

as these objections are pressed the Secretariat would not seem to be able to do the job properly. What then about the Military Staff Committee? Its function, as outlined in the Charter, is to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Council's requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security and the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal. It has failed to perform this function because after the war the U.S.S.R. was unable or unwilling to reach agreement with the other Permanent Members on the numbers and types of United Nations forces. At that time these forces were to be provided by the Permanent Members themselves and it was not surprising, given their very different experiences during the war, that they should find it impossible to agree on the contributions each should make to the United Nations.

The atmosphere of the cold war stifled any further work by the Military Staff Committee and its functions were afterwards executed by the Secretary-General. Now, however, the theory and practice of U.N. forces has changed. Their purpose has not been the enforcement of U.N. decisions against recalcitrant states but the supervision of agreed arrangements. The non-permanent members have become the major troop contributors. A good deal of experience is available for analysis. There may be some basis for believing therefore that the Military Staff Committee, enlarged by the addition of several non-permanent members as the U.S.S.R. has proposed, could work out some standard rules and regulations for peacekeeping.

Another possible answer to the question I have posed of who is to do the planning is that the governments chiefly concerned should do it