

The foreign policy of a democracy is thus in large part a product and a test of the moral insight of a whole people.

In stressing the decisive relation of moral considerations to effective judgment -- in international affairs as in other fields of activity -- I am not, of course, suggesting that all political and diplomatic questions should be regarded as issues between right and wrong. Far from it. A moral approach to problems does not require that we should see all of them in simple terms of challenges to righteousness; or of black and white.

Indeed, the contrary is true, and gray is the prevailing shade. This should induce humility and tolerance. Some wise words on this subject were spoken by Professor Brebner when he spoke at the Columbia University bicentennial convocation on October 30 last. He said:

"During recent years, a hurricane of investigations and persecutions has lashed those parts of the earth where men in political authority have conceived themselves to be compelled to maintain one set of values and to attach all others. Throughout these operations, nothing has been more dreadful than the common assumption that every man must at all times be 'right.' Surely this intolerance of variation is the insolent vain-glory and self-assurance that the Greeks denominated hubris, the basic, the suicidal sin. In our time this sin may take the form of worshipping the power over nature or over human nature, or the deification of a man, an economic entity, a political party or a nation state."

An arrogant Pharisaism and smug satisfaction with one's own superior righteousness, in a person or in a nation, are not only unamiable qualities, they are not conducive to clear political judgment. He whose humility and moral sensitivity is least highly developed, is most likely to confuse principle with questions of fact or expediency, and to make an easy subconscious identification of his own viewpoint with the cause of right.

Furthermore, self-righteousness in international affairs is likely to lead to rigidity of thought and intolerance of other views. This often prevents a wise understanding of complex and changing situations; and tends to make diplomacy captive and inflexible.

There has, for example, been a tendency in recent years, for public conferences between governments, at least those where the U.S.S.R. or its satellites participate, to be regarded less as opportunities for the negotiation of differences