

The United Nations, as a focus for negotiations, is I think most useful if, like an honest mirror, it reflects the political face of the world as it is.

To those who complain that the United Nations provides communist nations with an opportunity for propaganda, I would point out, as Mr. Lodge did at a recent hearing of a United States Senate Sub-Committee, that the U.N. arena provides us with an invaluable chance to refute false communist propaganda before an audience which includes those nations whose sympathies are uncertain.

If vetoes, or the threats of vetoes, continue to prevent the entry into the United Nations of new members, we might in time have to explore ways in which qualifying non-member nations might be associated with United Nations work. But I do not think we should abandon the far preferable possibility of reaching some agreement on the entry of applicants. I would not be opposed to a "package deal" as such. Where moral principles are not betrayed, compromise is the civilized and traditional method of making progress with competing interests. This is as legitimate in politics as in business. Where "package" deals are objectionable, it is the contents, and not the wrapping together, to which exception is sensibly taken.

I certainly agree with Professor van Wageningen's point that deeper or more far-reaching and precise commitments to narrower groupings such as NATO or regional organizations need not in any-way conflict with loyalty to the United Nations and can indeed strengthen it.

As I have already suggested, the primary value of the United Nations flows precisely from the fact that it is so nearly universal, that it does embrace within one constitutional system, however embryonic, both sides in the cold war, and many nations whose attitude to that prevailing tension is "neutralist". It is precisely this near-universality that can make the United Nations valuable if we are ever to move toward the gradual relaxation of tension and lowering of temperatures essential to any secure peace.

Meanwhile, the United Nations can also serve effectively for international police actions, as the Korean example illustrates. The "Uniting for Peace" resolution gives added flexibility for this function, should it be needed. Where more fully articulated and more highly organized collective security arrangements are necessary, these can be and are achieved through such arrangements as NATO or ANZUS.

Conflict is no more inevitable in the multiple loyalties which simultaneous membership in the United Nations and in other organizations entails, than it is in an individual's loyalty to family, school, town, and nation.

I agree wholeheartedly that we must broaden our community in depth, and agree too that this is above all a problem of psychology - of political habits, intellectual outlook, and moral attitudes.