

of limitations governing the use of force by United Nations troops in seeking to prevent violence and civil war as provided for in Security Council Resolution of February 21. This is an entirely different matter. Clearly the United Nations is not a party to the conflict in the Congo, nor is it pitted against any faction there. It must by its mandate, as I have already noted, be impartial. It can employ force, under its mandate from the Security Council, but only as a last resort. This qualification must be taken to mean precisely what it says and must be applied in each case according to the circumstances. For the rest, the United Nations must make its best endeavour to bring about an appropriate understanding of its aims and objectives in the Congo, and to eliminate the misunderstandings which have been a tragic source of trouble in the past. My Delegation has urged repeatedly in the appropriate quarters, and urges once more, that these efforts be vigorously pursued.

I have said that it is difficult for countries and governments to take a dispassionate view when the dignity, the safety, and even the lives of their nationals seem to be being placed pointlessly in jeopardy. It is almost equally difficult to be forced to watch while the complex and painful problems which I have described are cynically used, by some, to mount a vicious attack against the fabric of the United Nations and against its dedicated Secretary-General. I can only say that it has bolstered my country's confidence in the soundness of the United Nations that this cynical attempt to exploit the tragedy of the Congo for extraneous and unworthy purposes has met with so little positive response.

I shall wish to revert to the military aspects of the Congo problem in another context before I close, but I should now like to turn to the third type of problem I mentioned earlier - the political problem. Here we encounter a fundamental dilemma.