

We must work towards amelioration rather than hope for complete solution. Steps have been taken in that direction. It was Benjamin Franklin who said at the signing of the Declaration of Independence, "We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately". The Economic Recovery Program, that great feat of imaginative statesmanship, is now in operation under skilled guidance. In the middle of March the United Kingdom, France and the Low Countries concluded in Brussels a very far reaching economic and military agreement. On the same day President Truman told Congress, "I am confident that the United States will by appropriate means extend to the free nations the support which the situation requires. I am sure that the determination of the free countries to Europe to protect themselves will be matched by equal determination on our part to help them protect themselves".

Now, one of the great problems of helping the free nations to protect themselves arises from the development of a new and skillful technique of conquest from within, of which the events of last February in Prague are the latest of several examples. In several countries disciplined minorities, prompted and supported from abroad, have succeeded in imposing their rule on the majority. This is what has happened in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in Hungary, in Rumania and in others of the satellite states.

This variety of indirect aggression has succeeded by bloodless, or almost bloodless, methods and often with an appearance of legality, though not with its substance. Its success is not based on any principle acceptable to the believers in democracy, and it brings with it the simultaneous introduction of all the deplorable machinery of the police state.

What means can be devised to prevent the pattern being repeated in other countries now outside the Iron Curtain which are very important to the security of the rest of the world? The Security Council of the United Nations is not able to deal with indirect aggression of this sort. It is paralyzed by the use of the veto. The Charter of the United Nations was framed as a constitution for the international community. It is far from a perfect constitutional instrument, but the troubles in the United Nations today do not arise from its defects. They stem from the fact that there is no international community. You cannot have a collective system unless you have a collective will to make the system work. Such a collective will is lacking, for there is no common purpose among the greater nations to join together in an honest search to remove the troubles that plague the world.

Within the compass of the Charter, however, means can be devised whereby the free countries can voluntarily "hang together" and so avoid being "hung separately". Many of those who were at the San Francisco Conference hoped that the then current euphemism for the veto, "the unanimity of the great powers", might have a positive meaning; but they had their doubts and what are now Articles 51 and 52 were added to the Charter. Article 51 preserves "the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence pending positive action by the Security Council". Article 52 authorizes regional agreements between member states.

Use can be made of these articles to bring together some at least of the free countries which have a collective will to unite against threatened dangers. In my own country the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. St. Laurent, a month ago outlined the possibilities in words worthy of quotation:

"The formation of such a defensive group of free states would not be a counsel of despair but a message of hope. It would not mean that we regarded a third world war as inevitable; but that the free democracies had decided that to prevent such a war they would

...../organize