

club, or as a useful weapon in the cold war. Rather, the United Nations is and should be a place where all our ways of living and thinking must meet the challenge of our times, which is quite simply the challenge of survival - survival, not of one culture or of one group of humans, but of humanity itself - and where they must be measured against our common need for peace, for freedom from want and fear, and for a positive and constructive drive towards what we acknowledge as good.

Now about that second charge, that the United Nations is, or is trying to be, a "super-government". The United Nations is prevented by the terms of its Charter from such a course. What it is has been well described by the present Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, in an address to the University of California convocation at Berkley. He said then:

"The organization does not exert any powers beyond what the member states at any given moment, and in any given situation, collectively are willing to give it in order to cope with problems they have in common. It is an organ for free co-operation of the nations, inside the framework of agreed procedures, and supported by a permanent civil service".

The United Nations acts only with the consent of its members, and in the case of certain of its most important functions, particularly those concerned with the maintenance of peace, only with the consent of the five permanent members of the Security Council, one of which is of course the United States. What the United Nations can do and most often successfully does, is to give an opportunity for focussing the collective will of the nations and peoples of the world.

Finally, there is the accusation that the United Nations has failed to assure world peace, that it has not brought us the military security we had hoped for and expected. It must be admitted that there is truth in this - but it is not the whole truth. The failure is not that of the United Nations which, I must say again, can do only what its members collectively want it to do, what they are prepared to have it do. The collapse of the wartime partnership among the five great powers has robbed much of its force and efficiency from the machinery set up by the Charter for the maintenance of peace and the halting of aggression, but has not robbed the United Nations of all usefulness in this sphere. Regional and collective defence arrangements such as the North Atlantic Treaty, the Organization of American States, the ANZUS Pact and the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization recently launched in Manila, were envisaged in the Charter and have provided a useful thought restricted form of security. In addition, the Uniting for Peace resolution of 1950, which was adopted after the United Nations had taken the first steps to halt aggression in Korea, establishes a procedure by which the General Assembly could, if such action were regarded as desirable, take over functions for the maintenance of peace which the Security Council might be unable to use effectively owing to the abuse of the veto by one of the five great powers.