

In a recent article, Professor Hans Morgenthau suggested that there was an "insoluble contradiction between national sovereignty and an effective international organization". This is not a premise to which I can wholly subscribe. Nor did the framers of the United Nations Charter subscribe to it. On the contrary, they explicitly assumed that the United Nations would be "based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members".

In essence, therefore, the United Nations is and remains an instrument of governments. If it is to be a dynamic instrument, as the late Dag Hammarskjöld saw it, this will depend on the continuing commitment of its member governments to a dynamic world order. On the face of it, I can see nothing irreconcilable between such a commitment and the conception of national sovereignty. Indeed, I should think that if the facts of interdependence are realistically accepted a dynamic world order becomes a matter of enlightened national interest to all nations.

There are those who feel, with Senator Fulbright, that "the sovereign nation can no longer serve as the ultimate unit of personal loyalty and responsibility" and there can be no doubt that this conception has a firm basis in fact. At the same time, we cannot discount the continuing hold which nationalism has on men's minds. Indeed, Senator Fulbright himself regards it as "the most powerful single force in the world politics of the twentieth century".

I am not here concerned with an assessment of nationalism as such. Certainly, we cannot say that we disparage the resurgent sense of national identity and interest in Eastern Europe for example. Nor can we discount the contribution which nationalism is making to the nation-building process in scores of new countries. These countries have been propelled to independent nationhood on the current of nationalism and nationalism is now helping them to achieve cohesion by developing a body of national attitudes, institutions and ideals.

What we have to recognize, I think, is that nationalism is a source of energy which can be tapped for good or for ill. So long as it does not cut across the development of a sensible international system of order and security, so long as it does not inhibit international co-operation in the attainment of common ends, so long as it does not exclude a broadening of the frontiers of loyalty -- there is no intrinsic reason why nationalism should not be harnessed to the "new realities".

Nationalism has been one of the forces at work in the essentially bi-polar world that took shape in the immediate post-war period. It has been one of the forces which have helped to bring about a greater diffusion of political and economic power in the world. We are having to take account of that diffusion in the North Atlantic partnership. We also know that the trend towards what is sometimes called "polycentrism" has had its impact on the Soviet world. And it has substantially altered the conditions of non-alignment, which has been the course of policy adopted by most of the new nations on attaining independence.