

of the recent United Nations Assembly in relation to Palestine.

There is another point. When disputes reach the Security Council, not enough use seems to be made there of procedures for private and informal discussion and agreement. There is a tendency to rush at once into angry and unproductive public debate during which positive statements are made and firm positions taken. This makes conciliation and compromise difficult; the stand previously taken has become a headline in the world's press and there is nothing so difficult for a government to abandon as a headline. I am a great believer in frank and open diplomacy, in open covenants, openly announced, but often quietly and confidentially reached. There is more to diplomacy than an irresistible desire to talk to the press "at the drop of a hint". This, however, is by way of digression.

Does all this mean that we should give up the United Nations as a too difficult, if not too good a job? Not at all. That would be suicidal as well as cowardly. The weaknesses that have been displayed, the difficulties that have been encountered, together with the deterioration in the world situation, mean that we should work harder, far harder than we have before, to build up our international organization into an effective instrument for the preservation of peace with enough force behind it, to back up decisions which it has freely taken against their violation by others, even by its own members. That is the obligation - of acceptance and enforcement - which members undertook when they signed the Charter. But the force necessary to carry out these decisions, must be brought under some form of international control.

The inalienable right of a nation to repel as best it can an unprovoked attack, must remain. Even the most law-abiding citizen in the most effectively policed city has that. If some one jumps on him out of a dark alley, he can do his best to fight back. He doesn't wait until the neighbours or a policeman appear. But with this exception, the United Nations must, if it is to be effective, have adequate force under its sole control, to implement its decisions. This force, which would consist largely of forces of the member states, must be capable of being brought into action quickly as a result of an international decision which cannot be blocked by any one power.

You will of course complain that this is impractical and impossible. My reply is that at the moment it certainly is but that it is an objective which must be reached; a purpose that must be realized. The alternative is international anarchy in an age of guided missiles, guided bacteria and guided hatreds. The so-called realist who can get any comfort out of that alternative is my idea of an optimist. He is also my idea of a man burying his head in the sand.

It is also idle to complain that surrender of absolute control over national forces means an infringement of national sovereignty. Of course it does, but every nation, even the permanent members of the Council with their veto, when they signed the Charter gave up some part of their national sovereignty in the interests of a greater security. If they are going to benefit from that surrender, they must be able to implement collective decisions by collective police action, which alone can guarantee collective security. There is no other way. Peace never has been, and I venture to suggest never can be, preserved on any other basis. This does not mean disarmament. It means, not the abolition of the truncheon, but putting it in the hands of a policeman, rather than a prowler.

I am, I hope, realistic enough to know that the process of putting enough power in the hands of the United Nations to overawe and keep in check any nation that may harbour aggressive intentions, is going to be a long, tough one. I know also that as long as the power of veto