

resolution won the overwhelming support of the Assembly by a vote of 49 in favour, 5 against, with 3 abstentions.

In sponsoring the resolution, Mr. Pearson laid particular stress on the need for open-mindedness. Speaking to the Ad Hoc Political Committee on November 7, 1949, he said:

One of the principles embodied in our joint resolution is that we must keep open every channel for consultation and negotiation. We must not close any door.

The second principle is that we must also not close our minds. We must explore all possible avenues which give any promise of leading to a satisfactory solution to this vital problem. The Atomic Energy Commission must be prepared to consider any suggestion which could contribute to such a solution. The members of that Commission should be willing and anxious, and I know they would be willing and anxious, to examine ideas from any source, whether from an officer of the General Assembly, or from any government, or from the press, or from any individual in any part of the world.

As requested by the Assembly, the six permanent members of the Atomic Energy Commission resumed their discussions on December 20 under the chairmanship of the Canadian Delegate, General A. G. L. McNaughton, who proceeded to circulate to the members a summary of the various suggestions that had been made during the course of the Assembly session. These were referred to their governments and are being carefully studied.

Although the Assembly produced no remarkable decisions on atomic energy, there was a growing recognition that, in the words Mr. Pearson used in the Ad Hoc Political Committee on November 7, "if the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. did not agree on a plan for ensuring that there will not be an atomic arms race, there will be no such plan and there will be such a race, without any winner!"

In spite of the apparently ineffectual efforts of the United Nations to deal with the overwhelming problem of atomic energy control, a plan that is technically sound has been developed and has received the political support of the great majority of nations of the world. The effort to resolve the deadlock has become the most important political problem of the day and, although the issues appear at the moment to be politically insoluble, there are perhaps grounds for the hope expressed by a great atomic scientist, Dr. Leo Szilard, as quoted by Mr. Pearson before the United Nations on November 7, 1949:

Politics has been defined as the art of the possible. Science might be defined as the art of the impossible. The crisis which is upon us may not find its ultimate solution until the statesmen catch up with the scientists, and politics, too, becomes the art of the impossible. This, I believe, might be achieved when the statesmen will be more afraid of the atomic bomb than they are afraid of using their imagination, because imagination is the tool which has to be used if the impossible is to be accomplished.

How the political problem can be solved, it is impossible to say, but, speaking in the House of Commons on November 16, 1949, Mr. Pearson made this suggestion:

The problem of peace is much broader than the problem of agreeing on the clauses of a treaty to prohibit the use of the atom bomb. It is the problem of establishing sufficient mutual confidence to tackle not only disarmament and the bomb but the whole range of major friction points—political, strategic and economic—which are witnesses today of the tragic division between the two worlds.