

The Pater Noster of the Economists.

---

Imaginary personification of our thought;  
Revered be Thy economic laws;  
Thy stable equilibrium come:  
Thy precepts be observed in the world,  
as they are in our classrooms.  
Enable us each day to fulfill our  
propensity to consume.  
Forgive our lapses into humanity, as  
we extol Thy austere impersonality.  
Protect us from cyclical fluctuations, and  
ensure the full utilization of all resources:  
And to Thee be the power and to Thy  
professors the glory:  
From logics to econometrics.

Amen.

# EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

---

## CHAPTER V. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

### Section B. Functions and Powers

(Draft put forward by Mr. Evatt (Australia) as a suggestion only, for the consideration of Subcommittee A of the Executive Committee.)

1. The General Assembly should have the right to discuss any matters covered by the purposes and principles of the Charter or within the sphere of action of the United Nations or relating to the powers and functions of any of its organs or otherwise within the scope of the Charter; and, except as provided in paragraph 2(b) of this section, to make recommendations to the members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or both on any such questions or matters.

April 9, 1945

Chapter VI, Section C, Paragraph 2 to read as follows:

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters, or on the authorization of enforcement action proposed under a regional arrangement or by a regional agency under VIII, C, 2, should be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

Note

This amendment would apply in cases where a regional arrangement such as the Inter-American system wished to act to maintain peace in the region but might be prevented by the vote of one of the permanent members of the Security Council. Its adoption would mean that the Security Council would vote on the question of authorizing regional action by a majority of seven members (instead of by seven members, including the votes of all five permanent members).

The important feature of this proposition is that it prevents negative action by one of the Big Five.

The motion to authorize action by the regional arrangement could not be defeated by any one power but only by five votes. It should be noted in this connection that under the Yalta Agreement, even enforcement action favored by the five permanent members of the Security Council would require the votes of two of the small or middle nations as well.

H.F.A.

Univ of Calif

Univ of Minnesota

How Long

W are  
down from Conf.

H R D

Pr. Fair

Conf closed  
Honorable

Excellent Charter

Good Faith

Face Questions here  
which could be met  
in future

Respectful Believer

Expected too much

Agreement

Minnesota

White Owl  
Stollon



ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

WASHINGTON

May 7, 1945  
San Francisco

Dear Harold:

This whole business of "Freedom of Information" is, as you know, boiling up hotter and hotter. I have some ideas about it which I'd like to put before you as briefly as possible. I know you have been thinking about it a great deal.

First, may I hand you (attached) a letter and memorandum I have just received from Bob Leigh of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. It speaks for itself.

Secondly, my own suggestion, for whatever it is worth. As I understand it, the present attitude of the Delegation, and perhaps of the Conference, is averse to resolutions. I quite understand the desirability of maintaining that position, but I doubt if it can be maintained in the face of the universal demand for some kind of expression in this area, and in the face of the action already taken at Mexico City. What I have to say, therefore, is based on the assumption that there will be a resolution of some kind.

I think it would be dangerous to adopt a general resolution (against sin and for virtue) like the glittering generalities adopted at Mexico City. If Russia accepted such a resolution, for example, or if Brazil with its notorious censorship, or Argentina with its fascist government accepted such a resolution, the reaction in this country would be cynical, to say the least.

On the other hand, if an attempt were made to deal with the realities of the problem in a resolution, the resolution would certainly be opposed by a number of governments, some for one reason, some for another. I therefore suggest that the resolution take the following form:

Commander Harold E. Stassen  
Conference Headquarters  
Fairmont Hotel

(1) A recital of the fact that the peoples of the world now possess means of international communication which make possible a degree of international understanding such as has never before existed.

(2) A statement of the belief of the Conference that these means of international communication should be so employed as to bring about the greatest possible mutual understanding between nations through the free exchange of information, knowledge, ideas, advances in the sciences and the arts, etc. etc.

