

not the cause of it - is the privilege of the veto which under the charter is given to the Five Permanent Members of the Security Council. In the bad relations between the Great Powers which have now existed for too long a time, that veto-limitation has been enlarged and extended beyond anything contemplated at San Francisco when the charter was drafted. At that time, it was understood, -- indeed it was definitely so pledged by the five states who were to possess it -- that it would be used with responsibility and restraint; only in grave cases where the consequences of a decision might mean war. It was certainly never intended that it should be used -- as it has been used -- quite irresponsibly and selfishly to prevent the operation of machinery for the settlement of disputes and the removal of causes of trouble. If we were too optimistic at San Francisco -- though I assure you this optimism was by no means universal, especially among the Middle Powers -- it was because we felt that the links of friendship and cooperation forged between the Great Powers in the heat of a common struggle for survival against Fascist forces of evil, might remain, if not unimpaired, at least unbroken, after victory was won. That hope has been bitterly disappointed. Those links have been snapped, and one by one discarded. History has once again shown the senseless and selfish folly of man, in throwing aside after a war the methods and the spirit of international compromise and cooperation which alone had made possible his victory.

In 1948 there is little left, between the two great groups into which the world is forming, of that confidence, cooperation and respect which can alone make the present United Nations a workable instrument for establishing peace and security. We might as well face that fact. One consequence of it is that the veto power in the Security Council has been -- and indeed in this situation is bound to be -- used for the protection of selfish national interests by those who are aggressive or suspicious or do not desire international cooperation except on their own terms. The veto, therefore, which has been justified as necessary to preserve the unanimity of the Great Powers by ensuring that they all act together, merely highlights their disunity. Its repeated use -- and it has been used by one state twenty-two times -- simply underlines the weakness of the Security Council as the instrument for establishing security. It reduces action in that body -- on controversial political issues -- to the lowest common denominator of inaction. Unity is, finally, achieved, but on the basis of zero; on the basis of no runs, no hits and no errors; that is, no errors of commission, only lost chances.

We should not, however, mistake the symptom for the disease. The symptom is the veto-scarred record of the Security Council of the United Nations. The disease is the division of one

cooperating world into two opposing worlds.

The futilities and frustrations which sometimes occur in the meetings of the United Nations, and more particularly the Security Council, have been the consequence and not the cause of this division.

So we find that instead of a United Nations based on the idea and the principles of a cooperative world community, we have a United Nations in which too many of the members are concerned primarily with the protection of their own exclusive national interests. The emphasis is placed on individual sovereignty, instead of collective responsibility; on national defence, instead of collective security. Instead of the United Nations acting as a forum for the expression of the conscience of mankind, it is becoming a platform for the aggressive propagation of ideological passions and reactionary and revolutionary plans. Discussion is debased to the level of vilification. It is, of course, a good thing to have disputes and grievances exposed, and talked out, but only if the exposure is for the purpose of reaching some understanding which will solve the disputes and remove the grievances. I do not suggest that we return to the superficial courtesies and hypocritical concealments of the old diplomacy, where aristocratic gentlemen gracefully bowed low while preparing to stab you in the back. There is something to be said for standing up and calling a spade a spade. There is nothing, however, to be said for shaking your fist and calling it a blanket-blank American or British or Soviet shovel.

DEBATE DESIGNED TO INFLAME

Debate designed to inflame is merely the degradation of free discussion, and there has been too much of that at the United Nations recently. The old diplomacy -- even the old secret diplomacy -- has shone at times by contrast.

It is now quite clear that the primary interest of certain governments in the United Nations Assembly is the use to which it can be put as an agency for the propagation of national policies, and subversive ideologies which are very often used for the support of such policies. The experience of the recent Assembly seems to show that, in the pursuit of this objective, any means justifies the end; any techniques are permissible. No holds are barred, no rules of truth or conduct are observed. No decent international purpose is sought or served.

