

between the ideal requirements and the dictates of realism. (Netherlands). The Soviet bloc representatives claimed that the United Nations should accept the principle of "co-existence" and that this involved the recognition of Security Council unanimity. Thus, according to Mr. Molotov, "the United Nations is inconceivable without the recognition and implementation of the principle of co-existence and joint settlement of international affairs by countries with different social structures, and this finds most vivid expression in the Charter provisions relating to the Security Council." The same point was made by nearly all the satellite representatives; for instance, the Byelorussian stated that "the tendency to sidestep the Charter found expression in attacks on the principle of unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council." The repetition of this point in nearly all the Communist speeches suggests that on the issue of sovereignty, the Soviet Bloc may not yet be quite ready inside as outside the United Nations for concessions to the will of the majority.

As to the General Assembly, a few speakers urged the need for more restraint in discussion. Mr. Entezam, in particular, suggested that more energy should be devoted to conciliation, rather than to debate. This was supported by Israel. The South African representative and his colleague from Venezuela were almost alone in condemning United Nations intervention in domestic affairs.

### Membership Issue

The membership issue was one of the most popular ones. All felt that the deadlock should be resolved soon and a surprisingly large number of representatives came out in favour of universality. (Pakistan, India, Greece, Indonesia, Peru, Norway, Egypt, Saudi-Arabia, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Venezuela, Cuba). The speeches disclosed acute interest in this matter and suggested that strong pressure will develop at the next Assembly to solve the problem. The Soviet Representatives, as could be anticipated, took the opportunity to urge the admission of Red China.

No very clear indication of a definite trend was disclosed concerning Charter revision. Mr. Macmillan felt that "the United Nations, as it stands today, represents the highest common factor of agreement that is possible among the nations". Mr. Uden (Sweden), while recognizing that the Charter is not a perfect instrument considered that "the Charter as it stands at present does not prevent the United Nations from fulfilling its tasks providing that the member states really wish to act in accordance with the principles of the Charter". Others, the Pakistan Representative for instance, were prepared to consider sympathetically suggestions for revision. Chile had some interesting amendments to suggest but admitted that the time was not yet ripe for Charter revision. No strong and general desire for early revision was expressed at San Francisco.

While most representatives recognized that the best United Nations work had been done in the Social and Economic fields, those from the Asian, African and Middle East countries were unanimous and outspoken in their praise for the operations of the Specialized Agencies and the accomplishments of the organization in promoting social and economic wellbeing. The point is not particularly original, but the references to this subject were so numerous and apparently so deeply felt that from a mere reading of the speeches, it appears