(3) A resolution calling upon the new organization, when established, to set up at the earliest possible moment adequate machinery to study the problems involved in an attempt to use modern means of communication between peoples in the interest of mutual understanding and the common increase of knowledge.

If you would like me to try to work out the actual text of such a resolution, I'd be glad to do so.

I am bothering you with all this because I think you have given more thought to the problem than any of us. Perhaps I should add that this whole field of international information is my responsibility in the Department and that I will have to try to carry whatever ball is kicked to me out of this Conference. I am therefore pretty much interested in the kind of pigskin which will be produced.

Faithfully yours,

*Ami*  
Archibald MacLeish

COMMISSION ON THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS  
70 East 45th Street, New York 17.

April 23, 1945

C  
O  
P  
Y

Hon. Archibald MacLeish  
Department of State  
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Archie:

Here is a copy of the letter which the Committee, with Roger Baldwin acting as its Executive, is proposing to send to the Secretary of State. The Committee members are as follows:

JAMES LAWRENCE FLY (former chairman, Federal Communications Commission)

ROBERT M. MACIVER (Professor, Columbia University)

ROBERT D. LEIGH (Director, Commission on Freedom of the Press)

ELMER RICE (Former President Authors' League)

MORRIS L. ERNST (General Counsel American Civil Liberties Union)

WALTER S. ROGERS (Communications Consultant, Versailles Conference)

Several hundred signers are to be obtained for this letter, and I believe that it will be given newspaper publicity. I am sending this on for your information.

Cordially,

BOB

Robert D. Leigh  
Director

April 23, 1945

C

O

P

Y

Hon. Edward R. Stettinius  
Secretary of State  
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Secretary:

In line with the policy of the United States declared by President Roosevelt in the first of the "Four Freedoms", freedom of speech everywhere in the world, the undersigned citizens desire to urge upon the State Department the presentation through the American delegates to the United Nations conference of the issue of freedom of communication between the nations of the world.

By that we mean not only unhampered, indiscriminatory use of all available transmission facilities but also the right to travel and reasonable access to sources of information by press, radio, and motion picture representatives and by qualified research students.

It seems to us that freedom of communication, as thus outlined, is a subject entirely appropriate for consideration by the conference, with a view to the adoption of basic principles and for reference to one of the Commissions to be established, or to a special commission, to devise ways and means for progress towards the ends in view.

We note with satisfaction, as marking a notable advance, the resolution adopted for regional freedom of communication by the Inter-American conference held at Chapultapec, Mexico, approved by the representatives of twenty-four nations, half of those represented at San Francisco.

We sign this memorial in the belief that the peoples of all countries should have the opportunity to read, see and hear about all matters of general concern; and with the observation that the interests of the industries concerned and of the general public in freedom of communication appear to be identical.

We are,

Sincerely yours,



C O P Y

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE  
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

TOP SECRET

May 5, 1945

My dear Mr. Secretary:

I have been greatly dissatisfied with one phase of our proposal regarding "Regional Agreements" and I am putting my viewpoint before you for immediate consideration before it is too late. At the moment, while we have tentative agreement on this text with the U. K. and China, we have on file our proposals individually and I now think we are entitled to amplify and amend our proposals (with notice to the other sponsoring powers).

I am greatly disturbed lest we shall be charged with a desertion (1) of our Pan American obligations at Chapultepec and (2) of the Monroe Doctrine. The former is a threat to the Pan American solidarity which becomes increasingly indispensable to our own safety. The latter is a threat to confirmation of the entire San Francisco charter by the Senate of the United States.

Under the "Regional Agreement" proposal which we have submitted, our European allies are exempted from the jurisdiction of the Security Council and from the authority of the Organization in respect to any "measures against enemy states in this war or regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of such states until such time as the Organization may, by consent of the governments concerned be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by a state now at war with the United Nations". I do not object to this exemption and I am quite willing to continue it for the very good reason that we can't expect our allies to depend upon an untried Peace League for their defense against a resurgent Axis until it has demonstrated its adequate capacity to serve this defense function.

