

war. Since 1945 the gates to the future have narrowed, while the vistas of the horrors of modern warfare have expanded beyond our imaginations.

But this cannot be blamed on the United Nations. We all know that failures and frustrations can easily be detected, just as steady achievements can be overlooked. In the United Nations we are suffering on the international plane the same headaches that nations like yours and mine experienced in setting up our domestic machinery of government. In Canada, as in this country, the extension of the rule of law to the frontiers of the nation state did not come overnight. It will take longer than nine years for the United Nations to establish beyond question the supremacy of the law in the vastness of the world community.

Yet can we visualize the sort of world we might inhabit today if, even with all its defects, we had not developed this instrument for collective action?

Some of its achievements should be briefly noted. The United Nations succeeded in bringing an end to the conflict in Palestine. The United Nations worked out a partial settlement in the dispute between India and Pakistan. The United Nations has aided states in the achievement of their independence, and devised a solution to some of the issues arising in the aftermath of war, such as the disposal of the Italian colonies. Above all, the United Nations acted to resist aggression and to achieve an armistice in Korea.

These are concrete illustrations of effective collective action. Let us look more broadly at two main areas of collective action in which the United Nations has proven its usefulness and vitality:

- (1) Collective security;
- (2) The economic and social basis of collective security.

The principle of collective security is basic to the United Nations Charter. It means acceptance of the fact that aggression in one part of the world constitutes a threat to every other part. While it may be necessary at times to balance our collective security obligations against the resources at our disposal, to deter aggression has become the continuing concern and responsibility of all.

Korea provided a test of the collective security principle in action. True, the intervention of the United Nations in Korea was possible only because of a happy accident which prevented the Communist representatives on the Security Council from exercising their veto power. True the burden fell unequally on the member nations. True, too there was much improvisation in arrangements. Nevertheless, the historic decision to take collective action to resist this unprovoked aggression has significance not only for Korea, but for the whole world.

Because the paralyzing effects of abuse of the veto power in the Security Council imperilled the ability of the United Nations to implement the collective