

Bill

San Fran

Senator Connally has used a sound analogy for this Conference. If we are ~~going to put our guns on the table~~ ^{war are to be instead of blazing around the world} we must have in its place a ~~sound~~ ^{world wide} system of law and justice. ~~The suddenness with which science has shrunk the world we live in~~ ^{with a police force to stop and punish development before the outbreak of violence} makes it difficult for us to realize that absolute national sovereignty, ~~born that we must abandon the old notion that each nation is a law unto itself,~~ ^{centuries ago, is dead. It died with the arrival of the airplane, the radio, the rocket, and the rebomb.}

In its place we must develop the 20th Century principle of the right, duties, and responsibilities of ~~nation to nations~~ ^{each}, of ~~man to man~~ ^{all}.

True sovereignty rests in the people. They are accustomed to exercise it on local, state or provincial, and national levels; their own welfare demands that in the future they put some of it to work on the world level. No nation has any right in the modern world to do as he pleases without regard to the effect of its actions on other nations. Just as each free man must limit his liberty of action so that he does not injure his neighbor, so must ~~nations~~ ^{each} in this world ~~where all nations are neighbors.~~ ^{limit its action}

The new ~~level of government~~ ^{organization of the United Nations}, which this conference which is now being held ^{same} ~~is merely the extension into a larger area of~~ ^{which we now recognize on the local level.} the fundamental principles of living together, ~~an extension made necessary and possible~~ ^{It should also be clear that} by the developments of modern science. Nations ~~would~~ continue to have their own flags, their own constitutions, their own cultural heritages, and their own citizens. ~~To this~~ ^{we seek only to} ~~would be added~~ ^{and higher} ~~the new level~~ ^{of cooperation} to administer those international relations which ~~has failed~~ ^{under the method of} diplomacy, with its intrigue, balance of power, extra-territoriality, tariffs and devaluation of currency, and other devices, has failed to handle, ~~resulting in~~ ^{periodic recourse to war.}

Step by step, utilizing existing machinery where possible or establishing new mechanisms where needed, we therefore must develop rules or laws to spread human freedoms - the rights of fair trial and of worship, press and speech, and of workers

to organize. The new level of government must emphasize human rights rather than national rights. The United Nations Organization will be foredoomed to tragic failure if it is not founded on a deep respect for the fundamental dignity of man of whatever race or color or creed.

supplementing the addresses of this evening by Dean Gildersleeve and Senator Connally, it appears to me that there are three major phases of the world situation which have a vital bearing on the future security of the peoples of every nation including our own. These are: First, the method of control and supervision of atomic energy and of related scientific developments, Second, the development of the police force principle of the organization, Third, the application in practice of the trusteeship principles of the Charter to the dependent peoples.

Each of these items should be high on the agenda. The Assembly must come to grips with them promptly and directly. The United Nations Organization has moved expeditiously since the adjournment of the San Francisco Conference, but the events of the world have moved much faster. And it is my view that public opinion has also moved much faster.

There is a rising tide of public opinion throughout the world that the United Nations Organization must be made stronger and there is a growing recognition that the United

Nations Charter has the vitality and the flexibility to develop in any manner that the peoples of the world want it to develop.

Let us briefly discuss these three phases of the world security problem as a contribution to the public opinion foundation for the policies of our United States Delegation to this first Assembly.

There appears to be a steadily increasing agreement that atomic energy must definitely be controlled on a world level and that the United Nations Organization is the means through which this worldwide administration should be developed. This view is sound. The control must be as broad as the science which developed it, as broad as the sources of the Uranium which is used in atom splitting, and as broad as the effects of its use. Each of these factors are worldwide. World wide administration is imperative.

