

Let me also make it clear that I propose that the agency set up in this particular field will have world-wide jurisdiction and that no nation shall be permitted to fly a commercial plane in international flight except under the jurisdiction of this agency. This does mean a new concept. It does mean that we are saying that we will not permit the existence of outlaw nation. We must recognize that wars do not occur simply because one nation marches across the borders of another. The causes of war go far behind that event. War is the final and terrible manifestation of the anarchy of nations, of the lack of law and order and justice on the world level which has paraded for so long under the name of absolute nationalistic sovereignty.

This approach will also require that we discontinue the notion that our country or any other country can, in a futile attempt to give false prosperity to a particular group within a country, suddenly jump up its tariffs, or devalue its currency, or install embargoes upon any certain group of

products, and thus bring suffering and depressions to other parts of the world. As a part of the price of peace, we must contemplate lower tariffs and increased trade with the peoples of the world. There may well be times when this will mean that we will obtain a slightly lower price for some of our wheat, our butter, or our shoes. But we must ask ourselves, do we want to contribute in this way to gradual advancement of the standards of living of the world, or do we want to follow the narrow, selfish course which always in the past has thrown us into the whirlpools of vicious depressions and the conflagrations of civilization that we call war? Will we take a chance on a few cents less for wheat and shoes, or would we rather take a chance on sending succeeding generations of our sons into battle?

We must also contemplate granting of assistance through capital, credits and technical skill to the other peoples of the world. I do not propose a Santa Claus role. The entire approach should be that of far-

sighted investment in the development of the resources and standards of other peoples of the world. Let us be perfectly frank and say that if to maintain peace in the next fifty years, we spent one-half of the amount we are spending to win this war in five years, the price of peace would not be too high.

Our American system of private capital and individual enterprise will survive with greater vigor if it takes a position of world cooperation and leadership, that it will if it tries to turn within itself. If its horizon is narrow, if it seeks to close itself with its own borders, it will wither and deteriorate in the petty internal struggles of a shrinking economy. Individual capital thrives from use, and what greater use can there be than that we devote the capital of America to the sound development of a world in which we fully participate? Individual enterprise reaches its greatest height when it meets its greatest challenge. What greater challenge can there be than to meet the demands of the consumers of the world, to



show great resourcefulness and initiative, to demonstrate that man was meant to be free, that he was endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. While we will live with and cooperate with other systems, and while we respect the rights of other people to choose their own governments and their own economy, we should hold fast to our own basic principles and keep them bright before the world, not in a boastful or domineering manner, but in the manner of one who believes in the standards he carries.

World trade after the war, with the diverse types of economy that will be in existence will present many difficulties, but they will not be insurmountable. We will be able to maintain our system of private capital and individual enterprise and successfully compete with and do business with other countries having various forms of state and planned economies.

To do so in an orderly manner will require the development of a code of fair trade between nations which will minimize the

sudden throwing upon the market of an excessive quantity of a product at low price. An overall framework of world monetary and trade policies within which the nations will compete and do business must be slowly developed.

The means must be developed by which nations having a complete governmental centralization of world trade, such as Russia, can develop multilateral trade rather than only bilateral trade. This can be done with stable currencies and an international clearing house.

All must recognize that in the modern world no nation, whether operating under a free economy, a planned economy, or a state economy can long enjoy a high standard of living and peace in a world beset by economic warfare and world-wide depressions.

Any advantage which one country obtains at the expense of a ruinous blow to the economy of another country can be nothing but temporary, and inevitably will rebound to the future disadvantage of both.

As a further part of the price of peace,

we must contemplate maintaining a strong modern navy with adequate bases over the seas, an alert, up-to-date air force, and a mechanized, highly-trained land force.

The forces should not be tremendous; we should not become a militaristic nation.

But we should discuss our world-wide policy frankly with our military, naval and air leaders and endeavor to reach agreement with them as to the military forces needed to carry forth these policies.

We must also recognize our responsibility to furnish a part of the police power of the world and to back up the United Nations organization in a system of justice and law that will be gradually developed.

I believe it would be very desirable if a small portion of our forces were actually assigned to the direct control of the military staff committee of the United Nations. Joining with similar small forces from other major nations, they would constitute a very effective deterrent to the small disorders that break out in the world. These small breaches of world peace are often the fore-



runners of major wars and do so much to break down the whole moral tone and code of world behavior. We all recognize that the speed with which one or two squad cars can arrive at the scene of trouble is a greater deterrent to crime than the fact that a large citizen's posse can be organized after considerable delay. So, I believe we should definitely contemplate consigning small, fast, hard-hitting forces to the control of the United Nations organization, so that they can be used quickly and decisively for policing action in accordance with general policies which our Congress and our President establish in advance. The size of the force and the rules for its use should indicate that its nature is definitely police, and not military. I wish to also make it clear that I do not propose that this joint force should be more powerful than the forces of our own nation or of Russia or of Great Britain. In fact, I would oppose such a development. Man functions best under a system of law and order with checks and balances. I believe it is wholesome and good that the major powers

of the world and the United Nations organization should operate somewhat as checks and balances upon each other. If we all frankly recognize that we will not always agree, but never lose sight of the overwhelming necessity of moving forward together on the big issues, if we are not hypersensitive to criticism, then there is no basic reason why we should not live together in peace.

