If we weaken in our respect for law at home, how can we ever hope to substitute law for force as the determinant of peaceful relations between peoples? What possible hope is there for the acceptance of controversial decisions of a world court or the controversial resolutions of a United Nations, if decisions of our own courts, including the highest in the land, are challenged, mocked, and even rejected by sections of public opinion?

The strengthening of the rule of law within states is, in short, essential both for the health of society and for the establishment of a rule of law

between states....

National governments must one day accept the same limitations on their power and authority and for the same reasons: peace and order and progress. They must free themselves "from the disastrous conviction", as Barbara Ward puts it, "that the hierarchy of responsibility ends at the level of national responsibility...(that) Below may be law... All above is force."

## UN TO LEAD THE WAY

A first timid step has been made away from this conviction and toward the acceptance of world law and authority in the work of the United Nations. Its assemblies have tried, by discussion and decision, to develop moral force as a basis for international law and as a deterrent to national aggression. Even more significant, the United Nations, as I have already mentioned, has used international police forces to

aries. If we cannot ensure that the dawntenning equo

stop or contain or prevent armed conflict between nations.

These steps are encouraging as far as they go, but they don't go very far. Indeed, the power of the United Nations to act for all people is almost a mockery alongside the power of great states to act for their own people and against others. Yet a beginning has been made.

If it were not for our national blinkers, our national prides and prejudices, we would seize on these first feeble achievements of the United Nations in law making and peace keeping as an exciting and challenging point of departure in the achievement of the only security we can possibly get against nuclear annihilation: collective security based on collective action, and on collective international policy. We should bend every effort to achieve this objective but we remain more concerned with other matters that seem to be more important than mere survival.

I conclude by re-affirming these two goals that we

should seek to reach.

The first is a law for all humanity, based on justice and an accepted standard of behaviour, produced and protected by a world organization, with international force behind international law....

The second goal is to make national law stronger in the respect it earns and achieves, and in the justice it ensures; stronger by a process of evolution which keeps it in harmony with a changing society; stronger by the wisdom of its legislative creation, the integrity of its administration and by its fearless and impartial enforcement.... same month flast veer, while this mouth at a ports

199,300,000. In the January-June period tempertus from

west 1000,000,632 dose men raquid 00 Chamitrel