Scientists also appear to be in agreement that there is a reasonable certainty of the success of an inspection and accounting system. Obviously the basic reliance is upon good faith. But good faith alone is not enough. Good faith alone

is not sufficient for the government of any village or city or state. Founded on the general good faith of the people there must be a mechanism of government, a means of enforcement, a vehicle for implementation. That has been the experience of man from the beginning of time. It still applies. The good faith of the nations of the world in outlawing from their hands the terrifying means of wholesale destruction of other members of the family of nations must be implemented by a definite inspection and accounting and police force system that will lead to that confidence, that freedom from fear, that is essential for happy and successful life.

It is not too early to initiate a study and discussion of the manner in which the United Nations ~~police~~ police force can be established and controlled. The agreements of the respective members to furnish a portion of this force as provided in Articles 43 and 45 of the United Nations Charter should be promptly negotiated and fulfilled. But we should not stop there. Everyone recognizes the principles for a successful police force

—

of a city. It must be truly a community police force and not the police force of a particular portion of the community.

It must be well equipped. It must have integrity. It must not be dominated by any special clique. It must not itself dominate the community. It must function under definite laws and must itself respect human rights.

Should not these same rules apply at the earliest possible date on the world level for stability and peace and progress? Do we not need a small efficient worldwide police force which is not attached to or controlled by any one nation? Would a small number of airforce units be a logical way to initiate such a force? If the atomic bomb is outlawed for all nations would it be sound to place a small number of them at the hands of this force as a safeguard against the ~~xxxx~~ surreptitious building of a number of atomic bombs by an outlaw nation? Could this be done on a basis that the United Nations force would not have sufficient strength to dominate the world but would have sufficient strength to deal a very heavy blow to any outlaw that

tried a surprise attack on any other nation? Could such a force operate efficiently and with integrity if it were composed of volunteers from many nations? These are some of the questions which I hope a sub-committee of the United Nations Assembly begins to consider at an early date.

In other words, should we not seek to establish a world force for peace on such a basis that it would be clear that no nation in the world need fear that this force in itself might become an overlord and that no nation need fear that ~~this~~ this force itself ~~might become an overlord~~ could be used by some other nation for aggression, but yet strong enough that no nation in the world would feel that it could disregard or destroy ~~this~~ force without devastating and crippling loss to itself.

We need a new kind of balance of power. A balance of power that is not attached to the individual aims or objectives of any individual nation but is rather attached to the common desire of all mankind for lasting peace.

~~XXXX~~ In the atomic age does this not appear to be an

essential step for world peace and for world freedom from ~~fact~~ fear? If it is then let us take it soon rather than too late.

~~Insurrectionism~~ There are those who urge that all atomic bombs should be entirely outlawed by agreement and none should be retained by the United Nations or by any individual nation. I emphasize again that this course would have the effect of placing a high premium on lawlessness. In other words, if any nation, and it could be a comparatively small nation, violated the international agreement against atomic bombs, and surreptitiously prepared even a moderate quantity of ^{bombs} them and then carried them by stealth and deception to the centers of government and of industrial life of the major powers of the world, or poised them for supersonic rocket delivery, it could demand submission to its aggressive requests by the major nations of the world. You might say that to follow this course would be madness. But if this were to occur it would not be the first time in history that madmen have obtained control of a government. If there were no atomic bombs in existence outside of the outlaw

country, the outlaw would know that he could inflict crippling injury without comparable risk for himself. Thus it would appear that there should be in the hands of a truly international force, a moderate quantity of atomic bombs so situated at points around the world that it would be practically impossible for any outlaw to conduct a successful Pearl Harbor against all of these international bases at the same stroke. It would further appear that each unit of this international force should be composed of men from many nations of the world so that there need not be any fear on the part of any nation that this force would be used against it, unless it were a lawless aggressor.

The trusteeship provisions of the Charter furnish an opportunity and present an urgency for early and definite contribution toward a just and lasting peace. Article 73 of the Charter provides "Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the

Are these principles being fulfilled today? This question should be asked by the United Nations Assembly early in its first session. The United States of America should exercise a moral leadership in the asking of the question, and in ascertaining the facts, and in making ~~a~~ constructive proposals. The United States of America should expedite its own preparation of trusteeship proposals for the islands of the Pacific which it intends to place under trusteeship.

