

the severance of diplomatic relations, the interruption of communications, an embargo upon trade, and other forms of pressure short of the use of armed force. The security council could call upon all members of the organization to join in the application of such measures.

If sanctions of this nature were still ineffective, the security council could in the last resort require forcible action against the disturber of the peace. In such action, the council would be aided by a military staff committee which would be in charge of plans for the application of armed force. The military staff committee would also have to do with long-term problems concerning the regulation of armaments. Here is another fundamental difference between the proposed organization and the league of nations. The new security organization would be founded on a clear recognition of the fact that world security is based upon the maintenance of a large superiority of power on the side of peace. It is also recognized that machinery would have to be devised to make it possible to apply such power instantly and effectively, should another aggressor arise to disturb international peace.

It will, I am sure, be agreed that peace-loving nations cannot afford to risk a return to conditions which allowed one nation after another to be struck down by an aggressor before concerted action could be organized and taken. Nations have surely learned that they cannot secure their liberties except on an agreed basis of mutual aid. The proposed arrangements with their emphasis on the exploration of peaceful means of settlement, and with organized force in the background to deal with recalcitrants, ought to prevent international disputes from reaching the point of danger. The main function of the police is not to catch criminals, but to make it obvious that crime does not pay. The police do not interfere in the settling of disputes by discussion or litigation, but the police are available if the disputes threaten to lead to the breaking of heads.

The question arises: How would the security council be able to call out forces when the danger point had been reached? Under the present proposals, members of the organization would not be required to place forces under the control of the security council except in accordance with special agreements separately entered into, setting forth the number and types of the forces, and the facilities and assistance which they are prepared to provide. The agreements would limit the military aid, pledged by members, to what each member

was ready to give of its own volition. The agreements might include provisions governing the circumstances in which any forces could be called upon to serve abroad. These agreements would need separate approval in accordance with the constitutional processes of each country. In Canada that would mean approval by parliament before such agreements were ratified.

There is at present a good deal of obscurity about the methods by which this part of the proposals would be developed in practice. One point, however, is clear. As they stand, the acceptance of the proposals would in no way commit Canada to send forces beyond Canadian territory at the call of the security council. If any such commitment were sought, it would be embodied in a later agreement, freely negotiated by the government of Canada, and coming into effect only after it had been approved by parliament.

Provision is also made in the proposals for the use of regional agencies to handle local disputes under the general direction of the security council. The relationship of such regional agencies to the security council is likely to prove one of the important questions which will come up for consideration at San Francisco.

The maintenance of security is only one aspect of the creation of a world society in which peace can take root and flourish. It is not merely the security of nations that is indivisible; prosperity also is indivisible. Few would wish to return to the years before the war when many nations sought economic security in economic isolation. What happened was that the economic security of all nations was destroyed. Now is surely the time for the whole world to realize that just as no nation can ensure its own safety of itself, so no nation or group of nations can ensure its own prosperity in isolation.

In the social, economic and humanitarian activities contemplated under these proposals, which would extend over the whole international field, Canada would be certain to take both a prominent and a useful part. It would be a mistake to think of the world organization as exclusively preoccupied with the prevention of war. Indeed, if the defeat of our enemies brings about a securer world, we may hope that considerations of security will gradually recede into the background, and that progress in the arts of civilization by international cooperation on many fronts will be the first topic and central concern of foreign policy. We should come to think and act, less and less, in terms of force, and, more