

idate within the Western world the resources which are available for security.

I think also that the middle powers should be expected to act in United Nations affairs with a strong sense of responsibility, and that they may be counted upon to do so. They are, for the most part, states with complex political structures of their own. The United Nations has a right to expect that they will not provoke irresponsible discussions; that they will not incontinently set the great powers at one another's throats in discussions which can have no possible issue; that they will not strain the United Nations beyond its resources by setting it tasks which it cannot fulfil; that they will have interests in many parts of the world, and will therefore have a stake in the maintenance of stable conditions the world over. I am not, of course, suggesting that virtues of this kind are to be found solely in middle powers and their representatives. All I have in mind is that these circumstances should permit the United Nations to take it for granted that a middle power may be trusted with this kind of responsibility.

I think also that we should expect a particularly high standard of political leadership to come from the secondary states. For the most part they have modern parliamentary or presidential systems of government and their traditions of government are well established. Some of them are federal states, in which the habits of compromise and accommodation, which make government over wide areas possible, are well known and constantly practised. They can, and indeed do, produce political leaders in the United Nations who have been trained on a stage sufficiently large in scope so that they can grasp the problems of world government intellectually and put them in their proper perspective. They do not always produce men of this stature, of course, but they are able to do so, and the United Nations has a perfect right to expect it of them and to demand it of them.

What I have been suggesting in the course of this discussion is not that the middle powers should be granted any particular constitutional position within the United Nations, or that an attempt should be made at the moment to segregate them in any formal way from the other non-permanent members of the Security Council. Nor do I think that any attempt should be made to give formal expression to the greater measure of obligation which must rest upon the middle powers in an international organization. For the present, at least, it is important only that both the difficulties and the possibilities of the middle power position should be fully understood and that the policies of members of the United Nations should be formulated in a manner which takes into account the realities of this position.

Throughout history there have been repeated efforts by one means or another to widen the area within which common rules and practices of government prevail. Sometimes this has been done by consent, or a measure of consent, and systems have been evolved or agreements entered into by which people conducted their affairs by the rule of law and settled their differences without resort to force. Against the dark passages of war and violence are set the pages of great achievement by which large areas and sometimes whole continents have been given enlightened and progressive administrative systems. I think we are now in a period of history in which this process of enlargement is taking place. The phrase "one world" was made popular around the world by a wise and famous American. It is possible that we shall achieve one world by consent through a process of negotiation and agreement and this, I take it, is the essential task of the United Nations. There is also the unpleasant alternative that the world will be organized on the basis of force. I am sure, however, that any world organization created by force - which would, of course, be world domination - would have within it the seeds of its own destruction. There is ample evidence in history, for example, of the tough and resilient