Let me also make it clear that while I have emphasized the price of peace, it is my conviction that if we pay that price, if we lift our eyes and seek to fulfill our responsibility to the peoples of the world, if we stimulate increased trade, and if we gradually give authority to the world agency in world fields and thereby limit our own international whims, if we recognize the responsibility of our great productive system, if we hold fast to our basic American principles and keep them before the world, and if we cling to our system of individual capital and free enterprise, we will find in truth that the price of peace is as bread cast upon the waters. For it will return to us many-fold



not only in the happiness of our people,  
not only in high standards of living and  
high levels of employment within our country,  
but also the development of the basic dignity  
of man.

THE END.

BOX WITH STASSEN PIECE

Harold E. Stassen was elected governor of Minnesota in 1938 at the age of 31, the youngest governor in the U.S. In 1943 he resigned to join the Navy and while overseas was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President. He will be a delegate to the United Nations Conference opening next week in San Francisco. The opinions expressed in this article are his own, and not necessarily those of the U.S. Navy.

# *American World Policy for Peace and Progress*

Speech delivered at University  
of Minnesota, Minneapolis

BY

**Com. Harold E. Stassen, U.S.N.**

Former Governor of Minnesota



March 7, 1945



## *American World Policy For Peace and Progress*

---

IN THESE last three years, America, with her allies, has won a long series of brilliant historic victories in this war. The names stand out as grim markers of our march toward victory, from Guadalcanal and Casablanca to Iwo Jima and the Rhine.

These battles will be symbols for generations of how Americans, who love peace, can and will fight when they must.

The superb productive power of our country has played a heavy part in these victories and has contributed to the strength of the other United Nations. American labor, management, capital and agriculture are entitled to high commendation for their performance. The flow of supplies and munitions and ships and planes and guns has been nothing short of a miracle.

### **In Sight of Victory**

The victories have been actually won by the unbelievably heroic and effective fighting of those wise-cracking, good natured, beloved American sons of yours on the battlefronts of the world.

They take off from rolling carrier decks, or advanced airfields, penetrate thick, soupy weather, fight their way to enemy strongholds and deal devastating blows. They wade into beaches in wave after wave regardless of the whirl of machine guns, the wham of mortars and the blast of bombs. They slog and worm their way up to blast and burn pillboxes and caves. They stand by their guns and pour out their fire in the face of diving planes or roaring

counter fire, or charging tanks. They take their guns, their planes, their tanks, their ships, their subs, their small boats, anywhere and everywhere to strike an enemy or support a pal. They die doing these things. They die, and others like them take their places.

With splendid military leadership from the Commander in Chief, and from generals like Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur and Arnold, and Vandegrift, and from admirals like King, Leahy, Nimitz and Halsey—they have brought us within sight of the final victory.

That final victory must be our No. 1 aim until the last enemy has surrendered. Nothing must divert us from following through to early, complete winning of the war. Each new quota of supplies and munitions and men to meet the fluctuating needs of the shifting types of battle must be promptly met. We must not listen to the siren call of reconversion until we can reconvert together in peace. Each new battle must be fought with vigor and with skill.

### Time for Thought

But it is right and proper and urgent that we in service, when the opportunity presents itself, and you at home, proceed to think through the world policy of America for peace, lest we lose much of what we are fighting for.

As you know, the President has invited me to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, and I have accepted.

It will be my endeavor to study and to learn as much as possible of the information, ideas and viewpoints of the people of America on the questions coming up at this conference. I have consulted and will consult with leaders of our government and of my Republican party; of church; of labor, agriculture and business; of women, of youth and of veterans. But I will not seek to, nor claim to represent any of them as special groups at San Francisco.

I will consider it my duty to represent my country as a whole as I see its best welfare, and to be individually responsible for my actions. It will be my aim to assist in securing a result of this crucial conference which will be supported by the overwhelming majority of the people of America, and by substantially all of the other United Nations.

This means, of course, that the result will not be, and cannot be, entirely in accord with any nation's or any person's individual views.

But, I cannot say too emphatically, that the alternative to finding the broad areas of agreement is to do nothing at all. And nothing at all would start us on our way along the short road of inaction, to worldwide depressions and to the next and most tragic world war.

**That is not an acceptable alternative.**

It is of tremendous importance that the principles which will guide our actions in the years to come be formulated and clarified and tempered in the heat of free discussion now, so that they may be clearly and definitely set before the world.

To stimulate this search, speaking only for myself, I state frankly what I consider should be the seven cardinal points of our future world policy.

**First:** That as a nation we will join with our present allies at San Francisco to build a definite continuing organization of the United Nations of the World, based on justice and law, and insured by force. That we will seek to develop gradually a new and higher level of government, with legislative, judicial, and executive functions, and with world-wide jurisdiction, for the future peace, progress, and well-being of mankind. That we are and will continue to be interested in what happens in every other part of the globe. That this is one world.

