

Second, the part played by United Nations peace-keeping forces has been essentially impartial. That is to say, these forces have not attempted to identify themselves with either party to a conflict and have not attempted to enforce any particular political solution of pending problems.

Third, the peace-keeping operations of the United Nations have been dependent on the voluntary co-operation of member states in making contingents, supplies and transport available to the organization. That is because it has never been possible, for political reasons, to conclude the agreements envisaged in Article 43 of the Charter, under which military forces were to be placed at the disposal of the Security Council for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

The system contemplated in the Charter was, of course, based on the concept of collective security. And that concept, in turn, was predicated on great-power agreement and on the overwhelming superiority of military power derived from the forces of the permanent members of the Security Council. When it turned out that great-power consensus could not be established, it was inevitable that the system itself should prove unenforceable. Only on one occasion -- in Korea -- did the United Nations conduct an action to repel aggression more or less in accordance with what had been envisaged in Chapter VII of the Charter. But that was a special and unique situation, and I think we must accept it as a fact of international political life that, in the foreseeable future, the concept of peace keeping is likely to evolve in a substantially different direction.

I said a moment ago that the concept of peace keeping has developed in response to specific situations. Because these situations have varied in both nature and scope, it is difficult to arrive at any comprehensive definition of the term "peace keeping". If an attempt at generalization is to be made, however, I suppose it would be fair to say this:

First, peace-keeping involves the interposition of an international presence in one form or another.

Second, the object of peace keeping is, essentially, to prevent violence from breaking out or to contain and curtail it where it has already broken out. United Nations forces are strictly debarred from taking the initiative in the use of armed force and, indeed, may use it only as a last resort.

Third, peace keeping is designed to create or restore, as the case may be, an environment in which a peaceful solution of the problems at issue can be at least contemplated.

Fourth, while peace keeping is not itself a form of conciliation or mediation, it has been specifically coupled with mediation in some situations and has served to underpin the carrying out of mediatory solutions in others.