

In commenting on the differing viewpoints and on the continuing need for peace keeping, I should like to emphasize one essential point. The United Nations can only with difficulty undertake important initiatives in areas of direct or major great-power interest. In terms of such interests, peace-keeping operations are most likely to be in peripheral areas. There are, however, degrees of remoteness. How remote, for example, is Kashmir from great-power preoccupations? If we are considering the nations allied in NATO and the Warsaw Pact, it is possible to say that in this area there is a balance of military power, a recognition of respective positions on certain matters such as German reunification or Berlin, with which the Security Council as such is not likely to deal. But Cyprus is of direct and continuing concern to members of the NATO alliance.

Outside the NATO-Warsaw Pact area, there are the complicated and changing great-power relationships involving Communist China. There are areas where the entry of new nations into the world scene, the recurrence of old animosities, conflicts of race and religion or economic and social instability could lead to threats to the peace of the world as a whole. These threats to regional peace could involve, with varying degrees of intensity, the great-power clash of interest. Whether we like it or not, our world has achieved a degree of common involvement in political and economic affairs which requires an attempt at common management. The Prime Minister of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, who can speak for a continent well aware of this fact, made the point vividly when he said that "all nations border on each other - no sea, no range of mountains; constitutes a barrier to events outside"....

The Security Council is still formally seized of 69 matters affecting international peace and security -- some admittedly dormant, but many containing the threat of serious conflict. One would have to be optimistic almost to the point of complete naivety to believe that the need for United Nations intervention will diminish. This is not a question of trying to solve all problems or trying to achieve universal peace overnight. It is a question of trying realistically to limit some of the risks to world peace in areas where United Nations action is a practical possibility.

It has never been assumed, of course, that immediate action by the United Nations would be desirable or possible in all areas where peace was threatened. There is not only the limitation already mentioned arising from great-power involvement. The Charter anticipates the possibility of action by regional agencies consistent with the purpose and principles of the United Nations. The United Nations and regional agencies have complementary roles to play and there is no doubt that these agencies can contribute effectively to peace both in conciliation and in peace keeping. The United Nations must, however, retain ultimate responsibility for all developments affecting peace and security. It might have to supplement regional action and it alone would be responsible for enforcement. The United Nations must be able to respond to all these needs.

From the consideration of need we turn to the consideration of interest and intention on the part of member states. Do most nations want the United Nations to go on with peace-keeping operations?