

services, often in dangerous circumstances, in order to carry out these tasks. There is no greater evidence of the vitality of our organization and of the role which it may play in the world than the loyal service which it has been able to command from its own representatives.

Certainly the task before the United Nations is great, and its responsibilities are likely to be steady and continuing rather than brief and episodic. For example, all three of the major subjects which have preoccupied the Security Council during the past two years are related to one great general and continuing movement. It arises out of the transformation of the colonial relationship between European people and people in other continents into a new partnership of free communities. A great tide is moving in the affairs of men, and it calls for radical and complicated adjustment in political relationships. It is not surprising that, as it takes place, it produces strains and tensions, and that some people are impatient for greater speed. But there is evidence before us every day that the process begun many decades ago is accelerating and that a completely new relationship is being worked out between the peoples of the western world and what were once called dependent areas. The United Nations is playing an important part in this process. This, I think, is one of the reasons why the world should be most grateful for the existence of this organization today.

On Friday last and on many other occasions the leader of the Soviet delegation accused the democracies of imperialism of the old kind is a rapidly diminishing force; a dying doctrine. The real danger today lies in the new imperialism of the post-war period. During that period only one state in the world has extended its borders and the area of its domination. That state has annexed 179,000 square miles of territory, and included within its borders in the last ten years more than twenty-one million people. Backed by its armies, it has imposed satellite regimes on neighboring states. It has used its great material power and resources to rivet its economic control over the peoples under its influence. Its leaders have talked freely of "liberation" and of "national sovereignty", but its agents abroad have never hesitated to proclaim their obedience to its control and their determination to serve its interests above the interests of their own governments and their own peoples. How can there be a feeling of peace and security, where an alien power insists on imposing its domination over other nations and peoples? We do not dispute for a moment the right of any state to maintain its own social and economic order, along with its territorial integrity. But we of the free democracies reject this new imperialism which uses the subversive forces of international communism to destroy the national independence of even communist states which will not accept its interference and its dictates. It is this new imperialism which the world watches with so much concern, partly because of its aggressive interference in the affairs of other states, partly because of its inherent instability. There are already evidences that because of its own internal weaknesses and contradictions it will not survive. As this new imperialism changes, a more just and equitable relationship amongst the states which it affects may come about. I hope that the United Nations will be permitted to play a constructive role in that change, as it is now playing in other areas where the old imperialism of earlier centuries is now disappearing.

The leader of the Soviet delegation also made on Friday a strong plea for support of the United Nations. He thought that certain United Nations bodies in their present form were most unsatisfactory, and felt that we should not put up with this state of affairs. His appeal for support and improvement of these bodies would have been more impressive if the government which he represents had not refused to play any part in the United Nations specializing agencies which have been established since the war. This boycott extends even to those agencies dealing with questions of health and welfare, food and agriculture, civil aviation and cultural relations. A government which follows that negative and sterile policy should not lecture the rest of us on support for the United Nations or on the virtues of international co-operation.

The Soviet delegate also argued on Friday, and in more detail on other occasions, that the international control of weapons of mass destruction, must not involve an invasion of national sovereignty. Such an insistence makes effective control futile and meaningless. It will be small comfort if and when some atomic bomb drops on us to know that while we have lost everything else, we have saved our sovereignty to the very end. If a state puts formal sovereignty ahead of peace