Nor can I speak those last two words without pausing to pay a tribute to him who made them mean more than mere words, more than

a symbol, the veritable keystone to a living cause and hope for mankind—Wendell Willkie.

**Second:** 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, and 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 the nation but by the Creator, with certain "inalienable rights."**

**Third:** That we consider that the future welfare and peace and happiness of the people of America are inseparably intertwined with the future welfare and peace and happiness of the men and women and children of the world.

**Fourth:** That we will use the enormous productive capacity of America and the reservoirs of capital and credit and technical skill to contribute to the gradual advancement of the standards of living of the peoples of the world, not as recipients of charity, but as self-respecting men and women of dignity and of pride.

**Fifth:** That we believe in the freedom of information through press and radio and school and forum as a vital factor in the peace and progress of the world and in the fulfillment of the dignity of man.

**Sixth:** That those who were aggressors in this war shall be stripped of all means to make war and shall remain so stripped. That we propose to remain strong on land, at sea and in the air, and will join with Russia and Great Britain, China and France, and the other United Nations in furnishing police power in the world.

**Seventh:** That we are and propose to remain a democracy of free citizens with an economic

system of private capital and individual enterprise. That we will seek constantly to improve the functioning of our system, both as to freedom and equality of our citizens and as to the success and adequacy of our economy. That we will explain our system to the world but will leave it to the peoples in each nation to decide for themselves their own form of government so long as they do not trample on basic human rights, or threaten the peace of the world, or transgress upon their neighbors. That we will permit our own citizens to learn of any other form of government they wish to study, but will not permit any other government to seek actively to undermine our own.

### For Basic World Law

Obviously each of these cardinal points could well be the subject of a major address. Within the limits of my time, this evening, I will discuss them in turn.

It is very generally agreed now that an international organization should be formed and that the United Nations should be the basis of such an organization.

I am not one of those who feel that the organization must take some certain detailed, exact form. I believe there are many forms that would be a definite step forward and would make a constructive contribution.

I hope that it will include some method of developing basic worldwide law. It should make possible the future enactment of a fundamental code of human rights. The beginning may be very small. But even if we started with the enactment of one law, a law that no country, in time of peace, shall execute a human being without just trial, it would be a significant step. We sometimes fail to realize that there is no such world law today. The Nazi stormtroopers and Gestapo who dragged civilians from their houses in Germany and summarily shot them, were violating every moral code we know of, but they were not violating any international law, because there is none to



protect a human being within a nation. This silhouettes starkly the tragic slowness of the development of society on the world level.

We know full well that Nazi aggression actually started, not when Hitler marched across his borders, but rather when he first ruthlessly trampled the rights of men within Germany.

From small beginnings, gradually the rights of freedom of worship, of fair trial, of freedom of speech and press, the right of the worker to organize, and the prevention of discrimination should be developed. With it should be stated the world-wide laws or rules against aggression, for the flight of aircraft, for the use of ports and canals, the restriction of armaments, the availability of resources, the advancement of health and education, and the prevention of unjust confiscation of property.

### Court, Police Force

Obviously if we are to have laws we must have a court to administer these laws. Clearly then, a United Nations Court of some type with world-wide jurisdiction is essential.

It is equally clear that a police force of some nature is mandatory to enforce the decisions of the court, if order and justice is to be respected and maintained. This definitely does not mean an all-powerful international police force of a super state.

Let us clarify our thinking.

If either the United States, or Russia, or Great Britain decides in the next 25 years to make war, then there will be another world war, and no organization, or league, or union, or treaties will stop it. But I do not believe any of these countries will want to make war. Each knows the horrors of war. Each has so much to gain by not making war. Each has a great future in the peaceful development of its peoples, its resources and its standing in the world.

They will not always see problems alike. They will not always please each other. But

in the main, they must and should work out their differences of views and find the way for joint action. The Yalta Conference was a very important indication that this can and will be done. Clearly, then, our policies should be based on the development of the world with these three Nations desiring peace.

A note of caution should also be sounded, however, that we should definitely envisage a system of laws and justice and a moral code supported by police force, and must not permit the development of a continuing system of world power and force without law.

### System of Trusteeship

The United Nations should also develop an effective and just method of trusteeships for use in governing territories that for reasons of extreme military importance, or inability of self-government, or peculiar economic position, or seizure from an enemy, can best be held in a form of joint United Nations title, rather than in the title of any individual nation. The enlightened interest of the world and the human rights of the people concerned should both be carefully safeguarded. The trustee may be either one of the United Nations, or the United Nations organization itself.

Let us also make it clear that the United Nations organization does not mean breaking up any of the stable associations of nations and peoples now in existence. It is definitely not adverse to the British Commonwealth of Nations, nor to the Union of Soviet Republics, nor to the United States of America, nor to the various associations of nations through treaties and friendships. On the contrary, we seek to build on these cornerstones of stability, a world-wide beginning for order and justice and peace in place of chaos and tragedy and war.

Tremendous steps have been taken in recent months toward the fulfillment of this first cardinal point of our world policy.

