

individuals of justice within a framework of law. These two purposes, of a world order seem to me the only ones which have a hope of commanding the allegiance of those whose effort, sacrifice and vision will be necessary to bring it into being.

Now, when we ask what contribution each of the members of our United Nations can make to the performance of these functions, we come face to face with one of the difficult inheritances of the past. The modern aggregation of sovereign states, resulting from a series of historical and geographical accidents, lacking long term economic or political stability, are obviously incapable of being related in any way known to the social scientist to the effective performance of the functions I have mentioned.

We are, for instance, all conscious today of the anomalous position of sovereign states whose voting weight in an international organization is not paralleled by any moral or physical equivalent. We are further conscious of the fact that no state in the modern world, no matter how powerful, can be morally, physically, or even in the long run, economically, independent. I hope I shall not be accused here of overlooking the great contributions, moral, religious, scientific and cultural, which have been made by small peoples. I am not overlooking these facts, but they bear a surprisingly small relation to geographic boundaries and the territorial accidents of history. What we must seek is a solution which will increase the contribution of all peoples for our joint salvation by diminishing the limitations that are placed on their development by the shackles of the modern nation state. A solution to this conflict between the sanctity of inadequate geography as represented by most nation states and the functional or political principle of world interdependence must ultimately be found, or there can be no effective world order. The Prime Minister of Canada was, I think, the first contemporary leader of a government to espouse the idea of the functional principle as the operative one in international relationships. On July 9th, 1943, speaking in the Canadian House of Commons on the problems which were likely to face us in the post war period, he said:

"It is too early for me to attempt even a shadowy outline of the form of the international settlement, political and economic, which may follow the ending of hostilities. It may be useful, however, to say a word about one of its aspects. The strong bonds which have linked the United Nations into a working model of cooperation must be strengthened and developed for even greater use in the years of peace. It is perhaps an axiom of war that during actual hostilities methods must be improvised, secrecy must be observed, attention must be concentrated on victory. The time is approaching, however, when even before victory is won the concept of the United Nations will have to be embodied in some form of international organization. On the one hand, authority in international affairs must not be concentrated exclusively in the largest powers. On the other, authority cannot be divided equally among all the thirty or more sovereign states that comprise the United Nations, or all effective authority will disappear. A number of new international institutions are likely to be set up as a result of the war.

"In the view of the government, effective representations on these bodies should neither be restricted to the largest states nor necessarily extended to all states. Representation should be determined on a functional basis which will admit to full membership those countries, large or small, which have the greatest contribution to make to the particular object in question. In the world there are over sixty sovereign states. If they all have a nominally equal voice in international decisions, no effective decisions are likely to be taken.