think some national interest requires them to act so. Our police are honourable men, but even the British police, with perhaps the most honourable traditions, have acknowledged the use of torture under provocation in Ulster.

sed

ans

icy

the 1as

ity

on

ive

all

est-

een

the

for

est

rsal

een

has

has

de-

ter

ice

be

ose

ob-

for

ons

hat

the

the

ail,

the

nd,

ean

ent,

hts,

ıt of

ed?

atry

Can

ries

ples

imi-

ness

on?

égi-

t to

nce

d in

get

y in

ern-

ers.

itio-

ac-

are

OV-

e to

ause

Clearly, there is no equality of sin; some countries deserve condemnation more than others, but there is no international consensus on that. President Carter has made an effort to eschew favouritism by cutting off assistance to allies that offend against humanity. There seems little hope of reform if the Western powers defend the rights of man by simply presenting a list of charges against the "other side" and, of course, being charged back. Might we not start with a few "true confessions", recognizing that we are all together in the struggle to civilize ourselves?

The greatest danger may be cynicism, that of the realist who contends that there is no place for morality in an immoral world and that of the moralist whose sweeping denunciations have undermined faith in government itself, both national and international. The world is, largely for technological reasons, a more dangerous place now than it ever was, but there are also more grounds for hope. A historical perspective reveals the phenomenal growth over the past quarter-century of man's capacity and will to regulate his actions by international law and international institutions. As Kal Holsti has pointed out, in a majority of all relations between governments "the techniques used to influence each other usually fall within the bounds of international law and the United Nations Charter". He asks whether "one instance of the use of violent power, even for unworthy objectives, means that that state's policy-makers are immoral in all their relationships? Or does it warrant the cynicism of some observers, who claim that, in any case, power is always the final arbiter in international politics, and that might makes right?" This indiscriminate talk about power is the stock-in-trade of realists and moralists on a platform. How they love to talk sententiously about power and thereby intimidate the listener! What we need are more precise analyses of the nature of power — and shrewder calculations, therefore, of what we can accomplish to promote morality in a wicked world.

It is of particular concern to Canada that cynicism went so far in the United States because the health, strength and good conduct of that country are essential to our survival and to the survival of so many values we share with Americans. The United States is not a monolith. It is a highly-complex country that can lose its head to the seductive strains of *The Battle Hymn of the Republic* and also give the world moral leadership unequalled in history. Canadians, as well as people in free and unfree countries everywhere, should and probably will welcome President Carter's affirmation of the continuing, if more subdued, moral leadership of America. If we Canadians are to follow his lead, he must, of course, not overdo it.

Contradictions abound in this essay and there is little consistency in the arguments used. Perhaps it is an argument against consistency. Well, not entirely — for it is also an argument for not losing sight of what seem, with good reason, to be permanent values. "To every thing there is a season," the Preacher said, ". . . a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; a time to love, and a time to hate; a time of war and a time of peace."