### A Golden Opportunity

With the background of the Atlantic Charter and the commitments of Secretary Hull's Conference at Moscow, the declarations of Tehran, the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks, the decisions at Yalta, the President's excellent message to Congress last week, and, the never ending wholesome study and discussion throughout America, have brought us to the eve of the San Francisco Conference for the drafting of a definite framework for continuing United Nations action in peace, with the overwhelming support of the people of the country and of the United States Senate for the steps proposed.

We should look, therefore, upon the San Francisco Conference as a golden opportunity to win a beachhead in the battle for a just and lasting peace.

The beachhead is of crucial importance and requires many sacrifices and unlimited determination.

And also, the beachhead is not the final goal, but only the jumping off place for the long hard drive toward victory.

So it will be, and so it must be recognized at San Francisco. The results of a successful conference will be of incalculable importance, but they will not be the final answer to our world problems for peace. They will only be the first step. Continuing interest of the American people, continuing devotion of their government, the approval and support of the proposals by the Senate, and then the steady growth and development of the United Nations organization responsive to changing world conditions, will be essential if we are to have anything more than a precarious beachhead. We must never lose sight of the fact that a static, unchanging peace cannot serve a dynamic, changing world.

### Issue of Sovereignty

In a discussion of the development of a new and higher level of government you frequently hear the rejoinder, yes, that would be a good

step but it would violate the rule of absolute nationalistic sovereignty.

Let us meet this issue squarely.

I do not want my country to face another generation of youth marching off to the horrors of war and say "We could have prevented the development of this conflict but we had to cling to the extreme principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty." That will not be an acceptable answer.

There may be many diplomats who do not know it; there may be many political leaders who are afraid to admit it; there may be many people who do not understand it, but the extreme principle of absolute nationalistic sovereignty is of centuries gone by and it is dead. It died with the arrival of the airplane, the radio, the rocket and the robomb.

In its place we must develop the new principle of the rights, duties and responsibilities of each nation to the other nations and of each man and each woman to the other people of the world.

No nation has any right in the modern world to do as it pleases without regard to the effects of its actions upon the peoples of other nations. True sovereignty rests in the people, and the people know that for their own future welfare they must exercise a portion of that sovereignty on a world level in place of the nationalistic level.

Just as each free man must limit his liberty of action so that he does not injure his neighbor, so each nation must limit its action so that it does not injure its neighbor. And in one world today, the nations of the world are all neighbors.

One of the most striking facts which has been demonstrated in this war is the enormous productive capacity of America. It has been a huge power for destruction and for victory.

It can be an equally great power for world construction and progress after the war if we but lift our eyes to its opportunities and

responsibilities and take the necessary steps for world stability.

This will require increased investments by American capital in the resources and facilities of other nations, and increased trade with lower tariffs throughout the world. We must explode the narrow view that if we develop production in other parts of the world we will preempt our own markets. We will create markets as we develop means to produce. Producers are consumers. The capacity of the human race to consume is just as great as the capacity of the human race to produce. Of course there are and will be acute problems of distribution. But we can either fight over a shrinking wealth, or work together to participate in an expanding production and the wealth of the future.

Vast sums of charitable assistance will be needed in the immediate postwar period, but this should be definitely separated from the careful investment of capital in the long-term development of other nations. It is better that American capital be invested and reinvested in various countries of the world to assist in raising their standards of living and indirectly develop jobs in America in the process, than that it be sterile and stagnant in America.

### Not a Santa Claus Role

This does not mean a Santa Claus role. Most of the peoples of the world do not want charity beyond the war emergency conditions. They want to be self-reliant. They want to rebuild their own homes and develop their own economy. It is healthy and wholesome for them and for the world that they should.

But it will mean long term investments and reinvestments.

Nor is this all just an idealistic dream. Never did a country for its own sake more need to clear the cobwebs from its thinking. Never did a country for its own sake more need to appraise the value and the purpose of its great productive strength.

If it does not lift its eyes and use its brain and its brawn for progress of the world, it will wither and deteriorate in petty internal struggles over the division of a shinking economy.

But if it contributes to the progress of the world, it will itself share in that progress in high standards of living, a richer life, and peace.

This is also true of other peoples. Any attempt to profit by one nation at the expense of other peoples will fail. If it meets with temporary success it will soon be lost in either the whirlpool of depression or the cauldron of war. We cannot have continued economic warfare and continued military peace.

The world must advance together and there is room in the world for all the peoples who live in it.

### Germany and Japan

World opinion is almost unanimous that the Germans and the Japanese must be stripped of their means of making war. This can best be done by joint action of the victorious nations through the United Nations organization, with a continuing joint occupation and inspection.

Under that military rule all indemnities and penalties and reparations should take place. Then and only then the gradual development of self-government should be permitted to arise. It should begin in the localities and in the schools and slowly develop as the capacity and desire for non-aggressive, peaceful and successful administration is demonstrated.