As~~as~~ the first Assembly meets, the United States must recognize and endeavor to discharge the responsibility for participation in world leadership which our strength and our productivity places upon us. We must not drift. We must not be unprepared. We must not be dictatorial. We must exercise in peace and for peace, the constructive counterpart of the affirmative and decisive leadership which our armed forces and our production machine exercised in war.

The eyes of all mankind should be on the first formal assembly of the United Nations of the world. With realistic

recognition of the difficulties, but with hope and confidence
in the future, we say tonight to the delegates of each and
every nation which will assemble, may God speed you in your
crucial race toward a just and lasting peace and toward progress
in the welfare of the men and women and children of ^{the} one world.

We are told that this is the common man war and that it must be the common man peace. But there are disturbing signs that the administration in its heart regards the common man as too dumb to be trusted with any advance information about his own peace. The better world is to be made for him, not by him. "His, not to make replies, his not the reason why, his but do and die."

These disturbing signs are found in the arrangements for the forthcoming conferences of the United Nations. The first step toward the organization of the post war of the world. The initial conference is to be held next week in Hot Springs. The big hotel there has been completely reserved for the delegates, secretaries and experts. No provision has been made for the representatives of the press who are, of course, the real representatives of the common man. There is no other hotel in Hot Springs. There are no private houses with adequate accommodations. There are no adequate telegraph or telephone facilities, Except for a couple of formal cut and dried matters entirely meaningless, newspaper men are to be excluded not only from the hotel but even from the

hotel grounds. The purpose of this conference is to discuss the supply of food to the countries of the world both during and after the war. The American people are certainly willing and eager to do their full share in feeding the people of the United Nations and the conquered territories, even though this means a continuing rationing of our own supplies. But surely it is unfair, undemocratic that the common man should not be told at least how much of the food taken from his table is to be sent abroad and where.

The second conference~~x~~ of the United Nations scheduled for April 19th is to consider difficult post-war problems, the problem of European refugees. Whether they shall be allotted to various United Nations and in what numbers, And where is this conference to be held? It was first scheduled for Ottawa where the British censorship could be trusted to hold a tight rein over American reporters. Then suddenly and without explanation, it was moved to Bermuda. Why Bermuda? Because Bermuda is the perfect star chamber, the ideal hiding place from American reporters and radio commentators, a hard place to get to even in normal times; and almost impossible place when the State Department can refuse passports to press and

radio representatives; a place of secrecy, darkness and silence. When, to all of these obstacles is added the iron hand of military censorship.

Everyone knows that the problem of refugees is a delicate question and that the handling of it will require a high degree of tact, vision kindness, ~~advice~~ and good will. But has not the common man a right to know what commitments are being made in his name? Is he too dumb or too important to be told how many refugees are to be settled in his community to share his ration table and compete for his job? We are presumed to be fighting for the four freedoms. One of these is cautiously phrased as "freedom of expression. The ^{President} ~~XXXXX~~ was very careful to avoid the common American term "Freedom of the press", or "freedom of speech". Freedom of expression is a more vague phrase, a politicians phrase, a phrase that could mean more or little. A phrase that can be made to mean freedom of the press, for those who believe in freedom of the press, but can be interpreted as something else by those whom freedom of the press is a bothersome obstacle to the exercise of arbitrary power.

The four freedoms are like the four legs of the chair. Knock out any one of the four and the chair will fall over and spill its occupants. In this case, the occupant_s is the common

man, typifying the millions of simple folks of the world who are giving the lives of their sons on foreign soil, on the 7 seas, and in the air. If freedom of the press is knocked out, then the Atlantic Charter becomes a wobbly platform indeed. It is a frightening thing that the very first step toward a peace of the common man should be to deny or impel one of the four freedoms for which his son is fighting.

