

will not breach it. Let us remember, when we think of systems of domestic law which are so often regarded as valid because they carry with them sanctions, that when the sanctions need to be applied the rule of law has broken down. In the international field, the sanctions are weak and imperfect. But, just because they are weak and sometimes not applied, the extent to which the law is followed is made more significant.

I do not wish to sound complacent about the state of international law today. There is certainly not enough of it. The machinery producing it is not smooth. There are many other criticisms that may be levelled against our body of existing international law. But laws are enforceable only to the extent that they reflect the will of the community. As nations accelerate their relations with one another and as they grow more dependent on one another, there arises an ever-increasing need for rules and regulations to govern their relations. There does exist in the international community a growing and profound recognition of the need for the development of the rule of law.

Admittedly, for the foreseeable future, states are not likely to surrender any more of their sovereignty to the United Nations organs or to the International Court of Justice than they consider to be necessary for the protection of their interests. It follows, therefore, that the effectiveness of international law depends, in large measure, upon the general consent of the international community, as it finds expression in formal principles of law.

Let us now consider the United Nations as a possible instrument for world order.

The purposes of the United Nations according to its Charter are to maintain international peace and security, to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights, and to be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

No serious observer would deny that the United Nations is not fulfilling these purposes as well as it might. But we tend to make two mistakes in judging the United Nations performance. The first is to believe that the organization is actually a hindrance to the achievement of its purposes. I think the record of achievement, if judged as a whole, demonstrates that much has been done, even though not enough, to attain "these common ends". The second mistake is to assume that any falling-short of the goals outlined in the Charter is evidence of failure and of the need for a new Charter.

The United Nations has had its failures and its successes. But no one should expect it to operate as though ideals could be translated into realities before a lengthy period of experiment, false starts and slow progress. There is really no substitute for time. To quote Dag Hammarskjöld: "Just as the first temptation of the realist is the illusion of cynicism, so the first temptation of the idealist is the illusion of Utopia".

Criticism of the United Nations most frequently relates to the maintenance of peace and security. It is said that the United Nations is rarely able to settle disputes peacefully and that, when it does have a role