

always been the case. It is, however, wrong and meaningless to be deeply attached to a text without regard to the prospects for its implementation. If there is to be any hope of respect for the UN, it is desirable that the efforts made in the organization should be more consonant with reality. There is to-day hardly any other road to take than that of negotiation and reasonable consideration of a politically and economically strong minority, so that the process of decision reflects the existing balance of power in the world. Otherwise, the adoption of a resolution will often be an empty victory and the immediate euphoria followed by a serious hangover. I am convinced that more harm than good has been done by the attempt to practice international politics in disregard of the real power structures.

No war

Some give the organization credit for the fact that there has not been a global war since 1945. Without arguing against this result, it must be admitted that some devastating uprisings have occurred where the resolution has had more to do with great-power interest than with the action of the UN. It should not be overlooked that UN peacekeeping operations have usually not been possible until a truce has been arranged by the major contenders. Further, when a dispute is brought before the UN, the Security Council may be paralysed if the states with a veto have different sympathies. Equally, in some cases – as, for instance, Vietnam and Cuba – great-power disagreement may make it impossible to take the question before the Security Council. This negative result may also occur – as, for instance, in the conflict in the Horn of Africa – because a regional organization is preferred to the internationalization of the problem. Thus UN peacekeeping operations are possible only when the matter is brought before the organization, the super-powers are in agreement and the parties directly involved find such operations to be in their interest.

In several cases, however, the UN has been successful. As a result, and due to the general disgust at the horror of war, peacekeeping operations have been surrounded by considerable, and not entirely harmless, idealism. This can lead a well-meaning opinion to pose more demands, which the power conditions in the world do not permit.

No doubt it is always desirable that solutions be found to those problems that are the background to any given quarrel. In this area, the UN has failed entirely.

The setting-up of a UN peacekeeping force has a tendency to be a "sleeping cushion" for the parties directly involved, while the background problems remain untackled.

Some countries have stressed the necessity that more should be done concerning the peacemaking functions of the UN, and have even left the impression that suggestions in this respect would be forthcoming. However, nothing has happened. This is not surprising. In order to be considered neutral, countries sending peacekeeping troops have usually refrained from announcing any attitude against the parties directly involved; thus, they are precluded from a peacemaking role in spite of the intimate knowledge they might have acquired. Indeed, to some degree, they become a part of the very problem that needs solution. The development of the peacemaking function of the United Nations is further hampered by the fact that the Security Council can be paralyzed by a veto exercised not on the merits of the case but on the calculation of the interests of the veto-holding power. No country is willing to submit its case to the United Nations so long as voting takes place without sufficient regard to the merits of its case.

The fact that at present there is no good solution to the problem of peacemaking should not lead to the conclusion that peacekeeping is superfluous. A country participating in peacekeeping operations, however, should raise no false expectations about the final outcome of the conflict. It should also fully inform the public of the likely expenditure of a sometimes lengthy UN action.

In this connection, however, one could consider whether the Security Council, or a group of its members, should be trying to put forward peacemaking proposals. In Namibia, where the pressure from the international community was great, the Western group on the Security Council were able to bring forth an acceptable formula for a solution. Perhaps a similar procedure could also be effective in areas such as Cyprus, where the pressure is not so apparent.

Little change

In examining the United Nations today, one has to note that hardly any change has occurred in the global attitude of the super-powers. From the point of view of the United Nations, *détente* has not become an independent expression but is only an integral part of the continuing power struggle between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Other countries can operate only within the framework set primarily by the two, of