

Of course the Western countries which dominated the United Nations when it was first formed no longer do so. It used to be that the Soviet and some of her allies and friends from time to time came close to mounting what is known at the United Nations as a "blocking third". That is, any important resolution before the General Assembly must have a two-thirds vote. Now the situation is that very often the Western nations have difficulty in acquiring a blocking third for resolutions put up by Asian and African countries, and often supported by the Soviet Union. You may say, "What do you want with a blocking third?" Resolutions put up from time to time by other countries may be very good, but from time to time some of those resolutions are by no means the wisest, and this brings in the next two points that I should like to touch on briefly. I refer to two broad influences which are at work in the United Nations all the time. One is the anti-colonial influence and the other is the cold war influence. These two influences seem to permeate virtually every debate and every resolution at the United Nations.

Anti-colonial feeling we can all understand. Every one of us can understand why people in Asia and Africa should have a strong anti-colonial feeling which reflects against the Western powers. That we can understand, but often this influence is not manifested by means of logic at all but rather by emotion. In due course this situation will probably clear up, but at the present time it presents a very serious danger to the United Nations.

### Anti-Colonialism

I should like to give a brief example of this influence. There is a resolution before the United Nations involving a plan put forward by the United States called, I believe, "Africa, a plan for economic and political development". This emphasis on this plan has been somewhat altered to overemphasize political development, and the particular emphasis has been that of setting target dates for the independence of a number of new states. On the face of it that sounds fine, but for very obvious reasons-- for instance, to avoid a situation such as arose in the Congo-- it is not desirable to set a specific date until the people in the area are able to take over the government of their country themselves.

The United Kingdom, of course, has been remarkably successful in this field, and it has been explained at the United Nations that the matter of target dates is not directed at the United Kingdom but rather at certain other countries. That may well be the case but once target dates are fixed they must be accepted by all and these are very impractical for the reasons I have pointed out. A number of countries in Africa and elsewhere have pointed out to me privately that they realize this is an impractical idea, but one of the less responsible countries has brought it forward and these governments naturally have to pay attention to the views of the electorate at home or, if there is no electorate, the people who live in the country. The result is that one country in Africa makes a matter an emotional issue on anti-colonial grounds and these other countries virtually have to go along, even though they really do not think the idea is sensible or practical.

That is the type of thing we have to watch there. A great many of the resolutions at the United Nations have become more and more dominated by emotional feeling rather than by logic. I think this is a matter that will clear up in due course, but at the present time it is a very great danger.