

concern. I think that it will be generally agreed that the United Nations has neither the right nor the duty to interfere in a country to support one form of government or one political party, or to prevent another form of government or political party from taking its place. Similarly, the Charter would seem to confer no right or duty on this Organization to promote or prevent a political union of sovereign countries which may wish to merge their separate sovereignties in a larger union or federation.

This seems to be clear as far as it goes, and it would be well if we were to recognize the relevance of these principles to the mandate that we are asking the Secretary-General to accept. But does this doctrine mean that the United Nations can have no interest in or answer to questions so fundamental to the original complaints which gave rise to the holding of this emergency session of the Assembly? It may be good international law, but is it an adequate answer to the urgent problems of policy with which the members of the international community are now confronted? It is equally good international law that a duly constituted and legally recognized Government can request another Government to send troops into its territory to buttress its security, and that the State so invited is at liberty, under international law, to respond to this request. To describe the response of the United States to the appeal from the Lebanese Government for help, and the response of the United Kingdom to that of the Government of Jordan, as "aggression" is ridiculous and really makes no sense, and indeed could make nonsense of the most central and serious provisions of the Charter. Having said that, I hasten to make this observation: At the same time, the generalized assertion of such a right to seek and receive assistance from any Government willing to give it could greatly complicate the search for peaceful adjustments of situations that might contain a threat to peace. These are problems of policy for which our present canons of international law do not give adequate guidance.

Similarly, the way in which the succession to power in a State is effected may have a profound impact on the structure and sense of security of neighbouring States. A sudden and violent change of regime in one country may have repercussions which may lead neighbouring countries to feel that their external security is threatened. How can we work out a tolerable reconciliation between the principle, central to the whole conception of the United Nations, that each State has the right to determine for itself what its form of government shall be, and the equally important consideration that no country should have the privilege of jeopardizing the peace and security of its neighbours? These considerations must both be taken into account in attempting to formulate an appropriate United Nations treatment of the problems which are before the Assembly.