

democracy. But the debate should also consider what would happen if the Members of the United Nations did not support the solemn Resolutions of the Security Council.

This is not a war fought for narrow national interests. It is a war fought for global principle. That is a profound change, a profound difference from the past. This conflict is about the principle that unprovoked aggression has ceased to be acceptable as an instrument of national ambition. This conflict is about building an international order where that principle is not simply declared -- and then ignored; but acted upon -- and then secured. This conflict is about making the United Nations the singular instrument of that order. This conflict is not about the war that now rages but the peace that will follow.

Old ideas and old realities die hard. Our old thoughts have not caught up with the new reality. And so, we fail to recognize change and thus deny opportunity.

We see that now in some attitudes about the United Nations. Because we have been used to a UN that talked -- and talked and talked some more -- some find strange a UN that can act. Indeed, some seem to reject a UN that can act. That attitude reflects an old reality which no longer applies. For decades the UN could not act -- and therefore could only talk -- because its members did not believe in the institution they themselves had created after the Second World War. The Cold War crippled the UN and turned what could have been a crucible of peace into a seminar in semantics. It was ignored and enfeebled by great powers who proceeded to conduct themselves as great powers always had -- unilaterally and often by force. In facing aggression, the best the UN could do was to develop the practice of peacekeeping, a practice which did not deter conflict or reverse it but simply picked up the pieces once the bloodshed was over. The UN became an auditor of aggression concluded, not an agency of aggression avoided.

And so some have equated peacekeeping to the UN, as if to say the UN should do no better. They see the UN as a place where people should talk about peace but not make peace, a place for blandishment not accomplishment. But that's not what the Charter says. That's not what the authors of the Charter wanted. They wanted an agency of action, a place where the countries of the world could gather to seek peace and, if that search failed, to make peace. The architects of the UN had had enough of talk; they had had enough of bloodshed which resulted from aggression undeterred; they had had enough of international organizations which had become excuses for inaction.

The end of the Cold War has liberated the UN from the divisions which prejudiced its purpose. We now have a UN that