EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

EVALUATION :

Failure of the regional security pacts to restore peace :

In the previous chapter we have discussed how regional security pacts (NATO, SEATO etc) have largely kept themselves either inactive or indifferent to fulfil the responsibility, incumbent upon them, of restoring peace by ironing out the peace-breaking forces in their respective jurisdictions. The states, not only as members of the regional arrangements, but also as members of the U.N. have prime and foremost duty to adhere to the objectives of maintaining international peace and security. The avowed purpose of these security-oriented regional pacts is to maintain peace within a definite area by the members of the pact. The responsibility of checking aggression and restoring peace rests primarily upon the Security Council, but, in case, the Security Council decision is blocked by veto or procedural wrangles and thus causing delay, the members of the regional pact will take enforcement action which would be "consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations." Moreover, according to terms of Article 53, such regional arrangements, except with regard to action to be taken against ex-enemy states, require prior "authorisation of the Security Council" in order to make its enforcement action valid. But contrary to the expectation of the framers of this Charter, the members of the
regional pacts did not utilise these according to the broad and general principles of the U.N. and thereby failed to restore peace. The Commission rightly observed that these alliances like NATO by failing to work under the direction of the U.N. aggravates arms rivalry that makes security through national armed forces so hard to attain.¹

**By-passing the U.N. by regional pacts**

The original idea behind incorporation of the provision of regional arrangements was meant for utilising these for peaceful settlement of disputes and for taking enforcement action during pendency of the action of Security Council, which for the time being might not operate effectively. The framers of the Charter did not foresee break-up of the Great-Power-unanimity which is the keynote of success of Security Council action. Enforcement action to be taken by the regional arrangements, was presumed to be of short duration and mainly of local nature. No idea of eliminating the regional arrangements, from the Security Council authorisation was then cherished by the states, but NATO or WARSAW Pact was expressly designed afterwards to eliminate Security Council authorisation by basing these on Article 51 instead of Articles 52 and 53. In short, the true spirit, if not letters is very much absent from the mode of operation of the regional security pacts, and their overriding tendency and lack of co-operation with the U.N. have become manifestly prominent.

¹ Commission to study the Organisation of Peace. 10th Report, New York, 1953, p.85.
These have attempted to by-pass the U.N. - by not subordinating their activities to this global body resulting in fundamental changes of the relation between the former and the latter.

**Cold war and regional pacts**

Rival nature of these pacts is the outcome of the policies of alignment pursued by both the communist and the non-communist camps. The cold war with its attendant evils spoiled chances of co-operation among the Great Powers necessary for smooth working of the Security Council. Some basic assumptions which lie behind the formation of the regional arrangements under Article 52 are: the U.N. will maintain peace by settlement of difference and the Big Five will never go to war with each other.² These pacts would supplement United Nations collective security machinery and would be subordinated to it. But these were lost in the post-1945 world, and soon the Major Powers deviated from their pledges at San Francisco. They formed two major power blocs and in order to propagate their respective ideology and political system they became interested in the formation of regional security pacts which by their very nature became rival. Soon after 1948, the Western Powers on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other concluded regional security pacts in rapid succession. The cold war has destroyed the "Charter's spirit of co-operative collective effort toward mutual

Domination of the regional pacts by the United States or the Soviet Union.

Two giant states - one the United States and other the Soviet Union are trying to attain supremacy over each other; and in doing so they intend to dominate the world. The Super Power member dominates over her fellow members who are either medium-sized or small powers, assembled in a defensive regional pact. It is an irony that some powers, say Iceland, Norway and Turkey consider their alignment to the N.A.T.O., or more precisely, to the U.S. bloc more in terms of a liability than asset. Commenting on this risky position of Turkey, Professor Mehmet Gonlubal says that "it has become impossible for Turkey to pursue a foreign policy meeting her interests." The U.S. domination of N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and CENTO is so conspicuous and open that she considers herself as the master of these organisations. The member-states, although enjoy legal equality with their 'Masters' in such regional pacts, have virtually, by their considerable dependence on that power in matters relating to defence, have lost almost all their control of defense and foreign policy.

