

Canada and the United States and other peaceful countries had once - and not so long ago - high hopes that this objective could be achieved through the United Nations. We know now - and the knowledge is distressing - that this is not now the case. In the present position of the world, with the unhappy division between East and West, between free democracy and revolutionary despotism, the United Nations cannot, in its present form, give security to anyone; to Arabs or Jews in Palestine, to Hindus or Moslems in Kashmir, to social democrats in Czechoslovakia or liberals in Spain. Every, or almost every, important political problem which now reaches the Security Council of the United Nations is considered by the Great Powers in the light of this two-world division. This has naturally resulted in frustration and futility, the symptom of which though not the cause, is the veto which paralyzes action in the Security Council. There is no point in fooling ourselves. In this case, let us avoid self-deception, the peculiar weakness of the Anglo-Saxon mind.

The United Nations, in its present form and in the present international situation, can guarantee nobody's security. This does not mean that we should scrap our international organization. Not at all. The United Nations has performed useful work in the social, economic and even in certain political fields. It remains, through its Assembly, the town-meeting of the world, even though its debates have on recent occasions tended to degenerate into ideological brawls. It is the world agency, through which we must try to organize prosperity and security; through arrangements which, if possible, will include every state. But if that is not possible, then it must be done through arrangements which will include those states in the United Nations who are able and willing to participate, and whose pacific purposes and non-aggressive policies have been demonstrated.

To make the U.N. effective at once as a universal security organization would require an amendment to its present Charter. Such an amendment would be subject to the veto and would get it. Well, what can be done? Over-ride the veto, and form a new organization with a new charter, with those who don't want to come in, staying out. I think, myself, that such a drastic step at this time is unnecessary and unwise. So does your Secretary of State, so I am in good company. It would mean a decisive and accepted final split between the democratic and the Soviet systems, with not an iron curtain, but an electrified barbed wire fence between them. But we must do something. We do not wish to lose our shirt while we are bathing in Lake Success, or to put it more prosaically, we cannot stand idly by an impotent United Nations and watch states fall one by one to the aggressor.

That would be suicidal folly as the recent past has shown. No nation - not even the most powerful nation - can be safe in that kind of anarchic world. Security cannot be guaranteed by national action alone, even on the part of the most powerful state. The Rhine is everybody's frontier now, or rivers farther west, and there are no little countries far away, whose fate, like Czechoslovakia's in 1938, means nothing to us. Nations therefore cannot safely rely on national aims or national arms alone. These have never in the past guaranteed more than an armed truce. On the other hand, reduction of armaments in the circumstances of the present would be a snare and delusion; an invitation to the aggressor to strike swiftly and with warning. Nor should our people be seduced into false security by signing pacts outlawing war which lull the deluded citizen into forgetfulness, and give him a feather duster as protection against a tank.

Security now can be found only in an association, or association of peaceful, but determined states, organized under the Charter of the United Nations, the members of which are willing to pool their arms and their resources for defence - who will not use those arms except in defence, but will not hesitate to use them when any member of the group is attacked. For this purpose they must be willing to surrender; no, to utilize, some of them