The "war-mongering" debate at the last assembly was a good example of this propaganda practice. It was introduced by the delegate of the U.S.S.R. in a resolution which was so worded and in a speech that was so provocative and intemperate that acceptance was impossible. But no one wished to be put in a position of supporting "war-mongering". So conscientious delegates were, for a time, in a dilemma. That may have been one purpose of the Soviet resolu-

tion. Another was its value for home consumption, both inside Russia and, more or less the same thing, inside communist parties outside Russia. There might have been a useful and constructive debate on this subject, during which the unanimous yearning of all peoples for peace and their horror at the blood and sacrifice of war, might have been given moving and impressive expression in the Assembly of the nations, with a ringing and sincere declaration against every form of war-mongering, including civil war-mongering. Instead of that we had violent tirades and personal attacks, on the one side, and efforts on the other at protection against this international mud-slinging. Too often, at the last assembly, the town meeting of the world tended to become an ideological brawl.

PROSTITUTION OF U.N. ORGANIZATION

The use of the assembly for such offensive propagandistic purposes; for attacks on nations as a part of power policies; for undermining the democratic way of life, and stirring up class and racial hatreds, and every form of civil strife, is the prostitution of our United Nations organization to an ignoble and aggressive purpose.

In the face of this, what should delegations do who still believe in the high ideals of the United Nations and in the possibility of free peoples working together for peace, friendship and prosperity? Should they reply in kind? No. There is no need to lower ourselves to that level. Not reply at all? That would be a mistake. We should not let this struggle go by default. We should, I suggest, do two things. Expose, coolly and factually, the false arguments and conclusions of those who are trying to establish a totalitarian tyranny, which is as old as sin and as reactionary as slavery. More important, however, we should go on the offensive ourselves. Those peoples who believe in freedom and democracy, justice and equality before the Law, who are genuinely sincere in their efforts to broaden and deepen the area of international co-operation, should take the lead in declaring the progressiveness and the superiority of their policies and ideals in the councils of the nations. The fact is that the United Nations, through no fault of the freedom-loving states, is becoming a vital field for political warfare. In that warfare we should take the offensive, and should back up that offensive by showing the people on the dark side of the moon that our system works better than theirs for the only purpose worth achieving, the dignity, security and prosperity of the individual man.

This does not mean that because certain states use the United Nations for furthering a selfish and aggressive national policy or for promoting subversive movements, (sometimes the two co-inside) that others need follow this bad example. There could be no quicker way of destroying our international organiza-

tion or weakening our own position inside that organization. We can exalt our own free way of life without being shrill or ill-tempered over that which others choose, or have chosen for them. We can also seek security through the United Nations, without always seeking at the same time international support for every national policy. There can be only one legitimate policy advanced in the assembly of the nations of the world and that is the collective policy of them all, or of as many as are willing to work together for carrying out the peaceful principles of the Charter. If any nation can cover up its own aggressive designs and is able to get support for them by appealing to the hopes or the fears of its fellow members of the United Nations, the organization, as now constituted, is obviously doomed. Even when national policies are non-aggressive and defensive in character, great care should be taken in making the United Nations the instrument for their realization.

ANOTHER RELATED DANGER

There is another and related danger confronting the United Nations; the tendency to use it -- and especially the Security Council -- as a means of avoiding national responsibility for dealing with difficult international situations. It is, I suppose, tempting to shelve this responsibility by putting it on an international organization, but it should not be forgotten that all members of that organization, if they are parties to a dispute, pledge themselves first to seek a solution by negotiation, conciliation or by some other peaceful means before they bring it to the Security Council.

There have been occasions recently when the services of the United Nations should not, I think, have been invoked because the parties mainly concerned with the situation had not exhausted other and direct means of settlement; or because the problem was beyond the present capacity of a new and uncertain organization. On the other hand, there have been occasions when the United Nations should not have been ignored in favour of national action.

DANGER OF EXPLOITATION

There is danger to any international organization if its members base their decisions either to by-pass or to exploit it solely on considerations of immediate national convenience or advantage.

A Greek philosopher surveying the government of his state many centuries ago said "no more good must be attempted than the nation can bear". Surveying the scene at Lake Success today I would suggest "no more good must be attempted than the United Nations can bear".

It may eventually be fatal to the United Nations, if it is asked to accept commitments which it cannot fulfill, because, in the absence of military agreements under the Charter to enforce its decisions, those decisions