

The most obvious answer to that question is that no government within the United Nations has, so far as I am aware, opposed the general idea of United Nations intervention of the type described. Not one of the peace-keeping operations which have been undertaken by the United Nations could have been initiated without the tacit support of the majority of the members and the active support of a significant number of states willing to contribute in terms of political negotiation, men, materials and money.

The difficulties of obtaining great-power agreement, the complexities of the local situations requiring peace-keeping action and the doubts of some members that they stood to benefit directly, may have affected the views of some governments which have not contributed much on the financial side. There are, however, important reasons of national interest which, in the long run, support peace keeping.

Dag Hammarskjöld pointed out, quite rightly, that it was the unaligned nations, those nations not protected by membership in some relatively stable power system, which would derive the greatest benefit and sense of security from a vigorous United Nations. We talk now of making a world safe for diversity, of having differing political systems, various regional alliances and a multiplicity of sovereign states exist together without the threat of annihilation, disastrous conflict or continual friction. This objective has evident appeal for newer nations, which are anxious both to preserve newly-found sovereignty against any rude intervention by force and to get on with economic development. The United Nations cannot give them any categorical assurances as to such conditions, but it is one institution to which they can turn for help of all kinds without commitment to blocs or political systems.

These calculations of national interest reinforce long-term support for peace keeping, so far as many states are concerned. In addition, the United States and Britain give peace keeping their active support, and a number of middle powers, of which Canada is one, are willing to use those elements of strength and security in their own positions to advance United Nations interests.

We come, therefore, to another fundamental question about peace keeping, that concerning its actual effectiveness on the spot. Here I should like to remind you of the very considerable differences between various types of peace-keeping action. The disputes over the financing of major operations, involving the movement of armed forces into the Middle East in 1956 and the Congo in 1960, have tended to focus attention on action of this type. We are, therefore, inclined to forget what has been done by groups of unarmed military observers or by other missions manifesting the United Nations presence under conditions of great tension. Peace keeping in Lebanon in 1958, for example, involved the very effective use of observers. The conception, execution and termination of the task showed how decisively the world community could manifest its presence in helping to achieve stability. Other observation and truce-supervision missions in the Middle East and Kashmir have rendered important assistance in ending hostilities.