Only the return of National Leaders to their own countries has enabled the United Nations to settle down quietly to its business. While the Leaders were there the United Nations represented a great propaganda forum where there was little scope for solid discussions.

So far as the Australians were concerned there has been great controversy over the activities of the Prime Minister, and if we were to read the Australian papers during the time our Prime Minister was at the United Nations we might feel that what was done there represented or absorbed the major part of the United Nations' time.

Since the Prime Minister's amendment which was moved to a five-power resolution asking Mr. Kruschev and Mr. Eisenhower to meet was defeated, publicity in Australia seems to have centred around nothing else. It is perhaps because of this publicity that in many minds this matter has gone right out of perspective as far as our relations with other countries are concerned.

The amendment to the five power neutralist resolution was moved by our Prime Minister because he thought it was wrong that anything should be done that might tend to polarise present world conflict between two countries - Russia and America. It is not a good thing for people to get in their minds, that the struggle is between Russian Communism and America as the sole bastion of democracy. The rest of us are not idle onlookers. Furthermore those countries which, since the last war, have known as the Big Four have played a vital part in world affairs, and since these four atomic powers are ones who can do most to relieve world tension, if agreement can be reached between them, the Prime Minister thought that a conference of the Four - Britain, France, America and Russia - would be much more useful than just a meeting between Mr. Kruschev and Mr. Eisenhower amidst the American Presidential campaign - a campaign in which Mr. Eisenhower is not a candidate but rather a man who will be fading from office in a few weeks' time. Surely it is much better and much saner to begin negotiations with a man who is firmly in the saddle for a full four years rather than with one who has but four weeks to go.

It is not generally realized that at the time the Prime Minister moved his amendment to the five-power resolution the Argentine had fore-shadowed a further amendment and that many of the people who did not vote for the Australian amendment abstained for the simple reason that they knew they were going to support the Argentinian amendment. This was one of the reasons why Australia only mustered five votes.
However, it should not be forgotten that if Australia only mustered five votes, the votes were pretty good ones to have—America, Canada, France, the United Kingdom and her own.

The main criticism that seems to be offered to what has been done is the effect this may have on our relationship with Asian countries. As far as I can see this fact has been grossly overplayed. Some of the Indian newspapers, and notably the Times of India, have attacked Mr. Nehru in very much the same terms as the Sydney Morning Herald used for our Prime Minister. The Times of India attacked Mr. Nehru for the angry and intemperate way in which he spoke to Mr. Menzies' amendment. It also attacked Mr. Nehru for the substance of what he was trying to do.

However, quite apart from this, the publicity that this measure has achieved in Australia has given it an importance in many Australian minds quite out of perspective in world affairs. There are many votes in the United Nations on many different matters—times countries are on a winning side and other times they are on a losing side. We hardly ever hear of these things although some of them might be on matters which vitally concern the whole free world such as disarmament. We heard of the Australian amendment to the five-power resolution not because of what was in the amendment but because it was an Australian amendment. If one reads the newspapers of other countries the space given it was often very small and sometimes non-existent.

It is not always realised that the Prime Minister made two speeches in the United Nations, the first one was the relatively unimportant one in relation to this amendment. It was the Prime Minister's maiden speech at the United Nations not by intention but purely because of the time table of the United Nations. His main speech concerned Australian foreign policy in general, our attitude to the Cold War, and in particular the Prime Minister referred to our plans for the growth of an independent multi-racial society in New Guinea. This was most important in view of the fact that he was speaking before many newly independent countries who had just been admitted to the United Nations. This speech was hailed by many of the New York papers in plain but blunt but welcoming terms—for one principal reason. It was hailed because a Leader of a small country, in terms of population and resources, had had the courage to get to his feet to tell Mr. Kruschev exactly what he had thought of him.