But what can we say in defense of our action in requiring at the same time that Pan America must depend upon this new Peace League (before it has demonstrated its adequacy) and must abandon its primary reliance upon inter-American relationships which are fifty years old and which were vigorously reasserted (under our auspices) at Mexico City within the last two months?

I do not believe it is possible to answer this question satisfactorily either to our Pan American neighbors or to our own American people.

We have all been troubled about this phase of the matter. We have all wanted an answer to it. But we have been deterred by our fear that an exemption for our inter-American "Regional Agreements" might be an invitation to the rest of the world to divide itself up into similarly immunized blocs and regional balance of power groups. There is no such invitation and no such precedent when we recognize only an existing implement which is the expression of a continuous inter-American policy for more than a century and which is without possibility of current parallel anywhere on earth.

DECLASSIFIED

E.O. 12958, SEC. 8.8(b)

STATE DEPT. 661061/205

BY LKH DATE 4/24/00

~~TOP SECRET~~

I have come to the definite conclusion that it is possible to protect our status without endangering the general objective and in a fashion to which none of our associated sponsoring powers can object because none of their interests will be involved.

Why should we not apply the same type of exemption to the "Regional Agreements" of the Pan American Union under the Act of Chapultepec which we allow to our European allies in respect to our European enemies? In other words why should we not add to our pending proposal that Paragraph 2 of Section C of Chapter 8 should be further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "and with the exception of measures which may be taken under Resolution VIII, known as the Act of Chapultepec of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, signed at Mexico City on March eighth, 1945, until such time as the Organization may, by consent of the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, be charged with this function"?

We have thus achieved three indispensable objectives. First we have preserved the Act of Chapultepec until such time as we and our "Good Neighbors" are prepared to relinquish its functions to the new Organization. Second, we have preserved the Monroe Doctrine until such time as it is no longer necessary for our security and we are prepared to voluntarily relinquish it. Third, we have prevented a veto in the Security Council upon any Western Hemisphere self-defense at all. On the other hand we have not set a precedent for encouraging other regional blocs and therefore we have not endangered the ideology of the new Organization. Furthermore we have not done anything which prejudices the legitimate rights and interests of any of our other United Nations.

I call your attention to the fact that this does not rob the Security Council of any authority in respect to the maintenance of peace and security. It merely temporarily suspends the power of the Security Council to prevent the American States from exercising their traditional functions of self-defense.

I respectfully suggest that this matter be immediately submitted to the American Delegation for the purpose of amending our proposal - preferably before Mr. Molotov has acquiesced in the prior text.

I emphatically recommend this - or some equally sound alternative. If the American Delegation does not offer a satisfactory formula it is perfectly obvious that the other Latin American countries will present their own proposal. I ask you this final question. Suppose the united Latin American countries should present the foregoing proposition in behalf of Chapultepec and the Monroe Doctrine is it conceivable that the United States could vote no? Such being the irresistible fact is it not infinitely preferable that we should take the initiative?

Cordially and faithfully yours,

S/ A. H. Vandenberg

The Honorable Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.  
Fairmont Hotel  
San Francisco, California

SECTION D      ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURE

1. The Economic and Social Council should set up commissions in the field of economic activity, social activity, cultural activity, promotion of human rights and any other field within the competence of the Council. These commissions should include authorities representing the major economic and social groups with particular interest in the field concerned. There should be a permanent staff which should constitute a part of the secretariat of the Organization.



SECTION C      REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council with the exception of measures against enemy states in this war provided by pursuant to Chapter VII, paragraph 2, or, in the regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of Germany and Japan, until such time as the Organization may, by consent of the governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility of preventing further aggression by these states. Simultaneous with such action the Security Council should make and investigation of the situation and proceed under Chapter VIII, Section B. In such a circumstance, the Security Council could proceed with the negative vote of any permanent member engaged in action provided for under such regional arrangements.

