

CALL FOR REVISION OF UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

TEXT OF SPEECH GIVEN BY HAROLD E. STASSEN AT LUNCHEON IN NEW YORK BEFORE YOUNG REPUBLICANS ON JANUARY 5th, 1948.

The overshadowing question of our time is that of future world war or world peace. The primary objective of America must be to win and maintain expanding individual freedom for ourselves and for others without the holocaust of a third world war.

The objective is an objective so challenging in its difficulties and so thrilling in its rewards for all mankind as to inspire the best that is in youth of America.

Considering the current state of world relationships, reviewing the two-year record of the United Nations and analyzing the clash and conflict of systems and ideas with Russia, I believe it is imperative that our Republican party propose a positive far-reaching policy in 1948 and seek Democratic agreement upon it in their subsequent convention as a bipartisan policy and enlist general public approval for it as an American policy.

As the capstone of that policy I propose that the United States initiate the calling of a major United Nations convention in the year 1950 for the purpose of amending and rewriting the charter and strengthening the United Nations for its noble and vital task, in the interest of mankind.

Such a convention can be called under the present charter without a veto. It appears to me that it is necessary and essential that it be called.

In the first instance, it will set a constructive goal out ahead of all the current clashes and disappointments and failures of parleys and of relationships. It will serve to emphasize that our ultimate American objectives are for peace and progress and freedom of mankind. It will brighten the hopes of peoples everywhere. The sum total of depressed minds and helpless attitudes is now a staggering millstone on the world.

Clearly the United Nations needs strengthening. Definitely it requires a new voting method to end the single-power veto, new means of developing its own police force.

Think how evident, in troubled parts of the world, is need for a U. N. constabulary to move in; new steps toward the rule of laws in special problems and in human rights on a world-wide level, in the place of the domination of men or of absolute sovereign states.

Certainly atomic energy must be inspected and controlled on a world-wide scope.

I say in all earnestness, today there are grounds for hope that if we measure up to our interim responsibilities, the situation in 1950 will be right for progress in the United Nations.

But while I sketch in broad strokes the imperative need of setting this target in 1950 before the world, I do not minimize the importance of the interim steps.

In fact, the decisions and actions in the intervening months and years will in large measure prescribe the prospects of success of the major later venture.

We must demonstrate the continued success of our free economy in America with its modern people's capitalism, its high production and its excellent distribution.

This requires a network of interrelated measures of limited powers in government, of curbs on excessive credit to decrease inflationary pressures, of supervision of exports to avoid too great an impact of world-wide shortages upon our domestic economy, of limiting of inventories to prevent hoarding, of economy in the civilian activities of government and of a variable federal fiscal program, all to check booms and avoid depression busts, while maintaining that precious individual economic freedom.

Supplementary action on the housing and health and education shortcomings is also indicated.

We should follow through thoroughly with Sen. Vandenberg to carry through the Marshall plan for rebuilding Europe, placing it on a sound and businesslike basis, establishing proper economic conditions to increase its prospects of success but above all, treating it as the bipartisan program that it is and not permitting quibbling or politics to delay and handicap or cut in half and destroy this essential program.

We should maintain a strong military position and increase our air power and enlarge our research. This is essential for the dual reasons that no one can guarantee future peace and the decisions of others are more likely to be for peace if we are strong.

Our economic practices in this interim must be consistent with our foreign policy.

Specifically, we should promptly stop shipping to Russia heavy machinery machine tools, electrical control devices and other apparatus and equipment which could become a part of a Communist war machine in a future year.

This stoppage of this type of equipment, not a complete boycott - should be our rule unless and until the leaders in the Kremlin show by definite agreement and action that they will co-operate in rebuilding Europe.

According to latest available statistics, in 1947 the United States shipped more industrial machinery to Russia than to either France or England and more electrical machinery to Russia than to France and England combined. This does not make sense under the current obstructionist policies of the politburo.

Neither the attempts to minimize the amounts nor to refer to our imports justify this inconsistency. The claim that we receive most of our essential manganese and chrome ore from Russia is not true. We have received less than 1/3 of our total imports of these two ores from Russia and we can, with comparative ease, develop the other sources if necessary to fill our complete needs.

We should promptly initiate an extensive worldwide campaign of ideas to combat the propaganda line of the Communists of Russia. Its objective should be to advocate, explain and inspire, individual freedom for men everywhere.

It should go far beyond the voice of American broadcasts and with versatility and resourcefulness assist the genuine desire for freedom and slake the worldwide thirst for truth, and for information.

If these five interim phases are well carried out, the year 1950 could see this situation:

Continued success of the American economic system marked progress in rebuilding Europe, with rising standards of living and a definite trend toward increased, individual economic, social and political freedom, continued low production and poor living standards in Russia, compounded rather than corrected by the ruble purge, the inability of the Kremlin successfully to wage aggressive war and diminishing communist strength in other nations.

This could well be the soil from which the United Nations could grow to greater strength along with a major realignment of Russian policy. This could mean an increased assurance of peace, a brighter outlook for individual freedom and human rights, a larger enjoyment of life with higher production and easier flow of goods, of ideas and of men between nations and tremendous dividends of better living to all peoples.

To those who mutter "dreamer" and "visionary" to thoughts like these, permit me to respond that all broad happy steps in mankind's tortuous progress, including the original establishment of these United States of America, were met by such labels.

Let me further ask for the alternatives to such an integrated program of long view.

Certainly the history of the world does not recommend a policy of blind and spineless semi-surrender to totalitarian concepts or demands as advocated by the extreme left now in America. From modern Munich to ancient Athens, history says that the road to peace cannot be paved with the jellylike blocks of appeasement.

Equally do the lessons of the past and our own powers of reason tell us that problems are not solved by closing our eyes to them, nor does time stop marching if we reach out to turn backward the hands of the clock.

The Young Republicans of America can in this year, 1948, make a historic impact on the policies of our party and our country.

Some of our seniors may demonstrate this year policies and practices which to the youth of the party appear as short-sighted, obstructionist, evasive and narrow. It will be their right to act as they see the issues. But it will also be not only our right but our duty to oppose them.

I am convinced that only by such direct and forthright opposition can the Republican party in 1948 be a party that is of service, a party that is humanitarian, a party that is victorious.



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