

action in the Middle East, or in Cyprus, or in Africa which helps to preserve the peace. On the one hand, the General Assembly has not been able to reconcile the differences which divide member states over questions of principle, but on the other hand these same member states have responded to clear and urgent requirements to initiate and to keep in being U.N. forces and teams to patrol, to supervise and to conciliate.

The disagreements are hardly surprising. For the first time in human history something resembling a world community is emerging from the dissolution of empire and the simultaneous spread of technology. Everywhere men pursue the same goals. Yet few are able to measure significant progress in reaching them. Disparities in national wealth, the indignities of racial discrimination, the rivalries stimulated by artificial boundaries and uncertain loyalties, all of these generate tension and conflict on a scale which is world-wide. Yet if the complexities are greater, so is our determination to act together to find solutions.

If we do not act together then the dangers of losing control are all too familiar to our post-Hiroshima generation. Every schoolboy has heard the term "escalation" and knows immediately to what it refers. This too is a new phenomenon. In the past governments have been prepared to go to war if necessary to gain their ends or to defend their interests, knowing that defeat, while never expected, would not destroy the nation state itself. Today no government can take or contemplate military action, whatever the reason, without a strong sense of the limits beyond which all such action would be suicidal.

Thus on the one hand the conditions which make for conflict and the use of armed force in world affairs are of unprecedented scope. On the other hand the potential effects of modern weapons impose on the conduct of states and the calculations of statesmen unprecedented limits. In these circumstances