

organization, when they are committed to its purposes and subjected to its rules. There is an obligation upon members of this organization to behave in accordance with definite principles and to observe insofar as possible the decisions of its various bodies. While no member could pretend that his record has been impeccable -- and I am certainly not suggesting that ours is and certainly the record of some have left much to be desired -- the noble principles of the Charter remain for all of us, to a greater or less extent, standards by which to measure ourselves. They are not yet fully attained but they inspire our conduct and we can say that being accountable to this great organization has had a beneficial effect on our behaviour. The same is bound to happen to these countries which are now outside, when they subscribe to principles and join an organization which we strongly support.

We are all, of course, deeply concerned to preserve and to respect the principles of the Charter. We are convinced that the action we propose here does no violence to these principles. The Charter is not a law with a precise interpretation for every article. It is a document which has to be interpreted with understanding and with moderation. Being the product of many different civilizations and schools of thought, it would be presumptuous for any of us to insist upon interpretations which would be inevitable only in terms of our own education and concepts. This is no plea for taking a light or expedient view of the Charter but a request that we should recognize that there may be legitimate differences in its interpretation.

Let us face frankly the principal concern of those who fear, for instance, that the admission of some of these states would be contrary to the terms of Article 4 (1). Can we say that these states are "peace-loving", an essential requirement for membership? How can we interpret exactly the meaning of this term "peace-loving"? It does certainly not mean "pacifist", because virtually all member states, including my own, maintain armed forces and believe that we must be prepared to fight if necessary to defend our principles and our way of life. Perhaps it is easier to understand this term if we contrast it with its antonym, which would presumably be "war-loving". We have known war-loving states in the past. The United Nations was itself founded in the association of countries fighting together against states controlled at that time by men who loved and glorified war for its own sake. There remain perhaps some individuals in the world who share this degenerate attitude to war, but I doubt if there is any state in the world today which now does so as a national policy. This is the age of the hydrogen bomb. To me it is inconceivable that states, whatever they may consider their national interests to be, should not now live in horror of war. It remains true that there are states - and I do not exclude some of the present applicants for membership - whose policies, if not altered but pursued in the extreme, could provoke war, but I am prepared to believe that they are not seeking war as an objective or instrument of national policy and that they would in fact go to considerable lengths to avoid it. This it seems to me rather than compliance with certain subjective structural or policy tests, should be the criterion to be applied in relation to Article 4(1).