Freedom of information to the citizens of these countries must be a fundamental rule. Open to the children of Germany and Japan and Italy the full access to the radios and publications and books of the world, and, if we are right in our basic concepts in America, and I believe we are, in a generation or two we will have a different Germany and a different Japan. When the change is demonstrated, they should be permitted to become self-governing



and be granted membership in the world organization, but even then there is no reason why they should be permitted to rearm, and there is every reason to prevent them from rearming.

We will be saying in effect to the conquered nations, "We will permit you to rise again as successful, self-governing constructive nations, if you so desire, but we will not permit you to rise again as a military power, whatever may be your protestations of intentions."

### **We Should Stay Strong**

We, ourselves, should remain strong. We should maintain a powerful, modern navy. We should keep an alert up-to-date air force. We should constantly train an efficient land force.

We should do this to fulfill the police force responsibility which will be ours in enforcing and supporting the world code of justice and the United Nations Organization, and also to assure our own future security and progress. We should make it plain that much as we want peace, much as we hate war, we will fight again, and will fight anyone who basically violates world justice and seeks to flout our policies and tries to substitute might for right.

This position, I am convinced, is more likely to maintain peace than an announced policy of making ourselves weak and of not fighting even though provoked.

To those who scoff at thoughts like these expressed tonight as abstract idealism, I simply ask that you look out upon the world-wide tragedy of war today. When the terror of war has reached the grand scale that it has today, it is time for some thinking for peace on a grand scale. And I add that I will work with you with just as much hard-shelled realism on the emergency of today and with just as much down to earth practicalism on the problems of tomorrow.

But our ideals will determine the all important question of the basic course that we take.

### **We Need No Scoffers**

We need no scoffers today. We need men. Men to assault the pillboxes of lethargy — the emplacements of prejudice—the spitting guns of intolerance. Men who are willing to fall in the assault so that others may carry the day. It will take that to build the world. It will take that to raise the standards of mankind—to make freedom and liberty and peace—living symbols to men and women and children—and not mere words in speeches or in charters.

Our fighting men want America to have a world policy for peace that is as big, as definite, and as successful as has been our strategy for war.

It will take time and it will cost.

But the alternative makes it worth the cost. In fact, my countrymen, there is no alternative for a just, a free and brave people.

They do not want you to surrender before the counterattacking assault waves of cynicism this best hope of enduring peace on earth.

Some people say that our democracy is not perfect and that there is discrimination and inequality and apathy and corruption. They are right. Some say that our economic system has not functioned perfectly and that there are maladjustments and sufferings and faulty distributions. They are right.

But neither of these facts is any reason for waiting for the correction of these imperfections before we step forward to fulfill the world leadership which it is mandatory that we exercise.

We must advance on both the world front and the domestic front at the same time. In fact, they are in large measure interdependent.

I speak not of a Utopia. I speak not of a human race suddenly turned angelic.

There will be selfishness and greed and corruption and narrowness and intolerance in the world tomorrow and tomorrow's tomorrow. But pray God, we may have the courage and the wisdom and the vision to raise a definite standard that will appeal to the best that is in man, and then strive mightily toward that goal.

---

---

*If this pamphlet has interested you, won't  
you please pass it on to a friend?*

---

**ADDITIONAL COPIES CAN BE  
OBTAINED**

**FROM**

**THE PLAZA BANK**  
**1230 OLIVE STREET**  
**ST. LOUIS 3, MO.**

**F. R. VON WINDEGGER, Pres.**

---

---

**WELLINGTON PRESS**



*Buy Bonds and  
Be Free!*

# American World Policy for Peace and Progress

●

ADDRESS BY HAROLD E. STASSEN  
*at a public meeting sponsored by the  
Minnesota United Nations Committee  
at the University of Minnesota, March  
7, 1945, and broadcast over the Colum-  
bia Network.*

●

Published by  
Minnesota United Nations Committee  
East 510, First National Bank Building  
St. Paul 1, Minn.

Governor Thye, President Coffey, Friends and Fellow Citizens:

In these last three years, America, with her allies, has won a long series of brilliant, historic victories in this war. The names stand out as grim markers on our march toward victory, from Guadalcanal and Casa Blanca to Iwo Jima and the Rhine.

For generations these battles will be symbols of how Americans, who love peace, can and will fight when they must.

The superb productive power of our country has played a heavy part in these victories and has contributed to the strength of the other United Nations. American labor, management, capital and agriculture are entitled to high commendation for their performance. The flow of supplies and munitions and ships and planes and guns has been nothing short of a miracle.

The victories have been won actually by the unbelievably heroic and effective fighting of those wise-cracking, good-natured, beloved American sons of yours on the battlefronts of the world.

They take off from rolling carrier decks, or advanced airfields, penetrate thick, soupy weather, fight their way to enemy strongholds and deal devastating blows. They wade into beaches in wave after wave regardless of the whirl of machine guns, the wham of mortars and the blast of bombs. They slog and worm their way up to blast and burn pillboxes and caves. They stand by their guns and pour out their fire in the face of diving planes or roaring counter fire or charging tanks. They take their guns, their planes, their tanks, their ships, their subs, their small boats, anywhere and everywhere to strike an enemy or support a pal. They die doing these things. They die, and others like them take their places.

