

to me further that those of us who have achieved relatively high forms of political development within the concept of the nation state are now in danger of frustrating our task of building the world state, by failing to recognize not only that the absolutely sovereign nation state must be modified, but also that effective law must precede absolute justice. This idea I put forward is one which has, I think, an important bearing on the orientation of the social sciences toward a world order. It is an idea, however, which can easily be misunderstood and prostituted to base ends and I therefore advance it with some misgiving.

We seem at times unwilling to recognize that we may not be able to bring into being a world state complete with all the social gains that have been developed by the most advanced of the nation states. Our impatience causes us to make the best an obstacle in achieving the good. If my mythology is correct, I seem to remember that Athena sprang full armed from the head of Zeus. If my history is correct, this miracle has never happened since - and I, for one, would find it a little disconcerting if it were common practice.

I am not, of course, arguing for law based on injustice or that any system of law can be permanently and firmly established on any other foundation than justice. What I am suggesting is that in the initial stages of any new society the establishment of law, acceptable and effective law, is the only guarantee that people will have the opportunity to struggle for a greater and ever increasing measure of justice within the framework of law. This, of course, is one of the most difficult and dangerous problems of our time, for there is always the possibility that people may agree to, or be made to agree to, a system of law which is essentially repressive and not expansive. That to my mind is the essential difference between the democratic and totalitarian concept of law. It is not that we can claim for our law that it guarantees justice. Such a claim would be absurd, as there are, and I expect always will be, injustices to be remedied and inequities to be attacked. What we can claim for it is that it does provide the opportunity for people to struggle against injustice and, as history has shown, to achieve some remarkable victories in their struggle. That same opportunity must be given to nations to struggle against injustice in the world organization. In doing so they have the obligation to accept the law of that organization as embodied in its Charter, as well as the right - and this is important - to try to alter that law, that Charter, into something far better than it is now.

I should like in the above connection to quote from the Report of the American Delegation to the San Francisco Conference to the President of the United States:

"On the frontiers of democratic society - not least upon the American frontiers - the instruments of order have always been in one form or another, an agency to enforce respect for law with moral and physical power to prevent and to suppress breaches of the peace; a court in which the differences and disagreements of the citizens could be heard and tried; and a meeting place where the moral sense of the community could be expressed and its judgments formed, whether as declarations of law or as declarations of opinion. To these three fundamental and essential instruments of order, time and the necessities of advancing civilization have added a fourth institution through which technical knowledge and accumulated experience can be brought to bear upon the social and economic problems of society - problems with which learning and science and experience can effectively deal.

"These four fundamental instruments - the enforcement officer, the Court, the public meeting, and the centre of science and of knowledge - are instruments to which free men have become adept over many