

Nations is not a government, let alone a super-state. Its Assembly can't order anybody to do anything. Its votes are only recommendations and therefore in that sense are not as important as those of a national parliament. Peoples become disillusioned when recommendations, which they confuse with orders, are not carried out; or, even worse, carried out only in certain circumstances.

It is also irritating and can be harmful for responsible countries to be unfairly censured by a majority vote or to have impracticable or unfair resolutions directed against them when other members seem either to escape censure or ignore it. But one can easily exaggerate the damage that is done. It is regrettable, of course, that certain Western countries get far more than their fair share of censure, while far worse offenders escape. It is not true, however, that the Western powers are the only ones who suffer from this practice. There is also vigorous and effective criticism of Communist and of Asian States.

Nevertheless, there is, I admit, at the present time an "anti-colonial" bias in the Assembly which often operates unfairly against certain of its members. For good reason, this rankles. It is irritating, for instance, to hear the word "colonial" used only in respect of those powers who have acquired overseas territories which they have led to or are leading to freedom and self-government. I am thinking particularly of Great Britain, whose great glory is the transformation by her own deliberate policy of her colonial empire into a Commonwealth of Nations. To listen to attacks on Great Britain and France as "colonial empires" when the Soviet Union, which holds under an iron despotism so many millions of subject people, is relatively immune from such attack is, I confess, hard to take. It should not, however, be seen out of proportion. It should not be assumed, for instance, that these colonial issues would not exist if the United Nations did not. They certainly would and probably in more dangerous forms.

Certainly the record of the recent Assembly on the most important items in its agenda does not warrant a charge that it behaved irresponsibly or fanatically, or that it was invariably hostile to the West. Let me give one or two examples.

(1) ALGERIA

It is charged that the Assembly's "interference" in Algeria, part of metropolitan France, would justify the French for rejecting completely the role of the United Nations. The French this year, however, wisely altered their previous tactics and tried to come to terms with the Assembly by participating in debate with moderate and reasonable statements, in which they were able to make their own case more widely and favourably known. The Assembly produced a very mild resolution on Algeria,