UNITED STATES DELEGATION  
Daily Schedule of Meetings  
Saturday, May 5, 1945

- 9:00 a.m. Delegates and Advisers (Fairmont, Room 562)
- 10:30 a.m. Commission II, Committee 4 (Veterans Building, Room 303)
- 10:30 a.m. Commission III, Committee 1 (Veterans Building, Room 223) This meeting is to be followed by a meeting of the Subcommittee of Committee 1
- 10:30 a.m. Commission IV, Committee 2 (Veterans Building, Room 313)
- 3:00 p.m. Commission I, Committee 2 (Veterans Building, Room 303)
- 3:00 p.m. Commission II, Committee 1 (Veterans Building, Room 223)



San Francisco, California  
May 1 - June 5, 1945

### PROPOSAL

That the Secretaries of State, War and Navy Departments give clearance and authorization for transportation and accommodations for a representative group of Official Consultants to the San Francisco Conference to tour the European (2-3 weeks) and Pacific areas (4-6 weeks), with ten day interval to consolidate plans, where American servicemen and women can hear first hand information of the Conference and how it affects them in the present and post-war periods....as well as offer up for the consultants constructive criticism and ideas based on the G.I.'s viewpoints of the Conference and their post-war problems at large.

The consultants with this writer would meet the servicemen overseas at various military posts mutually agreed upon before departure from the United States. The consultants would be formally introduced and offer a very brief talk of 5-10 minutes duration prior to a general informal round table discussion or "Bull Session". These sessions would be held in separate groups designated as Conference Technicalities, Labor, Education, Small and Large Business, Farm and Agriculture. Every G.I. overseas would fall into one or more of these groups either because of his former vocation and occupation or his contemplated future occupation.

These sessions would offer the G.I. and Officer, on an equal basis, the opportunity to sit down and thrash out in true American

democratic fashion problems that will face him and his family upon his return to civilian life either during the present conflict or after the war. The sessions would further offer up definite material for the represented groups to bring back to the United States and be worked into their organizational plans for the returning G. I. and his family on a localized instead of a national basis.

It is suggested that the War Department's Information and Education unit set up the meetings in all areas, administer the necessary shots for overseas travel to the participants, furnish transportation via the Air Transport Command, and furnish accommodations in the overseas areas. It is further suggested that the Naval Air Transport Service aid in the same manner in the Pacific Theater wherever possible.

The American Association For United Nations through Mr. James Shotwell and Mr. Clarke Eichelberger have told this writer that they will offer the services of their organization to band the unit of consultants together in an unbiased sponsorship for the trip.

It is suggested that the designated participants gather in New York or Washington with Mr. James Shotwell, who acted as temporary chairman at consultant meetings, for a final briefing and consolidation of ideas with official representatives of the War and Navy departments for security purposes.

It is further suggested that this writer be appointed by the sponsoring organization as official coordinator for the entire group and liason between the group and civilian and service press here and abroad with S. Vance Cagley acting as his assistant.

## PARTICIPATING PERSONALITIES

The following Official Consultants have expressed their desire to help the proposal of this writer succeed and have definitely stated they would like to make the trip, if and when it receives proper sponsorship and clearance:

Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger	Association for United Nations
Mr. James B. Carey	Congress of Industrial Organizations
Mr. Robert J. Watt	American Federation of Labor
Mr. Allan B. Kline	Iowa Farm Bureau
Mr. William Carr	National Education Association

In addition the following who attended the Conference but not as official consultants:

Robert E. Norton	Representing small business and technical points of conference.
Louis Lancaster	Who acted as Liason for the State Department and the Consultants. He would travel unofficially on a leave of absence and pay from the State Department. He would continue to act as Liason for the Consultants and represent the civic organizations.
S. Vance Cagley	President of the San Francisco Public Relations Club who has worked continuously with the writer and would travel as my associate and assistant coordinator.

It is hoped that Mr. Phillip Reed who attended the Conference as the International Chamber of Commerce Consultant will accept the extended invitation to join the group.

