

is a whisper in the passage of time, all of us understand that. We haven't had a nuclear war, we haven't had an atomic conflict in 40 years and part of that is attributable to the United Nations. Is that not an object worthy of celebration?

For others who are critics of the United Nations, the principle of sovereignty is not understood. Sovereignty is rooted in the Charter of the United Nations. It is not possible for the United Nations to impose its will on a number of sovereign states. You can't just say to Ethiopia — as much as some would wish it — that the government has to have a ceasefire; has to recognize the rebels; has to open supply lines to Eritrea and Tigre. You can't just say to Iran and Iraq: we determine that you end your beserk war; we insist that you bring yourselves to heel before this organization.

It isn't the institution of the United Nations, the body corporate, which is the problem. It is the behaviour of individual nation-states which is the problem. And it is a profound misunderstanding of the United Nations and the way it operates not to recognize that simple truth. There is no capacity under the Charter to interfere in the internal affairs of member countries. Those are difficult and aggravating complexities. They are also complexities which allow the place to work.

And then there are other critics...who still are quite simply malevolent and they do great damage. They pretend to be dispassionate, analytic, concerned. Poppy-cock. Folderol. They are, by and large, neo-isolationists in their views of the world, and they are made up of the Heritage Foundation and others of their ilk.

I want you, if you will, to forgive this moment of disrespect — I am a guest in your country — but I want to say to you, because it has distressed me, that the Heritage Foundation and those of its supporters, specialize not in insightful analysis, for heaven's sake, but in inspired sophistry. They are fundamentally anti-internationalist. They do not believe that the national interests of the United States should ever be subsumed in the interests of the greater international community. And I want to say to you that that makes me impatient. Groups of people who do not understand the moral and human imperatives of the international community in 1985 demonstrate a philistinism for which none of us should have any time.

Yet it does great damage; I have to admit that. And although it saddens me to say so, people of such views within this country and other countries — in particular, the Heritage Foundation — engage in easy slanders of the Secretariat for which the Secretary-General is hard-pressed to respond; they put Third World countries on the defensive; they provoke many Americans into needless opposition. So they need to be dealt with in precisely the fashion which was put to you: not as an obsession, not as an *idée fixe*, not as a preoccupation, but as a group which wields influence and therefore has to be responded to. I'm engaged in the self-immolating chore of reading tract after tract, monograph after monograph, article after article disgorged by the Heritage Foundation. Before long, I hope it will be possible thoughtfully to document the flaws, the weaknesses, the generalizations, the partial truths, the factual errors in what will amount to a dossier of indictment. In other words, in a rational, persuasive and thoughtful way, to fight back in the defence of the United Nations. Indeed, I hope that we can mount a coterie of ambassadors at the United Nations, champions of the United Nations, and gradually, over time, take