

stopped it. When they signed the U.N. Charter all the member-states promised to "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." In the light of what has happened since the nations took that pledge, that's a laugh - a bitter laugh.

The world has divided between the Communist nations and the free world nations, and the U.N. has divided in the same way. The U.N. Charter says, as Dr. Van Kirk recalled, that the U.N. is to be "a center for harmonizing the action of nations." Only on rare occasions has it been that. On the contrary, the U.N. has often been a means of showing how deep are the divisions between nations and how unfriendly their feelings toward one another. There are reasons for this for which the U.N. is not responsible. That, however, does not alter the fact. The cold war goes on, always threatening to become a hot world war, and the U.N. has not been able to stop it.

Next Dr. Van Kirk spoke of the U.N.'s failure to induce the nations to disarm or to reduce their armaments. Along with that of course goes its failure to lead them to agree on any method to control the new and terrible methods of warfare which, as Sir Winston Churchill says, "cast their shadow on every thoughtful mind." For all its life the U.N. has been trying to end the nightmare arms race. It has a Disarmament Commission which has instructions to prepare proposals which would provide absolutely dependable information as to the size and nature of the armed forces and of the armaments of every nation, effective international inspection of those forces and their arms, and some workable system to insure that once disarmament procedures had been pledged the pledges would be fulfilled.

The U.N. Commission has not failed to carry out these instructions for want of trying. Nevertheless, it has failed. It has not even been able to bring disarmament plans to a point of sufficient clarity and possible agreement where it would be worth while to call its members into conference to consider them. That certainly looks like nearly total failure.

Third in his list of failures Dr. Van Kirk placed the U.N.'s abortive efforts to work out a system of collective security for its members. The Korea experience did not solve this problem. True, there was collective action against Communist aggression in Korea. But most of this was action taken by only the troops of two nations, the Republic of Korea (South Korea) and the United States. Many of the member-states were not willing to take even token action.

The issue of collective security is so important that we will consider it in a separate section. But no one will deny that it is a problem which has not yet been solved. This means that up to now the attempt by the U.N. to provide a system of collective security which the nations can trust for their protection has been a failure.

Finally, in his list of failures Dr. Van Kirk came to the veto. This, as we have seen, is the right which any of the five permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, Britain, Russia and the U.S.A.) has to stop any action by that body against which it casts its vote. The Soviet Union has used its veto dozens of times, and China - which in the U.N. means the Nationalist government on Formosa - has