Technical staff would include a radioman from Armed Services Radio unit, five secretaries to record verbatim all informal sessions and a photographer.

*Benjamin W. Roscoe*  
1245 California Street  
San Francisco, Calif



LeGro Pressley - 780 Old Stage Road - Salinas, California  
4/8/45.

Commander Harold H. Stassen, U.S.N.R.  
Navy Department,  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Commander Stassen:-

Regarding the San Francisco Conference, Mrs. Pressley and I would like to say that we are very much in favor of a strong democratic United Nations organization. We think that this country should take the lead (especially Congress) and not wait to find out what the other nations are willing to give up before we commit ourselves. We have two sons in the service, one missing in action over Burma and we have to think that their sacrifices and those of the rest of the boys may be lost, so far as a lasting peace is concerned, for lack of aggressive leadership by the rest of us. We have the brains in this country and the leadership ability and we certainly hope that you will use every effort to see that they are used to do a better job than we did after the first world war. We have confidence in you and feel that the rest of the Western Hemisphere at least will be looking to us for, and we hope expecting of us that kind of leadership which is winning the war for us.

Sincerely yours

*LeGro Pressley*  
*Barbara Pressley*

*Don't command  
Stevens -  
I thought  
perhaps you  
would be  
interested in  
this note just  
sent to Mr.  
Fawcett -  
Quincy Wright*

May 4, 1945

Dear Leo:

I understand France wants a recognition of its treaty with the Soviet Union in the section of the Charter dealing with regional arrangements and proposes a clause recognizing the propriety of "preventive measures" taken in accord with preexisting mutual assistance treaties.

I think we ought to object to this. A general recognition in the Charter of the legitimacy of treaties permitting bilateral preventive action without prior authorization by the Security Council would be extremely dangerous. On the other hand, as a temporarily applicable measure against Germany, arrangements like the Franco-Soviet treaty are permissible under chap. XII. We should therefore insist that this and similar treaties are contrary to the Charter in principle and can only be permitted as transitional measures against present enemies. The following paragraphs elaborate this point of view.

1. It is to be assumed that a state, victim of actual aggression may defend itself by force. On the other hand, a general provision authorizing preventive measures (as distinct from purely defensive measures) without prior approval of the Security Council would be contrary to the obligations of members under chap. II, 4, and VIII, A, 3, and would reduce the powers of the Security Council under VIII, B, 2 and VIII C. 2. This is because "preventive measures" might include action taken long before there was any real breach of even threat to the peace and consequently might themselves constitute acts of aggression.

2. A distinction is therefore necessary between the right of a state to use force on its own determination when the victim of an actual aggression and its right to use force preventively when it considers itself merely threatened by aggression or in danger of being threatened by aggression at some future time.

3. In the first case the control of the Security Council can only come after the attacked state has resorted to self help. In the second case that control must come before the threatened or anxious state has resorted to self help. If this distinction is not carefully preserved the whole system of collective security will be jeopardized. While from the operational standpoint "preventive" and "defensive" measures differ only in respect to urgency, from the legal and political standpoint they differ fundamentally. On this point see Principle 7 of the "International Law of the Future" and art. 15 of the "Design" put out by the group under Manley O. Hudson.

4. Exceptions breaking down this distinction should therefore be avoided in the body of the charter. Treaties like the Franco-Soviet Treaty including such exception, should not be regarded as permissible regional arrangements.

5. The Franco-Soviet treaty, however, refers only to Germany and is therefore legitimized under XII, 2, even though contrary to the charter.

7. The difficulty however arises that the Franco-Soviet treaty is for 20 years and unless denounced "remains valid for an unlimited time". XII, 2 should have some time limitation.

7. Would it not be advisable to put the material in XII which is transitional in an appendix to the Charter and make specific mention of all the treaties which come under par. 2 including the Franco-Soviet treaty. There might be added at the



end of par 2 "during a period of three years, or such longer time as may be determined by the Security Council upon the expiration of that period." On this see Comment 19 on Dumbarton Oaks by the Group under Manley O. Hudson.