The sincerity of the administration is on trial.

If these two conferences are held in secret as planned, let the common man be warned. He will know that the peace, whether good or bad, is to be a secret peace, the peace of the politicians, as was the peace of Versailles.

THE PRICE OF LASTING PEACE

By Harold E. Stassen

Everyone knows the price of war. We know that it takes the lives of thousands in battle and maims in body and mind millions of others. We know that the dislocations, the separations, the congestion, the emotional stresses and strains, have an impact upon our entire people, the detrimental extent of which only time will tell. We know that in many of the countries of the world, directly hit by the full force of war, the homes and entire productive ability and equipment of millions of people are destroyed. We know that in the wake of war comes disease and famine and pestilence, and the sad plight of a generation of undernourished, fear-stricken children. We know all these things are the price of war and seek earnestly to avoid its recurrence. We say we hate war. We say we love peace. Yet, somehow we shrink from paying the price for peace. Somehow we even hesitate to discuss in plain language what it will cost to maintain peace - a just and lasting peace - in the world.

I believe that it is high time to talk frankly and directly about the cost of peace.

I believe it is time that it is said directly that there is no such thing as a cheap peace, or a peace of small price.

What are some of the things that we must pay to obtain a lasting peace after the United Nations win this war?

First of all we must give up the extreme narrow, out-of-date principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty. I know well that the mere mention of this causes some political orators to grab a microphone, take a bombastic pose, and ask "Will you pull down the Stars and Stripes? Will you permit Hottentots to tell the free people of America what to do? Will you have these United States of America bow down before foreign rulers?" Let us hold on to our seats while this wave of false, unfounded, emotional oratory takes place, and then proceed, as intelligent men and women, to analyze what this principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty means, on the one hand, and what we think are the true principles that should guide our conduct, on the other.

The extreme principle of absolute

nationalistic sovereignty is the principle that each nation is a law unto itself, that it can do in world affairs absolutely what it pleases, that it does not need to pay any attention to the effect of its actions upon other nations. It springs from the old theory of the divine right of kings, that notion of centuries ago that kings could do no wrong, that their power came directly from God, and that neither the people, nor the laws, could have any control over them.

The absolute right of kings has long since been limited by recognition of the basic rights of man, but nations have clung to the absolute nationalistic sovereignty doctrine which sprang from this background, have not recognized the change that took place, and have paid a tragic price for the resulting limitation of world cooperation.

As I stated in my March 7, 1945 address at the University of Minnesota I believe one of the seven cardinal points of America's world policy should be "That we do not subscribe to the extreme view of nationalistic

sovereignty; that we realize that neither this nation nor any other nation can be a law unto itself in the modern world, that we are willing to delegate a limited portion of our national sovereignty to our United Nations organization, so that it may be effective in the tasks we expect it to accomplish. That we hold that true sovereignty rests in the people, and that there is and must be a law of humanity above and beyond the narrow rule of nationalistic absolute sovereignty. That man is in truth and in fact endowed, not by his nation, but by his Creator with certain inalienable rights."

Far from being contrary to the basic concepts of government written into our American constitution, this concept springs from the enduring principles and underlying philosophy of our founding fathers and applies them to the world of today. It must be the American view that true sovereignty rests with the people and that the people shall say how and where their power is to be used for their own future peace and progress. The people will say that just as

each individual man and woman must limit his own actions so that he does not injure his neighbor, must obey the laws and respect the courts - so each nation must so limit its action that it does not injure its neighbors and must respect and assist in developing laws and courts that are above the nation and draw their power from the people.

