

Scientific and Cultural Organization, culminating in a 1980 World Congress on Disarmament Education (Paragraphs 101 and 105).

The UN has initiated and is carrying forward the studies linking disarmament and development and disarmament and international security. Ambassador Thorsson, chairman of the Nordic Proposal Working Group, has welcomed parallel studies at the national

level. In Canada these could be undertaken by Canadian universities, or by agencies concerned with international development, with the encouragement of the Department of External Affairs.

Similarly, the Canadian Commission for UNESCO would be a natural mechanism for involving Canadian teachers and adult educators in helping to implement Paragraphs 101 and 105 or the Final

Document. More specific educational efforts, such as the widespread publicizing of the Final Document itself, could be carried out by the UN in Canada and other NGOs, with the collaboration of the Department of External Affairs. Discussion of these and other initiatives might be included in the consultative process that was initiated by the Department of External Affairs in January of this year. ■

Stepping beyond idealism to see the United Nations

By Hans Tabor

Apart from the cynics, the worst enemies of the United Nations are often its warmest friends. One can hold up the ideal of the United Nations. The conclusion will be negative — that the organization has failed. But one should not judge results on the basis of the ideal situation. One has to consider the world as it is — not as we should like it to be — and to look at the UN as the mirror of the world that we live in, a world that is created by and for human beings and thus immensely unpredictable. When one takes that view, the judgment will be much more positive — that the United Nations has managed quite well.

Proposals have been made at the UN to improve procedure, to restore the vitality of open debate and to concentrate on shorter and more practical resolutions. It is possible that, within the foreseeable future, we may have restricted ministerial meetings of the Security Council and informal gatherings of its members not prompted by any concrete issue. However, there is reason to remember that earlier international organizations, in particular the League of Nations, did not fail because of structural or inherent political frailties but rather because the member countries were not willing to honour their responsibilities. As a representative of the Soviet Union once so rightly stated: "There is no reason for revision of the UN Charter; the important issue is that every member lives up to its rules".

We have heard a great deal lately of the "tyranny of the majority" at the United Nations and of the resolutions that express views of the "new" majority. Among other things, however, the "new" majority has mentioned that those countries that to-day are worried about the functioning of the General Assembly are the same countries that previously had a majority that they used to their own advantage. It has also been pointed out that the old majority was instrumental in setting up and formulating the rules of the United Nations based on its own set of values.

Certainly, one should be cautious in talking of the tyranny of the majority. It may be argued that tyranny is exercised rather by those countries that do not implement what the majority has decided. Decisions in the Security Council, and use of the veto, could be termed the tyranny of the minority. But, though negotiations often occur, it is fair to say that, in cases that appeal to the heart, the majority gives only limited consideration to other member countries' positions. No doubt, this has

*Caution
in talking
of tyranny
of majority*

Mr Tabor is the Ambassador of Denmark in Canada. A former Foreign Minister of Denmark, he has also served twice as his country's permanent representative to the United Nations. In July 1967, he was President of the United Nations Security Council. The views expressed here are those of Mr Tabor.