8. There should be added in the body of the Charter a provision declaring that all provisions of treaties inconsistent with the Charter are null and void except as provided in the appendix. See comment 17 by Hudson group.

Sincerely yours,

Quincy Wright

## COMPARISON OF A AND B DRAFTS

### I. Points of Similarity

1. Both drafts list three categories of territories that might be placed under trusteeship. Except for mandated areas and territories to be taken away from defeated states, the extension of the trusteeship areas is voluntary. Both drafts avoid specifying territories.

2. Both drafts indicate that the trusteeship arrangements might vary. The A draft refers to this point briefly under 5. The B draft gives the reasons for possible differences under section 4.

### II. Points of Criticism of B Draft

1. The principle of perpetual tutelage is objectionably stated in B draft Article 3.

2. The B draft does not provide a separate trusteeship for strategic bases. The B explanatory note begs the question under (a) of paragraph 5 and 6 of their commentary, with the rather self-righteous indication that a separate trusteeship over bases might ignore the welfare of the bases.

3. The B draft provides only a mandates commission responsible to the Economic and Social Council, in comparison to the A draft which provides a trusteeship council responsible to the Assembly.

4. The obligation of the state administering any territory placed under trusteeship is limited to the rendering of an annual report.

5. The trusteeship commission would lack the authority to inspect. Its authority would be weak.

### III. Disadvantages of the A Draft

1. The A draft lacks the force of the B first paragraph which provides that all members of the United Nations administering dependent territories accept the principle that it is the sacred trust of civilization to promote the welfare of the inhabitants. The acceptance by all members of this responsibility means that colonial powers to be admitted later on, such as Spain and Portugal, would be bound by the principle. This would have an important moral effect.

2. The effect of this first paragraph is weakened however by the indication that this acceptance of trusteeship for such areas of the United Nations is voluntary. *machinery*

3. Although apparently standing for the principle of trusteeship for strategic bases the A plan does not define what should be the responsibility of the trustee power for strategic bases. The A draft is open to the criticism that while it does provide for trusteeship for strategic areas it in no way indicates that there shall be inspection or responsibility to the world community similar to that for dependent people s.

### IV. Advantages of ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ B Draft

Details of the character of the trust are matters of subsequent agreement between the state entrusted with the administering of the territory and the United Nations. The A draft leaves arrangements for each territory to be placed under such arrangement with the states concerned, whatever that ~~XXXXX~~ means.



V. Criticisms of Both Drafts

It is not clear whether certain territories to be taken away from Japan and Italy are to be parcelled out among the United Nations to be trustee of those areas or are to be administered directly by the United Nations.

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**

---

SUGGESTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SCHEDULE FOR CONCLUDING  
SESSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

1. Date of final plenary session

It is recommended that the Conference hold its final plenary session, at which the President will be present and will speak, in the afternoon, Saturday, June 23.

It is recommended that at this final plenary session there be brief addresses by the four Presidents of the Conference and the Chairman of the French Delegation and by the Chairmen of the Delegations of the following countries: Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, and the Union of South Africa.

2. Addresses at the final plenary session

In order to conserve time it is recommended not only that the addresses at the final plenary session be brief but also that there be no oral translation. For the convenience of those who will be attending this final session it is planned to include in a printed program English texts of these addresses. English texts of the addresses also will be made available to the press and to the radio. In order to be able to prepare the printed program it will be necessary for the Secretariat to receive English texts of the addresses by 6 p.m., Wednesday. These texts would be sent to Mr. Oliver Lundquist, Presentation Officer, Room 415, Veterans Building. (The matter of the presentation of concluding written statements by delegations desiring to do so is referred to subsequently in this memorandum.)

