

are still able to call civilization.

The growing unity and strength of the Western democracies, however, and the confidence that is beginning to come from this; the events of the last few months, and in particular the conclusion of an armistice in Korea, may give us now a chance to move away from possible co-destruction and toward a co-existence which will be more than a word.

I do not mean to suggest of course that an era of sweetness and light is just around the corner. Nor will it be ushered in merely by changes of tactics or by paper promises of peace. But it does seem that there is at least more hope now for progress towards real peace than there was when the seventh Assembly opened almost a year ago. Whether this is wishful thinking or not, such progress is the fundamental purpose to which our United Nations is dedicated. We are, in all conscience, bound to keep everlastingly trying to bring about a better state of international relations; for if we fail in this we fail, sooner or later, in everything.

Faced with this task then, we should ask ourselves among other things if our present methods of diplomacy, inside or outside the United Nations, are adequate and effective enough for the purposes of negotiating differences, when the opportunity for such negotiation presents itself.

The United Nations is a place where we can meet either to settle problems or make settlement more difficult. It is a place where we can try to find collective solutions, or one which we can use to get support and publicity for purely national solutions. It is a place where we can talk to each other with a view to securing general agreement, or to the television and radio audiences in order to explain that disagreement is the fault of somebody else.

In any event, whatever face the United Nations now presents to the public is enlarged to alarming proportions by all media of information which now carry our words, our attitudes, even our appearances to the ends of the earth.

I know that without the active participation of world agencies of communication and information, this experiment in world organization could not succeed, because it would not be able to secure popular support. But the United Nations has, or should have, a private as well as a public face. There should be opportunities here for other than public appearances. A television panel discussion can be instructive and entertaining, but it is no substitute for direct consultation or for that old-fashioned diplomacy which is becoming more respectable by comparison with some of its gaudier, but not always more responsible or restrained successors.

It is, of course, essential that all free peoples should know and understand the great issues of policy which may mean life or death for them. But it is not essential, as I see it, indeed it is often harmful, for the negotiation of policy always to be conducted in glass houses which are often too tempting a target for brickbats. It is all too easy to strike attitudes in public, only to find later that we are stuck with them. Open diplomacy now tends to become frozen diplomacy.

I'm sure that we can all think of subjects that have come before us in recent Assemblies that could have been more constructively discussed and more easily settled if previously there had been quiet and confidential discussion of them