4. Prof. Mehmet Gonlubal quoted by N.YUREV in International Affairs, Moscow, June, 1966.

Foot Note: NATO's important partner as well as one of the Big five - France could not like U.S. domination in NATO and she insisted on greater sovereignty and independence than enjoyed by other members of NATO. French divergence in NATO has been discussed in Chap.III.
The Big Power, not only exercises decisive influence upon military matters, but also upon economic and political ones.

Tendency of the alliances to work independently.

Various suggestions were made by the UN's Collective Measures Committee and by the Commission to study the Organisation of Peace to integrate existing regional pacts more effectively into the peace-keeping machinery of the United Nations.\(^5\)

But, these suggestions, which aim at temporary utilisation of forces under regional organisation by the U.N., were rejected. In the Stettinius Report concession to regionalist pressure was acknowledged, and subsequently, the regional groups, by not placing themselves under overriding control of the Security Council, have pursued their objectives at the expense of world peace.

Prof. Claude has expressed the plain truth that it has been customary since 1945 by the members of the regional arrangements "to provide verbal assurance of their conformity with and subordination to the United Nations Charter." Continuing he stated, "The truth is that regional security agencies have, in fact, acquired an autonomous status, and a much more prominent status, in relation to the United Nations than was envisaged at San Francisco."\(^6\)

The regional security pacts of both the blocs are based on Article 51, instead of Article 53, for initiating enforcement action under the cloak of collective self-defense, but actually with the object of evading Security Council control. Thus, the principles of

---


the U.N. have been undermined. To quote Francis O. Wilcox, "The fact is, however, that the United Nations has been jockeyed into a position of relative inferiority." This position was conversely recognized by Dulles when he stated that regional organizations "do some extent function outside the scope of the United Nations' direct authority." Some delegates at San Francisco visualized independent role of the regional organizations at the expense of world organization [See Foot Note 7]. We see their apprehensions have largely become true.

**Diminishing faith in the United Nations and weakening of the collective security system:**

In view of independent operation of the regional organizations, the whole scheme of collective security, envisaged by the U.N., has been greatly paralysed. The original idea of maintaining international peace and security was through Security Council enforcement action based on Big-Five-unanimity. The Security Council is vested with ultimate authority in this vital matter, but with break-up of unity among the Permanent Members of the Security Council and with blocking of Security Council with veto, the Great Powers have put greater reliance on the regional alliances than on the U.N. system of collective security. [See Foot Note 7]

---

7. Francis O. Wilcox.
8. John Foster Dulles quoted by Francis O. Wilcox.


Foot Note: With adoption of the "Uniting for Peace Resolution" by the General Assembly in 1950, there has been fundamental changes in the relation between the General Assembly and the Security Council. The Soviet Union contested legality of that resolution.
These Great Powers are ideologically divided into non-communist and communist world and by forming rival alliances, they have deviated from their collective security pledges given to the U.N. Thus, the structure of U.N. collective security has been greatly weakened. One may cite the example of Korea where the U.N. for the first time applied collective enforcement action to stop aggression but in Suez, Congo, Cyprus and the Middle East the U.N. action is in the nature of peace-keeping and not collective enforcement. Disregarding the principles of collective security Senator Robert A. Taft asserted, "(We have) ....... no choice except to disregard the United Nations and to develop our own policy of alliances without regard to the non-existent power of the United Nations to prevent aggression."  

**Drawbacks of regional approach to world peace:**

Assertions made by Oswaldo Aranha that regional system would "facilitate the functioning of world system of peace and security" did not materialise. The regional system is based on the false hypothesis that it is precise, certain and limited. In actual practice we find the defects outweigh the merits. First, the difficulty of defining a region counters most — the area of a region may increase from small area to a hemisphere. Second, in the atomic-missile age the concept of regional defense or