With splendid military leadership from the Commander-in-Chief, and from generals like Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur and Arnold, and Vandegrift, and from Admirals like



King, Leahy, Nimitz and Halsey—they have brought us within sight of the final victory.

That final victory must be our No. 1 aim until the last enemy has surrendered. Nothing must divert us from following through to early, complete winning of the war. Each new quota of supplies and munitions and men to meet the fluctuating needs of the shifting types of battle must be met promptly. We must not listen to the siren call of reconversion until we can reconvert together in peace. Each new battle must be fought with vigor and with skill.

But it is right and proper and urgent that we in service, when the opportunity presents itself, and you at home proceed to think through the world policy of America for peace, lest we lose much of what we are fighting for.

As you know, the President has invited me to serve as a member of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations, and I have accepted.

It will be my endeavor to study and to learn as much as possible of the information, ideas and viewpoints of the people of America on the questions coming up at this Conference. I have consulted and will consult with leaders of our government and of my Republican party; of church; of labor, agriculture and business; of women, of youth and of veterans. But I will not seek to, nor claim to represent any of them as special groups at San Francisco. I will consider it my duty to represent my country as a whole as I see its best welfare, and to be individually responsible for my actions. It will be my aim to assist in securing a result of this crucial conference which will be supported by the overwhelming majority of the people of America and by substantially all of the other United Nations. This means, of course, that the result will not be, and cannot be, entirely in accord with any nation's or any person's individual views. But, I cannot say too emphatically that the alternative to finding the broad areas of agreement is to do nothing at all. And nothing at all would

start us on our way along the short road of inaction, to worldwide depressions and to the next and most tragic world war. That is not an acceptable alternative.

It is of tremendous importance that the principles which will guide our actions in the years to come be formulated and clarified and tempered in the heat of free discussion now, so that they may be clearly and definitely set before the world.

~~To stimulate this search, speaking only for myself, I~~ state frankly what I consider should be the seven cardinal points of our future world policy.

**First:** That as a nation we will join with our present allies at San Francisco to build a definite continuing organization of the United Nations of the World, based on justice and law, and insured by force. That we will seek to develop gradually a new and higher level of government, with legislative, judicial and executive functions, and with worldwide jurisdiction, for the future peace, progress and well-being of mankind. That we are and will continue to be interested in what happens in every other part of the globe. That this is one world. XXXX

~~Nor can I speak those last two words without pausing to pay a tribute to him who made them mean more than mere words, more than a symbol, the veritable keystone to a living cause and hope for mankind—Wendell Willkie.~~

**Second:** 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, and 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."

**Third:** That we consider that the future welfare and peace and happiness of the people of America is inseparably intertwined with the future welfare and peace and happiness of the men and women and children of the world.

**Fourth:** That we will use the enormous productive capacity of America and the reservoirs of capital and credit and technical skill to contribute to the gradual advancement of the standards of living of the people of the world, not as recipients of charity, but as self-respecting men and women of dignity and of pride.

**Fifth:** That we believe in the freedom of information through press and radio and school and forum as a vital factor in the peace and progress of the world and in the fulfillment of the dignity of man.

**Sixth:** That those who were aggressors in this war shall be stripped of all means to make war and shall remain so stripped. That we propose to remain strong on land, at sea and in the air, and will join with Russia and Great Britain, China and France and the other United Nations in furnishing police power in the world.

**Seventh:** That we are and propose to remain a democracy of free citizens with an economic system of private capital and individual enterprise. That we will seek constantly to improve the functioning of our system, both as to freedom and equality of our citizens and as to the success and adequacy of our economy. That we will explain our system to the world but will leave it to the peoples in each nation to decide for themselves their own form of government so long as they do not trample on basic human rights, or threaten the peace of the world, or transgress upon their neighbors. That we will permit our own citizens to learn of any other form of government they wish to study, but will not permit any other government to seek actively to undermine our own.

#

Obviously each of these cardinal points could well be the subject of a major address. Within the limits of my time, this evening, I will discuss them in turn.

It is very generally agreed now that an international organization should be formed and that the United Nations should be the basis of such an organization.

I am not one of those who feel that the organization must take some certain detailed, exact form. I believe there are many forms that would be a definite step forward and would make a constructive contribution.

I hope that it will include some method of developing basic world-wide law. It should make possible the future enactment of a fundamental code of human rights. The beginning may be very small. But even if we started with the enactment of one law, a law that no country, in time of peace, shall execute a human being without just trial, it would be a significant step. We sometimes fail to realize that there is no such world law today. The Nazi stormtroopers and Gestapo who dragged civilians from their houses in Germany and summarily shot them were violating every moral code we know of, but they were not violating any international law, because there is none to protect a human being within a nation. This silhouettes starkly the tragic slowness of the development of society on the world level.

We know full well that Nazi aggression actually started, not when Hitler marched across his borders, but rather when he first ruthlessly trampled the rights of men within Germany.

