

I went on:

Nations, in their search for peace and co-operation, will not and cannot accept indefinitely an unaltered council which was set up to ensure their security, and which, so many feel, has become frozen in futility and divided by dissension. If forced, they may seek greater safety in an association of democratic and peace-loving states willing to accept more specific international obligations in return for a greater measure of national security. Such associations, it has already been pointed out, if consistent with the principles and purposes of the charter, can be formed within the United Nations. It is to be hoped that such a development will not be necessary. If it is unnecessary, it will be most undesirable. If, however, it is made necessary, it will have to take place.

Let us not forget that the provisions of the charter are a floor under, rather than a ceiling over, the responsibilities of member states. If some prefer to go even below that floor, others need not be prevented from moving upwards.

Two or more apartments in the structure of peace are undoubtedly less desirable than one family of nations dwelling together in amity, undivided by curtains, or even more substantial pieces of political furniture. They are however to be preferred to the alternative of wholly separate structures.

This, you may say, is defeatism of the worst kind. It is not. It is merely sober realism.

During the months which followed there had been disturbing developments in eastern Europe, and very disturbing developments in the security council. These had been and were continuing to be demonstrations of the fact that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and their satellites did not intend or expect the United Nations to perform any useful function, unless it were the function of enabling them to extend their influence and domination. Everything else was blocked by the veto. Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Roumania, Yugoslavia, and then Czechoslovakia and many others, had seen their free democratic institutions ruthlessly crushed out of existence. Methods which had succeeded in those countries were being resorted to in Greece, in Italy and in France; and the upholders of genuine democracy were seeing with alarm that chaos being fostered and extended in their countries as an organ to bring about the kind of constitutional changes of which we have seen so many terrible and consequential examples.

This fateful march of events had made it unmistakably clear that the soviet union was a threat to peace and security -- directly, or according to the size of its armed forces, and indirectly, by its support of communist parties in countries which had not yet been driven into the soviet orbit.

Its record of international co-operation for peace was a bleak one. Ever since the San Francisco conference the soviet union has insisted that all measures for assuring and enforcing peace should be agreed to in the first instance by the security council in which it has a veto. It has refused to participate in almost all the international organizations set up under the aegis of the United Nations. It has refused to join the food and agricultural organization, the international refugee organization, the international labour organization, UNESCO, the international monetary fund, the international civil aviation organization, and the proposed international trade organization. It had spurned almost all the organizations set up for international co-operation in which it could not use the veto.