

Nations, or for that matter, upon recognition of states as the conferring of a favour and to forget that it is also in some respects the performance of an international duty and the imposing of a discipline. Admission to membership means the bringing of countries under the obligations of our organization and these are obligations which go far beyond those which are normally incumbent on members of the international community under the law of nations. We may disapprove of the regime or of the policy of some of the applicants but are they not likely to become more acceptable members of the world community as part of this organization, when they are committed to its purposes and subjected to its rules. There is an obligation upon members of this organization to behave in accordance with definite principles and to observe insofar as possible the decisions of its various bodies. While no member could pretend that his record has been impeccable—and I am certainly not suggesting that ours is, and certainly the record of some have left much to be desired—the noble principles of the Charter remain for all of us, to a greater or less extent, standards by which to measure ourselves. They are not yet fully attained but they inspire our conduct and we can say that being accountable to this great organization has had a beneficial effect on our behaviour. The same is bound to happen to these countries which are now outside, when they subscribe to principles and join an organization which we strongly support.

No Violence to Principles

We are all, of course, deeply concerned to preserve and to respect the principles of the Charter. We are convinced that the action we propose here does no violence to these principles. The Charter is not a law with a precise interpretation for every article. It is a document which has to be interpreted with understanding and with moderation. Being the product of many different civilizations and schools of thought, it would be presumptuous for any of us to insist upon interpretations which would be inevitable only in terms of our own education and concepts. This is no plea for taking a light or expedient view of the Charter but a request that we should recognize that there may be legitimate differences in its interpretation.

Let us face frankly the principal concern of those who fear, for instance, that the admission of some of these states would be contrary to the terms of Article 4 (1). Can we say that these states are "peace-loving", an essential requirement for membership? How can we interpret exactly the meaning of this term "peace-loving"? It does certainly not mean

"pacifist", because virtually all member states, including my own, maintain armed forces and believe that we must be prepared to fight if necessary to defend our principles and our way of life. Perhaps it is easier to understand this term if we contrast it with its antonym, which would presumably be "war-loving". We have known war-loving states in the past. The United Nations was itself founded in the association of countries fighting together against states controlled at that time by men who loved and glorified war for its own sake. There remain perhaps some individuals in the world who share this degenerate attitude to war, but I doubt if there is any state in the world today which now does so as a national policy. This is the age of the hydrogen bomb. To me it is inconceivable that states, whatever they may consider their national interests to be, should not now live in horror of war. It remains true that there are states—and I do not exclude some of the present applicants for membership—whose policies, if not altered but pursued in the extreme, could provoke war, but I am prepared to believe that they are not seeking war as an objective or instrument of national policy and that they would in fact go to considerable lengths to avoid it. This it seems to me rather than compliance with certain subjective structural or policy tests, should be the criterion to be applied in relation to Article 4 (1).

Some objections have been made to the admission of certain applicants on the grounds that they might not fully qualify as states and that they might not be able to carry out their obligations as members of this Organization. We are entering here a field where there is bound to be controversy. Unless there is willingness to compromise to take a moderate view, again the prospects of progress are likely to be jeopardized indefinitely. For our part, we consider that new candidates should not be required to meet stricter standards than those which have been applied in the past in dealing with this problem.

I submit that we must interpret the Charter in a spirit which is compatible with the Organization as it exists and as it has developed since its foundation. The United Nations is not and it never has been the preserve of countries all of whom are inclined to give similar interpretations to Article 4 (1) or any other. We could of course have formed a United Nations of this kind with membership exclusive to those who see alike on most things. When we rejected such a conception of the United Nations we accepted by implication a broad interpretation of the terms of the Charter.