

What I have said about the Canadian effort, and the spirit that inspired it, holds good, I believe, in every particular, for the many times greater contribution in each of these fields that the United States has made, and continues to make, towards the recovery of Europe's economic independence and well-being.

The second major undertaking of the postwar world has been the establishment of machinery for the settlement of international disputes and for the maintenance of peace. Great hopes have been entertained that the establishment at San Francisco of the United Nations would mark the beginning of a world organization which would provide real security. Today, this task stands in equal peril.

The settlement of international disputes, through machinery provided by the United Nations, has made some progress, though it is still far from having achieved success. Its success or failure would appear to have been dependent upon the extent to which the application of the veto has been in accordance with the general consensus of view of the member nations. In areas where it is clear that the veto has not been applied to further the special interest of one or more member nations rather than the general interest, procedures of negotiation and compromise, mediation and adjustment have been undertaken, and have proved helpful and constructive. However, in every area, and on every subject where it is obvious that the veto has been applied to further some particular interest, rather than the general interest, the process of compromise and adjustment has been ignored, and little or no progress as a consequence has been made.

The stalemate which has resulted from this state of affairs affects many situations which are of direct and imperative concern in the life of all free nations. Its continuance cannot fail to lead to threats to freedom arising not only from aggressive aims at territorial expansion, but, as well, from sinister plans to undermine the structure of free government within the borders of individual nations.

There is no nation, however great, which, in a world such as the one in which we live today, can defend its freedom solely with its own resources. All nations are, therefore, interested in security. Where existing machinery for the prevention or settlement of international disputes has proven or is proving inadequate to effect security, additional means must be sought.

Security for individual nations, under such circumstances, can be assured only by the effective co-operation, and the united power of those nations whose determination to maintain their freedom constitutes a strong bond of community between them. It is not surprising therefore that certain nations, knowing that their security depends on collective action in some form, and which are not yet able to achieve that security on the universal basis which the United Nations contemplates, should, pending this large accomplishment, seek to achieve their security on a less than universal basis.

As nations, we are all members one of another. The good of each is bound up in the good of all. This sense of community of interest cannot be too highly, too rapidly, or too widely developed. It is vital to the defence of freedom to maintain a preponderance of moral, economic and military strength on the side of freedom - all else is wholly secondary. To direct its energies to this imperative end seems to me to be the supreme task of the United Nations today.

...../There is a