

Here again, however, the split between East and West, aided by the veto in the Security Council - which must pass on all applicants for membership - has blocked off the desired end. There are 14 nations applying for membership whom the Western nations would like to vote in. Among them are such important European states as Italy, Portugal, Ireland and Finland; such important Asian states as Japan, Ceylon and Jordan. There are seven states, all Communist, whom the Soviet Union is pushing for membership. Up to the present, Russia has continued to blackball our candidates and we have paid her back by blackballing hers. (The case of Communist China is not included here. Clearly, such membership cannot be considered so long as Red China is at war with the U.N.) So a stalemate exists on the matter of membership. While it exists, the need of the U.N. to attain universality is being ignored. This, too, must be accounted another U.N. failure.

What About Collective Security?

At this point it is necessary to look at what some regard as the U.N.'s worst failure, and what certainly is its most controversial aspect. That is its effort to provide collective security for its members against the danger of war.

There are 111 articles in the Charter of the United Nations. Of these, articles 33 to 54 inclusive provide for the settlement of disputes between nations. These are the "collective security" articles, and many will say that they constitute the essence of the U.N. It was to set up this system of guaranteeing peace for its members, they insist, that the U.N. was formed. And if the system outlined in these articles is not working, then the U.N. is not working. The whole thing is a failure and a fraud.

Oh yes, they will admit, the U.N. may be doing any number of other admirable things. It may be relocating refugees and protecting the rights of natives in African jungles and showing Pakistan farmers how to head off another wheat crop failure. All these enterprises are good, but they are not vital. Vital, that is, to the future of the U.N. and of world peace. Nor are they vital to the security of the United States. The United Nations will be judged by its ability to protect its members from another world war. It will stand or fall by its ability to provide collective security.

When men talk this way they generally have in mind, in speaking of collective security, military security. They picture the United Nations as a great alliance in which the member-nations pool their military strength to keep the world's peace. Such an alliance would be so strong, if it held together, that no potential aggressor would dare challenge it. Aggression would be fore-doomed to defeat, and so probably would never be tried. If it were tried, it would be sternly suppressed at the point where it occurred, and so would not develop into a world war. That, it is said, is what the U.N. is supposed to do. If it doesn't do this, it is worthless.

(Strangely enough, many Americans who have talked in this way about the responsibility of the U.N. to provide collective military security have been most bitter in their criticisms of the U.N. for the heavy losses in Korea. That was one instance in which the U.N. tried to work in the way it is said it should. It did so successfully, at least to the