

of the Council as the central agency for watching over the peace of the world and initiating action to remove threats of war and other causes of serious disagreement or dissension.

If the Council is given these large powers—and I do not question the need for making it an effective centre for initiating action—its composition becomes a question of great importance. The suggestions made by President Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, which are indeed implicit in the Moscow declaration, are that China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States should always be represented on the Council. In the function of maintaining world security the part of these countries is so vital that one must unhesitatingly agree. It is also suggested that there should be added, by a process of election or selection yet to be worked out, a number of representatives of other states who would have temporary membership on the Council and it is to this question that I wish to direct attention.

The co-operation of the greatest powers is necessary to maintain peace. They must co-operate not only with each other but also with other states of lesser power. Especially among our European allies the memory of the Munich agreement of the autumn of 1938 is still vivid. In the circumstances which prevailed then, the Munich agreement may have been the best means of postponing war with Germany. In it, however, two great powers bought from Hitler and his Italian partner, at the expense of a small country, time to prepare themselves for war. Unless the smaller countries can play their due part in the new international system, there will be ever present the fear that great powers may settle their differences at the expense of the smaller countries. The mere existence of such a fear would in time greatly prejudice the whole scheme.

What then should the due part of the lesser countries be, especially in connection with this question of the composition of the new World Council? The simple division of the world between great powers and the rest is unreal and even dangerous. The great powers are called by that name simply because they possess great power. The other states of the world possess power—and, therefore, the capacity to use it for the maintenance of peace—in varying degrees ranging from almost zero in the case of the smallest and weakest states up to a military potential not very far behind that of the great powers.

In determining what states should be represented on the Council with the great powers, it is, I believe, necessary to apply the functional idea. Those countries which have most to contribute to the maintenance of the peace of the world should be most frequently selected. The military contribution actually made during this war by the members of the United Nations provides one good working basis for a selective principle of choice.

I have emphasized the necessity of basing world security on the maintenance of a large superiority of power. Between the two wars too many people in too many countries placed too much faith in general promises like those in the Kellogg Pact, in expressions of good will, in constitutional mechanisms. The world has been disillusioned, but the reaction in the other direction can go too far. If the new world system is conceived in terms of power alone, peace may be kept for a time, but not for long. If it is to last and broaden