From small beginnings, gradually the rights of freedom of worship, of fair trial, of freedom of speech and press, the right of the worker to organize and the prevention of discrimination should be developed. With it should be stated the world-wide laws or rules against aggression, for the flight of aircraft, for the use of ports and canals, the restriction of armaments, the availability of resources, the advancement of health

and education and the prevention of unjust confiscation of property.

Obviously if we are to have laws we must have a court to administer these laws. Clearly then, a United Nations Court of some type with world-wide jurisdiction is essential.

It is equally clear that a police force of some nature is mandatory to enforce the decisions of the court, if order and justice are to be respected and maintained. This definitely does not mean an all-powerful international police force of a super state.

[ Let us clarify our thinking.

If either the United States, or Russia, or Great Britain decides in the next 25 years to make war, then there will be another world war, and no organization, or league, or union, or treaties will stop it. But I do not believe any of these countries will want to make war. Each knows the horrors of war. Each has so much to gain by not making war. Each has a great future in the peaceful development of its peoples, its resources and its standing in the world.

They will not always see problems alike. They will not always please each other. But in the main, they must and should work out their differences of views and find the way for joint action. The Yalta Conference was a very important indication that this can and will be done. Clearly, then, our policies should be based on the development of the world with these three nations desiring peace.

A note of caution should also be sounded, however, that we should definitely envisage a system of laws and justice and a moral code supported by police force, and must not permit the development of a continuing system of world power and force without law.

The United Nations should also develop an effective and just method of trusteeships for use in governing territories that for reasons of extreme military importance, or inability

of self-government, or peculiar economic position, or seizure from an enemy, can best be held in a form of joint United Nations title rather than in the title of any individual nation. The enlightened interest of the world and the human rights of the people concerned should both be safeguarded carefully. The trustee may be either one of the United Nations, or the United Nations organization itself.

Let us also make it clear that the United Nations organization does not mean breaking up any of the stable associations of nations and peoples now in existence. It is definitely not adverse to the British Commonwealth of Nations, nor to the Union of Soviet Republics, nor to the United States of America, nor to the various associations of nations through treaties and friendships. On the contrary, we seek to build on these cornerstones of stability a worldwide beginning for order and justice and peace in place of chaos and tragedy and war.

Tremendous steps have been taken in recent months toward the fulfillment of this first cardinal point of our world policy.

With the background of the Atlantic Charter and the commitments of Secretary Hull's Conference at Moscow, the declarations of Teheran, the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks, the decisions at Yalta, the President's excellent message to Congress last week, and the never-ending, wholesome study and discussion throughout America have brought us to the eve of the San Francisco Conference for the drafting of a definite framework for continuing United Nations action in peace, with the overwhelming support of the people of the country and of the United States Senate for the steps proposed.

**We should look, therefore, upon the San Francisco Conference as a golden opportunity to win a beachhead in the battle for a just and lasting peace.**

The beachhead is of crucial importance and requires many sacrifices and unlimited determination.



And also, the beachhead is not the final goal, but only the jumping off place for the long, hard drive toward victory.

So it will be, and so it must be recognized, at San Francisco. The results of a successful conference will be of incalculable importance, but they will not be the final answer to our world problems for peace. They will only be the first step. Continuing interest of the American people, continuing devotion of our government, the approval and support of the proposals by the Senate and then the steady growth and development of the United Nations organization, responsive to changing world conditions, will be essential if we are to have anything more than a precarious beachhead. **We must never lose sight of the fact that a static, unchanging peace cannot serve a dynamic, changing world.**

In a discussion of the development of a new and higher level of government you frequently hear the rejoinder, yes, that would be a good step but it would violate the rule of absolute nationalistic sovereignty.

Let us meet this issue squarely.

I do not want my country to face another generation of youth marching off to the horrors of war and say "We could have prevented the development of this conflict but we had to cling to the extreme principle of absolute, nationalistic sovereignty." That will not be an acceptable answer.

There may be many diplomats who do not know it; there may be many political leaders who are afraid to admit it; there may be many people who do not understand it, but the extreme principle of absolute, nationalistic sovereignty is of centuries gone by and it is dead. It died with the coming of the airplane, the radio, the rocket and the robomb.

In its place we must develop the new principle of the rights, duties and responsibilities of each nation to the other nations and of each man and each woman to the other people of the world.

No nation has any right in the modern world to do as it pleases without regard to the effects of its actions upon the peoples of other nations. True sovereignty rests in the people, and the people know that for their own future welfare they must exercise a portion of that sovereignty on a world level in place of the nationalistic level.

Just as each free man must limit his liberty of action so that he does not injure his neighbor, so each nation must limit its action so that it does not injure its neighbor. And in one world today the nations of the world are all neighbors.

One of the most striking facts which has been demonstrated in this war is the enormous productive capacity of America. It has been a huge power for destruction and for victory.

It can be an equally great power for world construction and progress after the war if we but lift our eyes to its opportunities and responsibilities and take the necessary steps for world stability.

