

chosen for them. We can also seek security through the United Nations, without always seeking at the same time international support for every national policy. There can be only one legitimate policy advanced in the assembly of the nations of the world and that is the collective policy of them all, or of as many as are willing to work together for carrying out the peaceful principles of the Charter. If any nation can cover up its own aggressive designs and is able to get support for them by appealing to the hopes or the fears of its fellow members of the United Nations, the organization, as now constituted, is obviously doomed. Even, when national policies are non-aggressive and defensive in character, great care should be taken in making the United Nations the instrument for their realization.

There is another and related danger confronting the United Nations; the tendency to use it -- and especially the Security Council -- as a means of avoiding national responsibility for dealing with difficult international situations. It is, I suppose, tempting to shelve this responsibility by putting it on an international organization, but it should not be forgotten that all members of that organization, if they are parties to a dispute, pledge themselves first to seek a solution by negotiation, conciliation or by some other peaceful means before they bring it to the Security Council.

There have been occasions recently when the services of the United Nations should not, I think, have been invoked because the parties mainly concerned with the situation had not exhausted other, and direct means of settlement; or because the problem was beyond the present capacity of a new and uncertain organization. On the other hand, there have been occasions when the United Nations should not have been ignored in favour of national action.

There is danger to any international organization if its members base their decisions either to by-pass or to exploit it solely on considerations of immediate national convenience or advantage.

A Greek philosopher surveying the government of his state many centuries ago said "no more good must be attempted than the nation can bear". Surveying the scene at Lake Success today I would suggest "no more good must be attempted than the United Nations can bear".

It may eventually be fatal to the United Nations, if it is asked to accept commitments which it cannot fulfill, because, in the absence of military agreements under the Charter to enforce its decisions, those decisions have behind them only moral force and the weight of world opinion.

These dangers become more acute as United Nations activities tend to revolve around the policies of the two blocs now forming inside it, each headed by a super power and around each of which lesser powers find themselves, sometimes uneasily, clustering. Pressure, on the one hand, friendly and almost unconscious, on the other, undisguised and ruthless, is sometimes exerted on the smaller members of the United Nations to identify their own policies with one or other of the group leaders. It is becoming too difficult to avoid this, as the feeling develops "you must either be for or against us, when we are so right and so strong, and the other fellow is so wrong and so strong". It is increasingly hard for countries, especially those which have become known as middle powers, to maintain a position of independence and objectivity in the United Nations in the face of this growing division between the Great Powers. It becomes hard to reach a collective decision, based on reason and argument, compromise and conciliation. The trial is one of strength, not of right.

There are, of course, many and fundamental points of difference