

PROTECT THE UNITED NATIONS FROM ITS FRIENDS

William E. Moran, Jr.

People and organizations that strongly support the United Nations have, in recent weeks and months offered proposals and suggestions which cause concern. It has been suggested, for example, that the United Nations should involve itself in the Vietnam controversy with a peace-keeping force, that United States forces should be withdrawn as quickly as possible and be replaced by a United Nations force. Since the unilateral declaration of independence by Rhodesia, there have been suggestions in America and abroad that the United Nations should take action in that controversy. Suggestions of this sort bring to mind the old saw, "Oh, Lord, protect me from my friends, I can take care of my enemies myself."

Friends of the United Nations interested in strengthening it and making it a more effective force for peace in the world should give more consideration to its capacity and limitations. An admirable starting point is the book, *Crisis in the Congo, a U.N. Force in Action*, by Ernest Lefever (Brookings Institution, 215 pp., \$1.95). Here, Mr. Lefever has carefully analyzed the peace-keeping efforts of the United Nations in the Congo from 1960-64. In a remarkably brief compass, he provides a detailed picture of the way in which the problem in the Congo evolved, how the United Nations became involved, how its mandate was developed, what it did, and what success it had. The book raises the question of whether the United Nations, as now constituted and supported, is capable of engaging in complex peace-keeping operations of such a nature and, therefore, the extent to which it is reasonable to consider turning other such problems over to the United Nations.

The United Nations operation in the Congo was so thoroughly covered in the world's press and other mass media that many of us do not, even yet, have a very good idea as to what actually happened; we were so deluged with fact and fancy, allegation and counter-allegation, that we have not been able to see the forest for the trees. Mr. Lefever has now made available a remedy for that. His book is based on an analysis of primary sources, including interviews with many of the people who were involved

Mr. Moran, Dean of the School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, is President of the Catholic Association for International Peace.

in the Congo operation. His analysis was made in the light of United States policy and the United Nations and his conclusions must be viewed in that context. He concludes:

"The Congo peace-keeping effort was a novel, controversial and a less than efficient enterprise. It sometimes fumbled. It made many small mistakes. It was assailed on all sides. It precipitated a financial crisis for the United Nations. But in the final analysis, the United Nations force must be judged by its contribution to international stability, regardless of what other interests it might have served. So judged, the mission succeeded. It contributed to peace and security in central Africa and in the wider world.

"As the largest and most complex internationally authorized and administered operation in history, the Congo peace-keeping effort is rich in lessons and warnings for the future."

One of the lessons which can be read from this analysis is that the use of United Nations peace-keeping forces in a clear-cut situation to keep opposing sides from overt conflict and in compliance with a clear United Nations directive as in the United Nations Middle East force is something quite distinct from the attempt to impose peace within a country. In the latter case, one is faced by disagreements on the part of the various members of the United Nations as to what steps, in fact, ought to be taken or ought not to be taken. In a very interesting passage in his book, Mr. Lefever refers to the broad and vague mandate and severely limited authority with which the Secretary General approached the challenge in the Congo. He notes that the Secretary General repeatedly sought clarification of the mandate from the Security Council or the General Assembly with little success. He reports that United Nations members were not alone divided between proponents and opponents of the Congo mission itself, but that the supporters themselves did not agree on the application of the mandate to specific problems. He concludes, "they often agreed only that something ought to be done." He points out continually through the report the special limitations on an international force and compares it to a national force, or a local police force.

Foreign Policy and the Democratic Process

Max Beloff. Johns Hopkins. 144 pp. \$1.45 (paper).
 In a series of lectures delivered to an American university audience in 1954, Professor Beloff, an Oxford historian, discussed the problems and practice—especially in the U.S.—of democratic foreign-policy making. These lectures are now available in a paperback edition with a new epilogue contributed by the author.

Perspective in Foreign Policy

Charles E. Osgood, author & publisher. 62 pp. 50 cents (paper).
 Dr. Osgood is a psychologist in the field of communications who has served as consultant to the Air Force, the Navy, and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. He describes here, as in his earlier work *An Alternative to War and Surrender*, a strategy of "calculated de-escalation" known by its initials as GRIT, and he relates this strategy to America's Vietnam policy.

Soviet Disarmament Policy 1917-1963

Walter C. Clemens, Jr., compiler. Hoover Institution. 151 pp. \$4.
 Dr. Clemens, of the MIT faculty, has compiled an annotated bibliography of over 800 primary and secondary sources which are intended to provide "the widest possible familiarity with ideol-

logical, political, military and technical factors" affecting Soviet disarmament policy. Although many Russian language publications are cited, Communist English language publications and Western and U.N. sources are widely represented.

The Vietnam Reader

Marcus G. Reskin & Bernard B. Fall, eds. Random House. 415 pp. \$5.95/\$2.45.

This is a far-reaching, well-rounded collection of articles, speeches and documents on "the war in Vietnam per se and . . . its relationship to the continuing crisis in American foreign policy." Government leaders on both sides, "interested" foreign "bystanders" and American observers are among those whose views are aired here. *There are a useful chronology and bibliography.*

The Decision to Drop the Bomb

Len Giovanniti & Fred Freed. Coward-McCann. 348 pp. \$6.00.
 The authors have written a "political history" of the 117 days which preceded the Hiroshima bombing when American officials and scientists, and a new President, "wrestle[d] with the problem of whether or how to use the new weapon." Concurrent developments in Japan are reconstructed, too, from a variety of sources, including memoirs and extensive personal interviews.

By special arrangement with the Foreign Policy Association, readers of worldview may obtain any book published in the United States (except paperbacks) from the FPA's World Affairs Book Center, at the publisher's list price. Post free for domestic orders only. Send orders with check or money order to Desk WV, World Affairs Book Center, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

worldview
 volume 9, no. 1 / January 1966

WORLDVIEW is published monthly (except for a combined July-August issue) by the Council on Religion and International Affairs
 Subscription: \$4.00 per year.
 Address: 170 East 64th Street, New York, New York 10021

EDITORIAL BOARD

James Finn, Editor
 A. William Loos
 William J. Cook
 John R. Inman
 Charles Frankel
 Editorial Assistant, Susan Woolfson

worldview
 170 East 64th Street
 New York, N.Y. 10021

Return requested



NON-PROFIT ORG.
 U. S. POSTAGE
Paid
 New York, N. Y.
 Permit No. 609

CONTENTS

A Crisis of Credibility 1
Editorial

In the Magazines 2

Notes on the Dialogue 4
Thomas Molnar

Christianity and Atheism: A Dialogue? 8
Peter J. Riga

BOOKS

Protect the United Nations from Its Friends 13
William E. Moran, Jr.

Current Reading 16

Opinions expressed in WORLDVIEW are those of the authors, and not necessarily of the Council on Religion and International Affairs. Copyright © 1966 Council on Religion and International Affairs.

Readers are reminded that worldview welcomes correspondence. Letters may be specific comments on articles in recent issues or general discussion, but readers are requested to limit their letters to 500 words.