

when it is applied only to those empires who have colonies across the seas, and not to the colonial imperial power which has been subjugating neighbouring states. I am thinking, of course, of Russia. The greatest colonial and imperialist power perhaps in all history is the Russian Communist Empire of today. Yet day after day we listen to the representative of the Russian state and its satellites at the United Nations attack countries like France and Great Britain who have done so much in the last century to lead peoples to independence. It is hard to listen to attacks on these nations by countries who have done nothing but subdue free people and are still trying to do that. I also hope, as one who believes in the United Nations, that newly independent powers will show an increasing sense of responsibility in this matter and that there will be a growing appreciation of what countries like France and Great Britain have done to lead people to freedom, as against the reactionary policies of Communist despotism.

There is another danger; the development of a double standard of principle and practice in respect of Assembly resolutions. We pass resolutions aimed at forcing Communist powers to take certain action, for instance, in Hungary, and our resolutions are treated by these powers with contempt, and we cannot do very much about it except focus public opinion, the moral opinion of the world, on their misdeeds. That is something. But when we pass a resolution which is aimed at a power like Great Britain or like France, which has a "decent respect for the opinion of mankind", it accepts the decision and takes action accordingly in complying with it. It is becoming pretty hard for them, however, when they compare what they do about United Nations resolutions with what others refuse to do. If this double standard of practice and principles goes too far, it is bound to weaken the prestige of the Organization and the respect people have for it.

I have been talking about some of the weaknesses of the Organization, which are our own weaknesses, and some of which have become quite apparent in the last 4 or 5 months. But I would not like to finish on that note. What we have to do is to do our best to strengthen the Organization; to remove these weaknesses, to make it a more efficient agency for peace and the settlement of international disputes. Even in its short history of ten years, with all its weaknesses, the United Nations has some very great achievements to its credit. Those who criticize it, and some of these critics are becoming pretty vocal these days and seem to be increasing in number, those who criticize should look back and see what would have happened in certain parts of the world if the United Nations had not been in existence during the last ten years. They should also look forward and try to show how we could possibly be better in any way if it were not to continue in existence.