

peace-keeping costs – amounted to about a quarter of one per cent of the defence budgets of the leading military powers alone. The real problem is that two great powers, the Soviet Union and France, both permanent members of the Security Council, insist, from somewhat differing standpoints, that contributions requested from them for peace-keeping costs are either illegal or optional. There is disagreement about the principles which should determine an equitable sharing of the financial burden of peace keeping and, as a result, this burden is, in our opinion, unfairly distributed.

#### PERIPHERAL AREAS CHIEFLY AFFECTED

In commenting on the differing viewpoints and on continuing need for peace keeping, I should like to emphasize one essential point. The United Nations can only with difficulty undertake important initiatives in areas of direct or major great-power interest. In terms of such interests, peace-keeping operations are most likely to be in peripheral areas. There are, however, degrees of remoteness. How remote, for example, is Kashmir from great-power preoccupations? If we are considering the nations allied in NATO and the Warsaw Pact, it is possible to say that in this area there is a balance of military power, a recognition of respective positions on certain matters, such as German reunification or Berlin, with which the Security Council as such is not likely to deal. But Cyprus is of direct and continuing concern to members of the NATO alliance.

Outside the NATO-Warsaw Pact area, there are the complicated and changing great-power relations involving Communist China. There are areas where the entry of new nations into the world scene, the recurrence of old animosities, conflicts of race and religion or economic and social instability could lead to threats to the peace of the world as a whole. These threats to regional peace could involve, with varying degrees of intensity, the great-power clash of interest. Whether we like it or not, our world has achieved a degree of common involvement in political and economic affairs which requires an attempt at common management. The Prime Minister of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, who can speak for a continent well aware of this fact, made the point vividly, when he said that “all nations border on each other – no sea, no range of mountains constitutes a barrier to events outside”....

#### ROLE OF REGIONAL AGENCIES

It has never been assumed, of course, that immediate action by the United Nations would be desirable or possible in all areas where peace was threatened. There is not only the limitation already mentioned arising from great-power involvement. The Charter anticipates the possibility of action by regional agencies consistent with the purpose and principles of the United Nations. The United Nations and regional agencies have complementary roles to play and there is no doubt that these agencies can contribute effectively to peace both in conciliation and in peace keeping. The United Nations must, however, retain ultimate responsibility for all developments

affecting peace and security. It might have to supplement regional action and it alone would be responsible for enforcement. The United Nations must be able to respond to all these needs...

The difficulties of obtaining great-power agreement, the complexities of the local situations requiring peace-keeping action, and the doubts of some members that they stood to benefit directly may have affected the views of some governments which have not contributed much on the financial side. There are, however, important reasons of national interest which in the long run, support peace keeping.

#### STAKE OF UNALIGNED IN UN

Dag Hammarskjold pointed out, quite rightly, that it was the unaligned nations, those nations not protected by membership in some relatively stable power system, which would derive the greatest benefit and sense of security from a vigorous United Nations. We talk now of making a world safe for diversity, of having differing political systems, various regional alliances and a multiplicity of sovereign states exist together without the threat of annihilation, disastrous conflict or continual friction. This objective has evident appeal for newer nations, which are anxious both to preserve newly-found sovereignty against any rude intervention by force and to get on with economic development. The United Nations cannot give them any categorical assurances as to such conditions, but it is one institution to which they can turn for help of all kinds without commitment to blocs or political systems....

We come...to another fundamental question about peace keeping, that concerning its actual effectiveness on the spot. Here I should like to remind you of the very considerable differences between various types of peace-keeping action. The disputes over the financing of major operations involving the movement of armed forces into the Middle East in 1956 and the Congo in 1960 have tended to focus attention on action of this type. We are, therefore, inclined to forget what has been done by groups of unarmed military observers or by other missions manifesting the United Nations presence under conditions of great tension. Peace keeping in Lebanon in 1958, for example, involved the very effective use of observers. The conception, execution and termination of the task showed how decisively the world community could manifest its presence in helping to achieve stability. Other observation and truce-supervision missions in the Middle East and Kashmir have rendered important assistance in ending hostilities.

#### UN MULTI-NATIONAL FORCES

Peace keeping involving the use of armed forces has presented special problems. There is now not much doubt, however, that multi-national forces under United Nations control can be mounted and despatched and can commence and carry through their specific functions with considerable efficiency. Hammarskjold referred correctly to “possibilities for international organization which, once proven, cannot in future be disregarded”. The critics of