

others do not attract the attention from the press and public which it deserves. The General Assembly, the Security Council and the Atomic Energy Commission get all the attention and the headlines. I think that this shows a very sound instinct on the part of press and public. Nor does it imply that we should neglect the work of the specialized agencies; work of great value, and even greater promise.

It is true, of course, that there can be no peace, and hence no order, universal or national, in a world half-fed, half-starved. It is also true that the welfare approach to international organization, through the successful functioning of specialist bodies designed to bring about a higher standard of life for all men, has great possibilities of progress and achievement. Nevertheless, there is no escape from the fact that freedom from want would hardly be worth achieving, even if it were possible, in a world which did not have freedom from war and the fear of war. This problem of war and peace is the central problem of our time; now more than ever since the harnessing of atomic science to the chariot of destruction has made total war, total destruction. Until it is solved, until the political keystone can be wrestled into place over the doorway of our international establishment, there is going to be a certain hesitancy on the part of people to pass through the archway - and for obvious reasons.

My first hypothesis then is that the problem of war and peace today is basically a political, even a spiritual one, and that it can never be solved by materialist remedies alone - whether Marxist or capitalist. If this is true, then the core of the problem is to be found first, in the relation of the individual to his state and secondly, in the relation of the state to the international order. The first I have not the time to discuss. When we consider the second we are faced at once with the seemingly impossible task of reconciling the absolute sovereignty of the state with the demands of interdependence in the community of nations; of reconciling loyalty to our own state with loyalty to all peoples. To anyone who has followed the proceedings of the Atomic Energy Commission, many of the pros and cons of this question will be painfully, if not agonizingly, familiar. But to me the answer is so clear that no time need be wasted in searching for it, though much time will elapse before it can be put into effect. The reconciliation is to be found in a voluntary surrender of some measure of sovereignty to a world authority in the interest of peace and security. I suggest that the social sciences should orient themselves in that direction and preach the doctrine of the necessity of this surrender, a surrender which at present is unacceptable to many states, especially to the most powerful ones who would substitute for it the principle of unanimity of the great powers, a principle which tends to find its implementation only in the lowest common denominator of international action - that is, inaction.

At the present time, in our world organization of the United Nations, we are committed to this principle of unanimity - the scarcest commodity in a hungry world - and we must now do what everyone has to do when he reaches a dead-end; retire, and look for another approach. We have to ask ourselves what function or functions a world authority should exist to perform and, as we find the answer to that, we have then to ask what contribution each of the member parts can bring to the performance of that function. The immediate function which the world authority should exist to perform, I have suggested, is the preservation of peace. This is not, of course, an end in itself. It is, however, essential to the performance of any other function. Peace - which is far more than the absence of war - must be established before international law and order can be established. The second function is that of providing for the progressive extension to nations and