

know such concepts as aggression or threats to peace have always been extraordinarily difficult to define to everyone's satisfaction. They are doubly so today, the era of such phenomena as wars of liberation, subversion and neo-colonialism. Everywhere the status quo is under attack, often by violent means. The distinction between the internal and external affairs of states becomes blurred as does the very concept of the legitimacy of authority. The danger of great powers being drawn into local conflicts is increasing. It is understandable that these powers should wish to retain control over U.N. actions which are bound to affect their interests. It is difficult to agree however with the view of the U.S.S.R. that this control, including the detailed supervision of peacekeeping operations, be exercised exclusively by the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee. Even if there was a moratorium on the use of the veto, could we reasonably expect a committee of this membership to run peacekeeping operations without delay, disagreement or deadlock?

I do not think so. I believe the present system whereby the Secretary-General directs peacekeeping under the guidance of the Council is more in keeping with today's blend of political and military realities. No doubt this system might be improved. In particular the Military Staff Committee might be able to do some useful advance planning, including the preparation of a model agreement between the U.N. and contributing governments. It might possibly perform as well some advisory functions during the actual course of an operation. If this were to be done its membership would need to include the countries actually doing the peacekeeping at any one time.