3. Penultimate plenary session

It is recommended that the penultimate plenary session, at which the Charter, the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and the document establishing the Preparatory Commission would be adopted, would be held at 9 a.m.,



Friday, June 22. At this session each of the four Commissions would present its final report, thus placing the entire text of the Charter and of the Statute of the International Court of Justice before the plenary session for action. In addition, the Steering Committee would report the text of the document establishing the Preparatory Commission, and the Credentials Committee would submit its final report.

#### 4. Concluding statements

It will be recalled that paragraph II D of Document 468, which was approved by the Steering Committee on May 1, provided that at the final plenary sessions there should be no discussion of or statements concerning the substance of the texts approved, full opportunity for discussion and statements having been afforded at Commission meetings. It was further stated in that paragraph that the Secretariat was giving consideration to procedures whereby delegations so desiring could make concluding statements through the medium of the Conference Journal and through the public press. It is recommended that any delegation desiring to present concluding statements submit such statements in writing for the final plenary session. If submitted in English these statements would be made available to the press during the final session and would appear in full in a supplement to the Conference Journal. These statements should be prepared in English and be sent to the Office of the Executive Secretary, Room 404, Veterans Building, not later than twenty-four hours before the final plenary session if distribution to the press during the session is desired.

#### 5. Signing of the Charter

It is recommended that the Charter be signed in all five official language texts during the afternoon and evening of Friday, June 22, and in the morning of Saturday, June 23. It is estimated that a minimum of eight hours will be required for the signing. Arrangements have been made for this signing to occur in the presence of representatives of the press, newsreels, and radio in the Auditorium of the Veterans Building. These arrangements are under the direction of Mr. Warren Kelchner, General Adviser to the Secretary-General, Room 319, Veterans Building. Mr. Kelchner will communicate the details of these arrangements to the various delegations.

#### 6. Approval and signing of five official language texts

Arrangements are now under way, pursuant to WD 222, for approval of the final texts in all five official languages by means of an Advisory Committee on Languages under the Executive Committee and the Coordination Committee. Russian, Chinese,

and Spanish language panels have been established and each delegation is free to be represented on each panel by appropriate language experts. It is hoped that this procedure will enable each delegation to approve all five language texts. In the event that any delegation is not, however, in a position to approve any particular language text, it is recommended that such delegation sign the other language texts as indicated in the preceding paragraph and after each government has approved the unsigned text, signature of that text would take place in Washington.

7. General review of the Charter by the Steering Committee before final plenary sessions

Pursuant to paragraph I D of Document 468, approved by the Steering Committee on May 21, the entire Charter is to be reviewed by the Steering Committee after the Commissions have approved the Charter texts referred to them by the Coordination Committee and prior to presentation of the Charter to the final plenary sessions. It is recommended that this meeting of the Steering Committee be held on Thursday, June 21, at 8:30 p.m.

8. Final meetings of all Commissions to review Coordination Committee texts

In conformity with the foregoing schedule the final meetings of Commissions I, II, and III to review Coordination Committee texts will have to be completed by not later than Thursday afternoon, June 21. If necessary, it is believed that all three Commissions could meet for this purpose on June 21, one meeting to be held in the morning, one in the early afternoon, and the third in the late afternoon.

Note: It is suggested that the first meeting of the Preparatory Commission, for organizing purposes, be held on Saturday evening, June 23.

# TENTATIVE CONFERENCE SCHEDULE

Wednesday June 20	Coordination Committee: Completion of all remaining texts.	
Thursday June 21	9:00 a.m. Commission I : Final meeting 1:30 p.m. Commission II : Final meeting 5:30 p.m. Commission III: Final meeting Evening Steering Committee: Final meeting	
Friday June 22	Morning Plenary session Afternoon and evening Signing of the Charter	
Saturday June 23	Morning Signing of the Charter Afternoon Closing session Evening Organizing meeting of the Preparatory Commission	

~~Amth~~

~~USA~~

~~USSR~~

~~Mex~~

117

~~Autros~~



# MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in this digital version belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



[www.mnhs.org](http://www.mnhs.org)