---

Foot Note: Even the Korean case is not considered by some authorities as a valid example of U.N.enforcement action. See Clark M. Echelberger - U.N.; The First Twenty Years, Harpu, 1970.  
11. The term 'region' could not be properly defined. For discussion on this point see chapter I.
hemispheric defense has become almost obsolete. The Canadian diplomat Vincent Massey rightly observes that "hemispheric defense" and "continental isolation" have become a myth.\(^\text{12}\) Third, the argument that regional security pacts act as a deterrent is also subject to serious defects. Dulles' assertion that building of "situation of strength" among the allies would facilitate negotiation or discourage aggression is naive. In fact, this makes struggle for deterrent competitive, and in this ever-ending process armament is met by counter-armament.\(^\text{13}\) The consequences of this process would be at best an "uneasy peace" trembling upon a "balance of terror." In the same term Prof. Quincy Wright opines: "While the fear of retaliation is an important deterrent, it may not suffice to prevent war if power political rivalries continue with mounting tensions."\(^\text{14}\) The pretension made by Western Powers that NATO acts as a deterrent to check Soviet expansion could not be substantiated. The NATO could not solve the problem of Berlin blockade. In other conflicts (Say, Vietnam, the Middle East and so on) Western policy of detente failed to serve any useful purpose.\(^\text{15}\) Fourth, in view of divergent interests of members in an alliance, cohesiveness of the alliance suffers. We have already noted French divergence in NATO in the non-communist

\(^\text{12}\) Vincent Massey - Canada and the Inter-American System, Foreign Affairs, April, 1948.
\(^\text{14}\) Quincy Wright - Problems of Stability and Progress in International Relations, Uni. of California, 1954, pp.312,330.

Foot Note: In Vietnam, U.S. applied "the strategy of double-deterrent" but this signalised failure, and peace was restored through peaceful negotiation and signed in Paris in January, 1973.
bloc. Recently, after the Arab-Israeli War (Octo, 1973) the European members and specially Britain and West Germany did not lend their support to the U.S. The rift between Europe and the U.S. is becoming wider day by day. Similar instances could be drawn from the Communist bloc; Albania's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact, Hungary's revolt against the Soviet Union and China's divergence deserve mention. Fifth, in regional approach to peace, overlapping of membership (Turkey in NATO and CENTO) and gaps (Kashmir, neither covered by CENTO nor SEATO) are bound to occur. Last, but not the least, regional approach to peace becomes generally divorced from a just and stable world order. Accordingly, Sir Oliver Franks advocates that "regional approach to peace should keep in focus the long-range goal of world order," otherwise it becomes compartmentalised and narrow.

World peace: a matter of universal concern.

We have already noted that peace is really a matter of universal concern, for, we cannot compartmentalise peace for Europe, Asia, the Middle East and so on. Although trouble may start in a small area, that apparently insignificant matter sometimes develops into a major international problem. The Korean war of 1950 is cited as a local war but it continued for three years having wide international implications. Berlin, Cyprus,

15. For "U.S. - British rift" see International Herald Tribune, Feb.5, 1974, pp.1,2.
16. Sir Oliver Franks quoted by Francis O. Wilcox, Ibid.
Lebanon, Vietnam, and Cuba are such issues which did not confine in a limited area. Both NATO and Warsaw Pact have failed to solve the problem of Berlin, for last twenty-five years, in the context of reunification of Germany.\textsuperscript{17} The Cuban crisis of 1962 led the world to the brink of war which was averted by prompt negotiation conducted by the U.N. Secretary General.\textsuperscript{18} The long-drawn Vietnam war which threatened international peace adds another scar to regional approach to the problem. World peace implies a just and progressive outlook for peaceful solution of internation disputes and also an workable scheme for disarmament. Moreover, it implies freedom from political and economic domination. These essential factors could be effectively mobilised only on an universal scale.\textsuperscript{19}

**Unilateral action by Great Powers**:

The Five Great Powers had been given special status in the Security Council and each of them could bloc any action of the Security Council by applying "veto".\textsuperscript{7} They were given also special responsibility to maintain international peace and security by achieving unanimity among themselves. But, simultaneous with failure to achieve anticipated unanimity, they began to move in opposite directions and thus

---

\textsuperscript{17} Recently, Four Power Agreement, Sept. 1971, on Berlin has been reached for mutual transit and other facilities, but Berlin still remains divided. Moreover, the two German States e.g. F.R.G., and GDR are admitted as Members of the U.N.


