

guiding and helping the necessary change without impatience for overnight results.

It is sometimes said of our time that it is an age which marks the death of nationalism and should call for a far-reaching revision of old ideas of national sovereignty. Put in this way, I think the statement is misleading. Nationalism is very much what it always was, and the willingness to restrict national sovereignty is not very great even in spheres where the sacrifice would seem to be small. But this way of characterizing our age is also true in a sense. Ours is a time of a new internationalism which, perhaps, is not of our choice but, nevertheless, must be recognized as inescapable in our world of today with its new means of communication, its new economic interdependence and its new political relationships. This internationalism also presents a challenge. It is probable that it will, step by step, bring about an evolution of national concepts and policies which in the future may have a greater effect upon national sovereignty than is evident today. The United Nations is an expression of this new internationalism, a response to a world-wide need which has arisen. However, as you certainly know, the organization is not vested with any sovereign powers. The only exception to this principle is that the Security Council may enforce certain action, provided that its five permanent members are agreed -- a possibility which, for obvious reasons, today is highly theoretical. It is not likely that a world organization embracing so many disparate and, at times, antagonistic systems of government and national cultures could be held together today on any other basis. The United Nations, therefore, must rely for the present mainly on the processes of negotiation, persuasion and consent to accomplish its purposes and, above all, on the exercise of enlightened and moral leadership by those in positions of responsibility.

It is said that our time is the age of global wars. This is true in the sense that everybody, in one way or another, was a co-sufferer in the Second World War and in the sense that all the Great Powers were parties to the conflict. It is also true in the sense that a new major conflict would undoubtedly, in the same way, draw everybody into its orbit. But it would be false if it were to lead us to shut our eyes to the fact that we still suffer and may have to suffer from wars on a restricted scale and in limited areas which, in their effect on the human lives concerned, are just as terrible as the major wars. It is our duty to feel moral responsibility for a war in a remote part of the world as strongly as we would feel for a war in which we ourselves, or those dear to us, were directly threatened in a physical sense.

Frequently, these days, we also hear our time called the atomic age. Of course, the discoveries and inventions which make the tremendous forces hidden in the atom available as a new source of power have opened a new era. I feel, however, that the name "atomic age" would more rightly be applied to a time when the new power is used to improve the conditions of life for mankind than to a time which has so far only added this power to the already frightful arsenal of which we dispose for our self-destruction. What made the proposal of President Eisenhower in the United Nations so encouraging and so constructive was the strong expression he gave to his desire for, and his faith in, the possibility of initiating a true atomic age.