This will require increased investments by American capital in the resources and facilities of other nations and increased trade with lower tariffs throughout the world. We must explode the narrow view that if we develop production in other parts of the world we will preempt our own markets. We will create markets as we develop means to produce. Producers are consumers. The capacity of the human race to consume is just as great as the capacity of the human race to produce. Of course there are and will be acute problems of distribution. **But we can either fight over a shrinking wealth, or work together to participate in an expanding production and the wealth of the future.**

Vast sums of charitable assistance will be needed in the immediate postwar period, but this should be definitely separated from the careful investment of capital in the long-term development of other nations. It is better that American capital be invested and reinvested in various countries of the



world to assist in raising their standards of living and indirectly develop jobs in America in the process than that it be sterile and stagnant in America.

This does not mean a Santa Claus role. Most of the peoples of the world do not want charity beyond the war emergency conditions. They want to be self-reliant. They want to rebuild their own homes and develop their own economy. It is healthy and wholesome for them and for the world that they should. But it will mean long-term investments and reinvestments.

Nor is this all just an idealistic dream. Never did a country for its own sake more need to clear the cobwebs from its thinking. Never did a country for its own sake more need to appraise the value and the purpose of its great productive strength.

If it does not lift its eyes and use its brain and its brawn for progress of the world, it will wither and deteriorate in petty, internal struggles over the division of a shrinking economy.

But if it contributes to the progress of the world, it will itself share in that progress in high standards of living, a richer life and peace.

This is also true of other peoples. Any attempt to profit by one nation at the expense of other peoples will fail. If it meets with temporary success it will soon be lost in either the whirlpool of depression or the cauldron of war. We cannot have continued economic warfare and continued military peace.

The world must advance together, and there is room in the world for all the peoples who live in it.

World opinion is almost unanimous that the Germans and the Japanese must be stripped of their means of making war. This can best be done by joint action of the victorious nations through the United Nations organization, with a continuing joint occupation and inspection.

Under that military rule all indemnities and penalties and reparations should take place. Then and only then the gradual development of self government should be permitted to arise. It should begin in the localities and in the schools and slowly develop as the capacity and desire for non-aggressive, peaceful and successful administration is demonstrated.

Freedom of information to the citizens of these countries must be a fundamental rule. Open to the children of Germany and Japan and Italy the full access to the radios and publications and books of the world, and if we are right in our basic concepts in America, and I believe we are, in a generation or two we will have a different Germany and a different Japan. When the change is demonstrated, they should be permitted to become self-governing and be granted membership in the World organization, but even then there is no reason why they should be permitted to re-arm, and there is every reason to prevent them from re-arming. We will be saying in effect to the conquered nations, "We will permit you to rise again as successful, self-governing, constructive nations, if you so desire, but we will not permit you to rise again as a military power, whatever may be your protestations of intentions."

We, ourselves, should remain strong. We should maintain a powerful, modern navy. We should keep an alert, up-to-date air force. We should constantly train an efficient land force.

We should do this to fulfill the police force responsibility which will be ours in enforcing and supporting the world code of justice and the United Nations Organization and also to assure our own future security and progress. **We should make it plain that much as we want peace, much as we hate war, we will fight again, and will fight anyone who basically violates world justice and seeks to flout our policies and tries to substitute might for right.** This position, I am convinced, is more likely to maintain peace than an announced policy of making ourselves weak and of not fighting even though provoked.

To those who scoff at thoughts like these expressed tonight as abstract idealism, I simply ask that you look out upon the worldwide tragedy of war today. When the terror of war has reached the grand scale that it has today, it is time for some thinking for peace on a grand scale. And I add that I will work with you with just as much hard-shelled realism on the emergency of today and with just as much down-to-earth practicalism on the problems of tomorrow.

But our ideals will determine the all-important question of the basic course that we take.

We need not scoffers today. We need men. Men to assault the pillboxes of lethargy—the emplacements of prejudice—the spitting guns of intolerance. Men who are willing to fall in the assault so that others may carry the day. It will take that to build the world. It will take that to raise the standards of mankind—to make freedom and liberty and peace—living symbols to men and women and children—and not mere words in speeches or in charters.

Our fighting men want America to have a world policy for peace that is as big, as definite and as successful as has been our strategy for war.

It will take time and it will cost.

But the alternative makes it worth the cost. In fact, my countrymen, there is no alternative for a just, a free, and a brave people.

Our fighting men do not want you to surrender before the counter-attacking assault waves of cynicism this best hope of enduring peace on earth.

Some people say that our democracy is not perfect and that there is discrimination and inequality and apathy and corruption. They are right. Some say that our economic system has not functioned perfectly and that there are maladjustments and suffering and faulty distributions. They are right.

But neither of these facts is any reason for waiting for the correction of these imperfections before we step forward to fulfill the world leadership which it is mandatory that we exercise.

We must advance on both the world front and the domestic front at the same time. In fact, they are in large measure interdependent.

I speak not of a Utopia. I speak not of a human race suddenly turned angelic.

There will be selfishness and greed and corruption and narrowness and intolerance in the world tomorrow and tomorrow's tomorrow. But pray God, we may have the courage and the wisdom and the vision to raise a definite standard that will appeal to the best that is in man and then strive mightily toward that goal.



# 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)