\textsuperscript{19} See discussion on Regionalism versus Universalism in Chap. 1. Foot Note: With admission of the Republic of China as a Permanent Member in place of Nationalist China (Taiwan) the structure of the Security Council has changed; the other Four are U.K., France, U.S. and USSR.
undermined the general cause of peace. They paid lip service
to the principles of the U.N. and were motivated by narrow and
selfish interests. Sometimes, their selfish policies were enve­
doped in some so-called doctrines (Truman Doctrine and Eisen­hower
Doctrine of the U.S., and Brezhnev Doctrine of the Soviet Union)
in order to attribute some semi-international status. Based
upon these doctrines, the Powers carried on their interventions
(U.S. intervention in Lebanon, Soviet intervention in Hungary)
not only against the principles of the U.N. but also against
the wishes of the intervened states. These interventions are
made not for fulfilling the principles of the U.N. but for indi­
vidual politico-strategic interests of the Powers. This led to
tension, rivalry and breach of peace.

Evil consequences of regionalism.

The evil consequences of regionalism start from the
wrong approach in the field of defense and other related matters.
The regional security pacts wants to establish a defense zone
against the possible aggressor by instilling a sense of security
among the occupants of this zone. But with the development of
the idea of a global strategy in the struggle for power, the so­
called margin of safety (or security) afforded by the defense
zone has become illusory. The area of conflict may not be
limited strictly to the area demarcated as defense zone and
Powers outside the zone may also be involved. We have seen
regionalism in the field of security accelerates armament race
for attaining superiority in armament. The evil consequences of
armament race have been pointed out in an interesting study of the U.N. In his forward, the Secretary General of the U.N. rightly observed that the arms race should be checked otherwise it "would bring man's own ultimate destruction." The armament race is carried out at the cost of socio-economic development. Last, with the development of nuclear weapons and inter-continental balistic missiles (ICBM), the problem has become graver than ever. Nuclear physicists have given stern warning against full-scale nuclear warfare. Such a warfare would be total one and very few would survive harmful radiation effects.

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, we make the following suggestions, so that, regional organisations may play a proper role in their anticipated function of maintaining international peace and security.

Revision of the U.N. Charter for clarification of the ambiguities and adaptation to the changed set-up.

The need for revision of the Charter has been recognised by the Charter Review Conference according to the General Assembly Resolution of 1963. The members at the San Francisco Conference


could not foresee these difficulties which developed in the changed situation. See Foot Note 7.

The chapter on Regional Arrangement (Articles 52-54) has been badly drafted and gives scope of large amount of ambiguity. Kelsen rightly holds that an acceptable interpretation is necessary in determining the exact role of the regional arrangement in the matter of world peace. Moreover, the exact relationship between the regional arrangement and the United Nations requires clarification, so that, the former cannot deviate from its focus of maintaining international peace. In the present circumstances, Article 107 which provides for enforcement action against ex-enemy states (Germany or Japan) has become obsolete and should be deleted. Moreover, the exact scope of operation of self-defense pact under Article 51 is to be distinguished from regional arrangement (for self defense) formed under Article 52. Provision for functional (economic) organizations is to be specifically stated. The veto system should be revised, so that, shift towards General Assembly is made. Some items should be outside the scope of veto.

Some suggestions for revision limiting the scope of regional arrangements:

The following suggestions are made, so that, the

Foot Note: There had already been changes in the composition of the non-permanent and permanent members of the Security Council. The number of non-permanent members had been increased to 10, and China (Peking) had been admitted to the Security Council as a permanent member.

22. Hans Kelsen, Ibid.

23. See Chapter II for discussion on this point.
regional organisations can smoothly run as a complimentary body of the U.N. in the matter of maintaining international peace and security.

1. Regional Arrangements (Security and political)\textsuperscript{24} should be permitted to be formed only under Articles 52\textsuperscript{25} and 53, and before formation these would secure prior permission of the U.N. with which those should be registered.