Before going further, however, let me point out that the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for the development of a United Nations Charter does not contemplate the changing of this principle of nationalistic sovereignty. I am in favor of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a beginning of postwar world cooperation. I feel that the alternative to these proposals is to do nothing at all - which would start us along the short road to World War No. III. Therefore, while I frankly feel we should go farther than Dumbarton Oaks, and while I do not believe the American people should be led to expect too much from the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, I will realistically endeavor in cooperation

with the other members of the United States delegation at the San Francisco Conference to state the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in as sound a form as possible so that they will be supported by the overwhelming majority of the people of America, by more than two-thirds of the United States Senate, and by the majority of the other United Nations.

I do feel, however, that it is of great importance that we begin now to discuss the principles involved in the development of government on a new and higher level over the period of the next ten, twenty and thirty years. I am convinced we are only making a start, and unless we keep going in the development of effective international action for peace, we will fail to obtain it.

It is always helpful in a discussion of a principle to apply it directly to a particular situation. Let us therefore apply the present rule of absolute nationalistic sovereignty to the field of international commercial aviation. If we continue to follow the old principle, each nation has a perfect right to permit any of its citizens

to fly planes anywhere in the world where they can get permission to land, to charge whatever they wish for freight and passengers, and to apply their individual rules - or lack of rules - to flight safety. The result will be the cut-throat type of competition that is economic warfare, and which inevitably tends to become military warfare. The result will be instability in the development of world airways and the lack of sound uniform safety rules, with power politics constantly calling the tunes. In other words, even though most of the nations of the world enter into agreements from time to time, there will be nothing to prevent individual nations staying outside the agreement, doing exactly as they please, and disrupting the entire future development.

A constructive effort was made at the Chicago Civil Aviation Conference in November 1944 to reduce these difficulties. It was a good conference. It made progress on many technical matters. But it was totally unable to meet the most vital problems of the airways of tomorrow. Neither it nor

the agencies it created can in any way affect the aviation practices of the non-members - and non-members are numerous and extensive. Nor can it do a thing about reasonable rates or fair economic practices of its members.

Pause and contemplate what the situation as to airways and railroads would be in our own country if there was no agreement among the forty-eight states, if states could establish any airline or railroad between them they wished, could subsidize lines in conflict with each other, fix and change rates at will, and regulate or not regulate as they desired. We know it would be chaos confounded. And chaos will be the word to describe world commercial aviation in a few years' time if the principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty is followed.

On the other hand, if we follow the principle that man is sovereign, that we must have world-wide supervision over the development of air transport, there is no reason why we cannot develop international aviation that is as sound, safe, as serviceable as our excellent domestic airlines. I

would propose an International Civil Aeronautics Commission, whose members, selected by the nations of the world, would supervise international airways in much the same manner as our own Civil Aeronautics Board supervises the airways within the country. This means that the Commission would fix fair and reasonable rates; would issue licenses of public convenience and necessity to the airlines that are to fly the routes; would establish rules for safety of flight, for traffic control, for aids to navigation, and would supervise the development of the vast network of airlines that should cross and recross every part of the world. Under such a commission, we would have wholesome competition within the boundaries of regulation, instead of economic warfare. Under such a commission, our airlines would obtain a fair share of the routes around the world and would obtain such portion of the business as their own efficiency and comfort and service gave to the public. It would prevent ruinous race by nations to grant larger and larger subsidies to their airlines as

each seeks to develop the air in unrestricted competition with the others. But the board's jurisdiction would be limited to flights between nations, and the board would not be given any power over the airlines within this country or within any other country.

Of those who object to the development of such an international authority, I would ask what is it that you want to have American companies do which you feel an agency of this kind would not permit them to do. Do you want to try to grab more than America's share of future air travel, thereby developing a continuing source of international bitterness and intrigue? Do you want to charge very low rates between, shall we say, France and America, to undercut and ruin competition and then make it up by charging very high rates, say, between China and America, where you might have a temporary monopoly? Do you want it to be only your own business if you fly an airplane that does not meet full safety requirements, when you will be carrying the people of many nations in the plane?



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