

The strategic frontier, like the political one, may be regarded as requiring outposts. The most striking case of this is in the eastern and central Mediterranean where the Soviet Union are seeking control over certain strategic areas for the purpose of making secure the sea route from Gibraltar to Crimea.

CASE AGAINST LIMITED EXPANSION

It may be argued that the Soviet policy of maintaining outer bastions to its frontier can have no limits. By desiring political and social influences over the countries bordering on it it must invariably find a receding frontier which may be pursued indefinitely. The same kind of argument could be applied to strategic claims and lead, for example, to demands in the Mediterranean going beyond the expressed interest in the Italian possessions on the southern shore. Similarly it might be felt that the Soviet expansion will progressively extend through Siberia to the north-west areas of Canada and the United States.

In considering Soviet foreign policy it is important not to confuse the ends with the means. While the Soviet Union pursues, largely to the same extent, the same ends as those of the Czarist regime it does not, like the latter, accept the traditional techniques of diplomacy. The method of avoiding friction through diplomatic representation is very little appreciated by the Soviet authorities. The highly centralized Government of the U.S.S.R. does not permit its representatives in diplomatic missions or at conferences more than a small degree of discretion. The Government tends to use shock tactics through its controlled newspapers and its representatives abroad. There is a difference of opinion as to whether the Soviet Union is in the end less ready for international compromise than other states. It may be that the more violent forms in which its views are expressed are not in essence different from the more carefully guarded but perhaps equally maximum demands put forward in the traditional diplomatic language; both possibly may be intended as opening moves.

The Soviet Union has participated fully in the establishment of the United Nations Organization from the time when plans were first under consideration. In spite of frequent accusations there is no evidence that they have deliberately tried to sabotage UNO. It has been said that at the Preparatory Commission their delegation was generally constructive in its attitude. The attitude of the Soviet representative on the Security Council in New York has been disturbing, but there is no evidence of a desire to weaken that institution generally. It cannot be said of the U.S.S.R. or indeed of any other state that it is prepared to make any measurable amount of concessions to the interests of UNO or that it will maintain indefinitely its support. From one point of view the Soviet Union has, however, reason to continue to support the UNO since by any other action it would tend to turn the UNO into the nucleus of a world alliance against itself. Time alone will show whether the Soviet Union intend to put a major reliance on the UNO but the evidence so far is not discouraging.