2. Article 51 should not be interpreted to form a regional arrangement, self-defense under Article 51 should be distinguished from \textit{regional self-defense} (See Foot Note).\textsuperscript{7}

3. Regional defense system should be a part of the collective security system of the U.N. and subordinated to it. Full information regarding military strength and other details should be supplied to the U.N. regularly.

4. Non-members should not be party to a regional arrangement except with prior permission from the General Assembly determined by two-thirds majority.

5. Regional Organisations should each year make a report

\textsuperscript{24} Regional security arrangements having machinery for economic cooperation also should be treated as security arrangements.

\textsuperscript{25} Hans Kelsen, on Article 52, Ibid.

Foot Note: Self defense under Article 51 should be meant for imminent "attack" and having no permanent structural set-up, but regional arrangement (for defense) is concluded against a potential enemy and having permanent organisational machinery.
of its activities to the General Assembly of the U.N."26 The
General Assembly, may by two-thirds vote either approve or reject
the report. In case, the activities of the regional organisa-
tion are found to be inconsistent with the purposes and prin-
ciples of the U.N. Charter, the General Assembly, by a special
session, may by two-thirds vote dissolve that.

Supremacy of the U.N; Spirit of universality:

It is an undeniable fact that the supremacy of the
U.N. as the spirit of universality should be established as
embodied in the U.N. Charter itself for the purpose of building
a better world visualised by the delegates at San Francisco. At
appropriate places of the regional pacts, the members have up-
held the supremacy of the U.N. in the field of international
peace and security, but in actual practice their actions failed
to strengthen the United Nations in the strenuous task of achie-
v ing world peace. The crying need of our time is to strengthen
the United Nations not only in words but also in deeds. The
objectives of the U.N. are not to stop world war but to estab-
lish world order. It has been rightly asserted by Prof. Quincy
Wright that through efficient organisation of the world authority,
a perfect world order would be established.27 The supremacy of
the U.N. has been asserted by the late Secretary General Dag
Hammerskjold in June, 1954 when he pointed out that although
regional arrangements were encouraged by the U.N., that should,

26. Lester B. Pearson - Canada and the North Atlantic Alliance,
Foreign Affairs, April, 1949.
in no manner, usurp or jeopardise "the ultimate responsibility of the U.N." In the same vein, the Peruvian delegate on Sept. 15, 1954, affirmed the spirit of universality of the U.N. It is through the United Nations the forces of peace find their feasible expression and as such the supremacy of the U.N. is to firmly established. This has been clearly emphasised by the U.N. Secretary General: "The purpose of the United Nations is to add strength to the forces of common interest, as expressed in the Charter and the consensus of member nations, in the task of peace-making and peace-building." The Commission to study the organisation of Peace in its Tenth Report strongly advocated strengthening the United Nations.

Great Powers and international co-operation:

We have noted earlier that the Great Powers are endowed with special status in the Security Council. It was assumed they would maintain unanimity in the matter of initiating enforcement action envisaged by the U.N. But, anticipated results did not follow due to lack of agreement between the Great Powers. And the Great Powers have also special responsibility in the matter of maintaining international peace and working towards international co-operation. They must be willing and sincere to hold the heavy burden. They should discard narrow national interests (Case of

29. U.N.G.A., 14th ORs.
Anglo-French intervention in Suez in 1956, or Berlin blockade by the Soviet Union in 1948) and work according to the broad and just principles which bind the community of states. They must pave the way for international cooperation for stabilising world peace.

Although divergence developed between them in political and security fields, they have extended their sphere of cooperation in the non-political fields. A greater emphasis in the non-political field should be there, so that, the edge of 'the political' may be softened and scope for greater cooperation among the Big Powers in the political field may be widened. Thus, stress should also be placed on "functional" approach to peace [See Foot Note].

Realising the dangers of atomic warfare, the conflicting ideological blocs found it wise to devise ways, so that, states with different social systems could peacefully live. It became the object of study by the U.N. in 1961, for codifying the principles of Peaceful Co-existence which according to Western terminology was stated as "Friendly Relations and Co-operation Among States." This is a move in the right direction and even though their drafts differ, they have certain points in common.

