

of the United Nations could not be done. So far, I am not aware of any question which has been raised which would cause me to give a negative or discouraging reply. For that reason, my policy attitude remains that the United Nations should respond and should have confidence in its strength and capacity to respond."

In this lecture, I am concerned with ways and means of increasing that "strength and capacity to respond".

To this end I wish to review developments in the field of United Nations peace-keeping in order to illustrate the various demands which have been made of the organization and its response to them. I hope, as well, to suggest ways in which the capacity to respond can be strengthened, as it must be strengthened, if the United Nations is to fulfill its primary purpose of maintaining peace and security in future.

### Intervention for War

As the nineteenth century came to an end, governments were beginning to think about international organization to prevent war. But, in the main, they continued to rely for security on their own power, supplemented by military alliances which had replaced Metternich's earlier "Concert of Europe". Like the little old lady in Punch of 1914, they consoled themselves with the thought that, if threats to the peace occurred, such as the assassination of an Archduke in a Serbian town, "the powers are sure to intervene". After the shot at Sarejevo they did so - against each other and for national ends. The war to end war was on.

After World War I, experts on international affairs debated whether it could happen again. They hoped that it could be avoided by strengthening collective security. They looked to the new League of Nations for this. But most governments still showed a preference for arms and military pacts. When collective security and sanctions under the Covenant were advocated, it was primarily with a view to possible use against Germany. Later, in Italy's attacks on Ethiopia, the League rejected effective international action for peace. In consequence, we lost the race with rearmament, while Hitler and Mussolini scorned the treaties intended to maintain the balance of power. "Intervention", a dirty word in the case of Ethiopia, Spain and Czechoslovakia, became a necessity in Poland. Peace in our time dissolved in the global destruction of the Second World War.

Again there was a kind of peace, this time soon followed by "cold war" which had become so intense by the fifties that great-power deadlock was in danger of destroying or rendering impotent the improved League which we now called the United Nations. Yet the world organization, in spite of limitations and with varying success tried to keep the peace on the periphery of potential war - in Greece and Kashmir, in Palestine and Indonesia. Its method was one of persuasion and "watchdog" presence. It seemed a frail basis for collective security in the face of Soviet aggressiveness - and in the shadow of The Bomb.

Since the main Communist challenge at that time was in Europe, the North Atlantic states responded to the weakness of the United Nations by exercising their right of collective self-defence under the Charter. They