

one of the primary purposes of the United Nations is "to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace and for the suppression of acts of aggression", we have had a recent and very vivid experience of the extreme difficulty under which the United Nations operates, when it tries to enforce its lawful will on those who have committed aggression. Finally, although there is implicit in the Charter of the United Nations the idea of human brotherhood, the countries which compose it are split by what seems to be an irreconcilable gulf.

The hopes we once had and the expectations which are aroused by the Charter of the United Nations are, therefore, far different from its present character and capabilities. Nevertheless, I still think that the work of the United Nations, provides ground for a reasoned faith in its future. In any event, there is no other machinery for international action which provides a satisfactory alternative, though there are some, such as the Atlantic Pact, which may be more important as buttresses to our security in the immediate circumstances of the present.

Tonight I should like to advance the argument further by considering the role of the United Nations in the preservation of peace and security, particularly in the light of recent events in Korea. To do so, I will ask you to regard the Charter much as you might regard a legal document, to look at it with a careful and critical and unsentimental eye. Read in the light of existing circumstances, the passages in the Charter which deal with security matters - with the keeping of the peace - seem to present one glaring inconsistency. The preamble of the Charter and its first chapter would lead one to believe that the Organization is designed primarily to prevent or defeat acts of aggression launched by one state against another. Those opening pages of the Charter suggest that the United Nations is essentially a security organization and imply that there will be no limits on its efforts, as there is no limit on its obligation or on its purpose, to keep the peace and to frustrate acts of aggression. The language used in the opening pages is of a very comprehensive, and indeed universal, kind. The first Article of the Charter, for instance, lists this as the primary purpose of the United Nations:

"To maintain international peace and security, and to that end to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace."

Anyone reading that article, I think, would be forgiven if he inferred that if an unprovoked attempt were made on any state anywhere in the world, the United Nations would be expected to take action - take it at once and effectively - against the aggressor.

Anyone who had come to this conclusion however would be surprised when he came to Chapter 5 which deals with the power of the Security Council, as the primary security organ of the United Nations. Voting procedure in the Security Council, as described in Article 27, ensures that any one of the permanent members of the Security Council (i.e., the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, France and China) can prevent action against itself by the exercise of the veto. It emerges, therefore that the organ primarily responsible for security matters