Foot Note: The advocates of "functional" approach to peace rely on this for solving political issues.


Future role of regional arrangements:

The regional principle was welded into the universal one by the makers of the Charter at San Francisco, but they never meant a dominant and overriding role of the regional organisation. They justly expected that the regional system would act as an adjunct to the universal system of world peace. But in the light of the past experience we find the regional system has destroyed the fabric of peace contemplated by the United Nations. So, the regional organisations must reform their present mode of operation and adhere to the spirit of the San Francisco Conference. Their aim must focus the long-range goal of world-peace and international co-operation. The regional organisations should, therefore, act as a complimentary body to the U.N., be subordinated to the superior authority of the world organisation, and act according to the spirit of the world organisation. Its enforcement action would be temporary till the Security Council takes up the case and, in no case, should disturb peace by making unilateral use of force. Its reliance on ideology and armament is to be reduced. [See Foot Note.]

Abolition of two faces of regionalism:

The regional security pacts of both the communist and non-communist orbit have loudly professed peaceful aims and loyalty to the U.N. Charter. They have denounced aggressive designs and

Foot Note: Compared with 1950, the world in 1974 is not rigid bipolar. Ideological sharpness between the two blocs has greatly blurred and the two blocs have now largely become interdependent giving rise to modified bi-polarity. But it should be remembered that although detente between the United States and the Soviet Union has been established, the "bipolar alliance system" would continue. For the bi-polar alliance system see Francois Duchene - Europe's Role in World Peace in Richard Mayne (ed.) Europe Tomorrow (London; Fontana, 1972) p.39.
have put the label of defense. A reading of the pact (NATO or Warsaw Pact) would leave the reader with the impression that each of these pacts has nothing wrong or incompatibility with the U.N. system of maintaining international peace. But in their operation both of these pacts have not only undermined the U.N. approach to world peace, but also challenged the superior authority of the U.N. (cases of U.S. intervention in Cuba in 1962, in Dominican Republic in 1965; and Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956, and in Czechoslovakia in 1968). In other words, the Great Powers - the United States (through the OAS) and the Soviet Union (through the WTO) have taken unilateral action and have used these regional organisations as instruments for retaining their individual hegemony in the bloc. This is in contradiction to the professed aims of the regional pacts. The regional pacts in their actual operation do not conform to the principles of the U.N. and peaceful aims \( \text{See Foot Note}\). The two faces — one in letters and the other in spirit — of regional pacts must be abolished. Regional pacts in their actual operation must sustain the general principle of international peace envisaged by the U.N. The spirit must correspond to the letters.

This is not applicable to the regional organisations of the uncommitted nations, the Arab League or the Organisation

Foot Note: Some NATO-members—the United States, United Kingdom, and Portugal are major trading partners with the illegal regime in South Rhodesia in defiance of sanctions imposed by the Security Council resolution 253 of 1968. See, U.N.Monthly Chronicle, May 1972, p.7. The Soviet Union did not co-operate with U.N.Secretary General in the case of Hungary. doc A/3403, and A/3592. See previous discussions in Chaps.III and VII.
of African Unity (OAU). There is no fundamental difference in aims and aspirations of this group with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. They have adhered their loyalty solely to the United Nations not only in words, but also in deeds. There is close cooperation between the activities of the United Nations and those of the OAU. The U.N. Secretary General made extensive consultations with the OAU on various issues — liberation movement, Rhodesia, and apartheid — of Africa. The Secretary General commended complimentary role of the OAU in the matter of U.N. scheme of maintaining international peace and security.

In fine, the relation between the regional organisation and the U.N. should be close, co-operative and complimentary, as between the OAU and the U.N.

Strengthening collective security system of the U.N.

Present working of the regional security arrangements of the communist and the non-communist bloc has put the U.N. system of collective security at its lower web. The world organisation cannot make effective progress without proper working of an universal system of collective security based on broad and just principles. As alternate to collective security, regional security pacts were organised but these produced tensions, mutual suspicion, and arms race.

