

Mr. Green - I think the roots of the United Nations go very much deeper than those of the League of Nations. One reason, perhaps, is that the older nations have had the experience of the League of Nations and remember what went wrong with it. As a result of the Second World War, there has also developed a much greater determination to do something to stop these destructive wars. Today, the fact that a nuclear war means the end of civilization is recognized by all nations, and, in the light of this, the work of the United Nations has become vitally important; so I don't think there is any comparison between the United Nations and the League of Nations.

Mr. MacKenzie - One suggestion that has been made is that the United Nations Assembly is too large a body to make policy quickly - that the simple matter of getting through a debate on a subject, of getting through the preliminary statements, makes it difficult to get a quick decision when a quick decision is necessary. Do you know of any undertaking to change this so that the Assembly can be more effective in times of crisis?

Mr. Green - I think you must distinguish between the Security Council and the General Assembly. The General Assembly has, of course, 104 members and I don't think there should be any attempt to cut it down. As a matter of fact, there will be more members eventually. Some new ones are coming in this year, and the original plan was to have all nations represented. The Security Council, on the other hand, was supposed to be the executive of the United Nations. Five big nations are permanent members of the Council and each of them has a veto. Now, when the United Nations was set up, it was the belief that these five nations would be able to work together. They had, after all, been allies during the war and they had been successful. But almost from the start the Russians refused to co-operate. It has been difficult for the Security Council to function as it was intended to do because the Russians have had different ideas and have as you know used the veto about a hundred times. This, I think, is one of the drawbacks of the United Nations as it exists at the present, but it isn't easy to get round that difficulty.

Mr. MacKenzie - Would it require changes in the Charter? By what mechanism might this be done?

Mr. Green - The best way to change the situation would be to have a better spirit of co-operation. I think that, if the Communists decided to co-operate, then the whole organization would be able to function a good deal more efficiently than it does at the present. Even so, I am a great believer in the United Nations and I think that without it we would be in a terrible situation in the world today.