

not a basic disagreement comparable to those which separate the Soviet world from the free world. Nor is it a nineteenth century struggle between exploiters and exploited or even between nationalism and colonialism. It is merely a difference of opinion over degree and pace. On the fundamental principles there is general agreement. In recent months there have been indications that the developed and the under-developed countries are moving closer together on this question. The rift, happily, is not a fundamental one; there is no reason why it should be a permanent one.

The United Nations is an agency for the conciliation of political disputes and for the organization of collective action against established aggression, when all methods of mediation and conciliation have been exhausted. It provides, together with the Specialized Agencies, numerous opportunities for international co-operation in almost every form of economic, social, cultural and humanitarian endeavour. Finally, but by no means least, it is an agency with important responsibilities in supervising the evolution to self-government of many peoples now living in dependent status.

The United Nations provides points of diplomatic contact not elsewhere available, and it would not be wise to under-estimate the possible fruits of such contacts. In fact the numerous contacts with the Soviet bloc provided by the United Nations offer the free world the best opportunity to exploit a relaxation of the present tension, if the U.S.S.R. should show a willingness to compromise and cooperate in a way which would make this relaxation possible.

Yet we must not think of international affairs today solely in terms of the cold war, or of fear and insecurity solely in terms of Soviet imperialism. Even if communism had never been invented, and even if the Soviet Union were located on a different planet, a number of serious differences within the free world would remain. For many peoples of the world the most direct political threat, real or imaginary, comes from their next-door neighbours or from the continuation of long-unresolved situations in their particular parts of the world. To such peoples, the existence of the United Nations is not merely a reassuring fact — it provides the actual means of seeking redress for grievances without resort to armed force. It also gives them some assurance that if they are attacked, they will receive in some form or other collective assistance.

This principle of collective security is fundamental to the Charter and Canadian policy is based on an acceptance of that principle. We are convinced that aggression in any part of the world constitutes, in the long run, a threat to every other part, including Canada. Yet today, our acceptance of this principle — or, at any rate, its application in practice — is qualified, as are so many things, by the available resources in the free world. To say we must exercise judgment in deciding how the collective security obligations of the Charter can best be discharged does not mean that we can ever afford to turn a blind eye to any act of aggression. It does mean, however, that those who share the responsibility of defending the free world must exercise the highest qualities of intelligence, as well as of conscience, in deciding where and how the limited forces at their disposal should be applied. But while we must