The U.N. scheme of maintaining world peace is through

institutionalisation of collective security which according to U.S. Secretary of State is an indispensable factor for world peace. In U.N., operation of collective security is dependent upon unanimity of the Five Permanent Members. In other words, 'veto' by any Permanent Member could bloc collective enforcement action of the Security Council [See Foot Note 7]. The veto power in this respect should be made limited, so that it does not block operation of collective security.37

Collective security has been defined by George Schwarzenberger "as a machinery for joint action in order to prevent or counter any attack against an established international order."38 In view of some ambiguities in this definition we would suggest that collective security should be applied for defending just and progressive rights (it is inapplicable for defending colonial rights). The dynamic role of the collective security is to be established in the international field, otherwise, it would fail to correspond to the needs and aspirations of the developing nations. It must aspire for peaceful change and not merely defend status quo.39 Effective collective security presupposes that political climate of the world which is vitiated by ideological division should be vitalised by putting emphasis

Foot Note: A Great Power applies veto for invalidating Security Council action, (Soviet veto in the Hungarian issue) when her use of force has threatened international peace.

37. Commission to Study the ... Peace, 10th Report, Ibid, p.30. See also previous discussion on amendment of the Charter.
on the principles of peaceful co-existence. We agree with Thompson that powers must settle their vital interests, and the supporters of collective security must have willingness and power to achieve overwhelming strength. In the U.N., Collective security operates through the Military Staff Committee (Article 47) which should be vitalised and provisions should be made for setting up of a Permanent U.N. Force under Chapter VII of the Charter.

Some authorities are critical of the U.N. system of collective security, but the deficiencies of the U.N. system should be compensated by an active programme of international co-operation. Maxwell Cohen suggests that a system of legal norms would facilitate international co-operation, but these would not be enough. These should be supplemented by moral restraint and earnest endeavours by states with the aim of establishing "an orderly harmonious international community." Emphasising indispensable role of collective security Clark M. Echelberger rightly opines that "the world cannot have peace without such system."

40. Ibid.

41. Commission to Study ... Peace, Ibid. p.37.


44. Commission to Study ... Peace, Ibid, p.83.

45. Clark M. Echelberger, Ibid, pp.21, 22.
Focus of regional pacts on international equilibrium and a stable world order:

In the last analysis, we conclude that regional security pacts, by weakening the principles of the U.N. and of the collective security system of the U.N. have failed to establish a stable and just world order. On the other hand, these regional security pacts have established a delicate equilibrium which is always unstable and dangerous. Even the good effects of detente (U.S.-USSR, detente) are neutralised by mistrust, tension and armament race. Detente is no substitute for peace and international co-operation,\(^{46}\) for it attempts to strengthen Big Power hegemony and/or bipolar pattern in disguise.

Free and uncontrolled operation of these regional military pacts have, in the past, produced violent disruptions in the international society leading to tensions and wars. We believe these pacts would not, in future, eradicate these evils unless these are subordinated to the superior authority of the world organisation. We aim to make a world peaceful and prosperous where all the nations could participate in a spirit of friendly co-operation. This requires a stable international equilibrium, but that could not be established without superior controlling power of the world organisation (the U.N.) over the regional security organisations. As such, the world organisation should be vitalised by transferring a minimum authority to it for the

purpose of establishing international peace and fostering international co-operation. It has been rightly emphasised by Prof. Quincy Wright that the U.N. reflects this spirit of universality and only by developing the principle of universality, progress towards peace and peaceful co-existence could be made. This principle of universality could be best developed through the U.N., and it is through the U.N. the international community as a whole can opt for survival, justice and progress with the participation of all nations. In this challenging task the regional pacts have a part to play. They must channelise their efforts towards universality for it is through universality a stable and just world order could be established. They can best serve the mankind if they are based upon justice and not upon power.

47. Quincy Wright - Maintaining Peaceful Co-existence in Preventing World War III, Some Proposals (Ed. Quincy Wright), New York, 1962, p.415. See also his Problems of Stability and Progress in International Relations, Uni.of California, 1954.