

of unity. It should, however, be added that unity is not the same thing as that lifeless uniformity which is the ideal of the totalitarians.

"If we are to do anything about these divisions, we must first recognize and understand them.

"There is, first, the fundamental division between totalitarian and free societies. In the former, the citizen is the mere servant of the state, while, internationally, reliance on force and aggressive expansion is a normal development, however much the words 'peace' and 'co-existence' may be used to camouflage or confuse. Free societies, on the other hand, are based on the doctrine, however imperfectly realized in practice, that man has rights and duties above and beyond the states and governments which have been created by him in order to protect his freedom and security under law and justice.

#### SELF-GOVERNMENT

"Then there is the division between the self-governing and non-self-governing parts of the world. People often, but mistakenly equate this division with that between colonial-administering countries on the one hand, and dependent territories on the other. In fact, of course, the non-self-governing part of the world is incomparably greater than this. A people who are governed by a dictator, whose power is based upon military or police control, are not self-governing, even if the dictator happens to have the same colour, to be of the same race, and to speak the same language as most of his subjects. The people of a puppet state, the satellite dictatorship of a totalitarian power, are non-self-governing to a far greater extent than the people, for example, of a colony which is on the move, though sometimes the move may seem too slow, to national freedom under democratic self-government.

"Then there is the distinction between the highly industrialized parts of the world, with relatively advanced material standards of living, and what are called the 'underdeveloped' areas. Under the leadership of the United Nations we are trying to do something about this, but the process is bound to be a slow one. I hope it remains steady.

"The United Nations, then, operating in a world thus deeply divided, and indeed made the more necessary precisely because of that division, represents and must try to serve men on each side of each of these divisions, without betraying or weakening the principles of its charter in the process.

"Our direction is clearly laid down: it is toward economic and social progress and away from poverty: it is toward full and free self-government and away from dictatorial regimes imposed from inside or from outside: toward the progressive realization of human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person.:::

"But the most important of the United Nations tasks is unquestionably that of keeping the peace. Though in this field, too, we have a number of achievements, there is less ground for satisfaction, or even for confidence that the passage of time is necessarily bringing us closer to our goal. There is far more reason for anxiety than complacency.

"The United Nations has, I think, shown in Korea that it is capable of taking effective and successful international police action against local aggression. It must be remembered, however, that in this case a great power was willing and able to give the lead and shoulder most of the burden.

"Apart from the problem of possible local aggression, and the risk of it spreading through hasty or ill-considered action, there remains the danger of a major conflict. Here the primary object of our world organization must be prevention, rather than intervention.

#### AGGRESSION

"Such a war could be caused by deliberate aggression, or by accident or miscalculation. Certainly the history of the last twenty-five years has shown that the danger of deliberate aggression, by totalitarian empires, is a real one. Such deliberate aggression can be and is being deterred by regional collective security organizations, by defensive alliances, which make it clear that peaceful nations cannot be destroyed and absorbed one by one. In this way such arrangements - which are aimed against aggression as such and wherever it comes from - deter attack and serve the cause of peace. They also restore the balance in threatened areas of the world and thereby contribute to stability and security.

"Where such regional and defensive coalitions are necessary, they can be readily developed within the framework of the Charter. The Charter recognizes and regulates, but in no sense prevents them, providing they are organized and operate in accordance with its principles.

"The United Nations itself, however, - as a universal organization at least in principle - serves a more fundamental purpose in providing an efficient framework and endless opportunities for negotiation and conciliation under a system which embraces both sides in what we call the cold war. Those who would view with equanimity any reduction in United Nations membership so that those nations whose aggressive tendencies are, with reason, feared, would be outside rather than inside our international system, have, I think, the wrong conception of the purposes and the possibilities of our organization.

"Quite apart from the danger of deliberate aggression, we must recognize that in a tense and fearful world there is also the risk of accidental war, brought about by miscalculation or a misreading or misapprehension on