

Although the recent proceedings of the Security Council give little support to the view, surely also it is no longer visionary to conceive of situations in which the Council will function as was originally intended, by consensus of the permanent members of the United Nations as a whole, through co-operation rather than confrontation.

We founded the United Nations, as the Charter says, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". More has been accomplished in this past year to remove that danger than in any year since this organization was created. Certainly, so far as the risk of a general nuclear war is concerned, the hopeful evolution of great-power relations evokes deep feelings of relief, gratitude and satisfaction from us all.

It would be a bitter irony if the safer, saner world that seems at last a possibility rather than a dream should turn instead into a world in which the stream of violence simply cuts new channels. Time and again, the smaller countries have called for an end to the nuclear-arms race, an end to nuclear confrontation. We have sought an international order in which the great powers would conceive it neither as their interest nor as their obligation to attempt to police the world. Now the great powers, in their own interest and in the interest of us all, are moving in this direction. Is the new security and freedom that will thereby be available to all countries, large and small, to be dissipated in new forms of violence? Must we admit that only the fear of nuclear escalation has allowed us some limited success in the past generation in controlling recourse to force?

Yet the international community still has no answer to the dilemma of deciding at what point local violence has such wide and obvious international implications that it can no longer be accepted as a purely domestic matter. We struggled with this problem last year in the crisis in Bangladesh. And, even where violence is plainly international from the outset, our means of dealing with it are often pitifully weak. There are those in the world who appear to believe that the norms of civilized international life are not for them. They consider that they have a right to pursue their grievances with kidnapping, piracy, murder and wholesale terror and violence.

The problem is growing. It has become world-wide. My own country has had its tragic experience of violence of this sort. Canadians instinctively share the horror and shock that these acts produce wherever in the world they may occur. The Canadian Government understands only too well the agonizing choices governments face when called upon to deal with a sudden nightmare of violence.

Terrorism takes many forms. It is called forth by a wide range of complex situations. The rights and wrongs of these situations are bitterly contested. It is simple realism to recognize all this. But the problem cannot be ignored because it is difficult; there must be no truce with terror. Some acts of terror are the work of deluded and demented criminals; others, of frustrated and desperate men willing to sacrifice their own lives and the lives of innocent people in what they regard as a noble cause. When we agree