

Harold E. Stassen

To Go From Navy Back to Politics

EVEN though the next Presidential election will not take place until 1948, people who are interested in politics are already talking about men who may be candidates for the nation's highest office. One name which you would hear often if you could listen in to some of these conversations is that of Harold E. Stassen. Many think that he has a good chance to be the Republican Party's choice for President.



H E
Harold E. Stassen

At the present time, Stassen is not in a political job. He has been serving in the Navy for the last several years. His most recent job with the fleet has been that of aide to Admiral William "Bull" Halsey. Stassen, who holds the four-stripe rank of captain, expects to be discharged sometime in December.

Before the war, Stassen had an outstanding political career. It really began when he was in college, for he held, at various times, almost all offices on the campus. After graduating from the University of Minnesota, Stassen studied law.

He began to practice law in a town not far from the farm where he was born. But in a

year's time, he decided to enter politics. In 1930, he was elected to his first job, and he held this position until he ran for governor in 1938. The people of Minnesota selected Stassen as their governor by a 2 to 1 vote. At that time, he was only 31 years old, the youngest governor Minnesota ever had.

Stassen was elected governor three times, and was very popular with the citizens of his state. He made weekly radio talks to them in which he would discuss things of interest to the people. He asked the voters to write to him, giving suggestions about what was needed in the state.

The people of the nation have come to know Stassen in the last several years, too. He has been an outstanding backer of the idea of an organization of nations. He served as one of our delegates to the United Nations conference at San Francisco. (This was the conference which drew up the charter for the United Nations Organization.)

Stassen, who is 38 years old, is a tall man with a friendly manner. He has a wide smile which seems to be contagious. He says that when he gets out of the Navy, he will not seek public office for a while. He wants to rest first, and then do some reading and studying to catch up with what has happened in the nation since he has been away.

Just For Fun

"I sent my little boy for two pounds of plums and you only sent a pound and a half."

"My scales are all right, madam. Have you weighed your little boy?"

★ ★ ★

A student strolled into his eight o'clock class late. The professor turned and said to him, "You should have been here at eight o'clock."

The student answered sleepily, "Why? What happened?"

"I'm always breaking into song."

"You wouldn't have to break in if you only had the key."

★ ★ ★

"For some reason, I can't remember Stone's name."

"Well, that is a hard name."



The Editor Says

IF your home town is like many others, you will find in it a few people who think that they are a little better than anybody else. Because they think of themselves as being "different," they do not care to have much to do with other boys and girls.

People who think of themselves in this way are different, all right. But not in the way they think. They are different because they are snobs. And by their acts of snobbishness, they advertise the fact that they are petty people—people who think only about little, unimportant things.

Snobs often have peculiar reasons for thinking that they are better than others. Sometimes it is because they have more clothes or more money to spend than other people, or because they live in big, pretty houses, and are invited to more parties than others.

A snob may not realize it, but he is really hurting himself by his actions. He is limiting the number of friends he has. This is certainly not good, because a

person needs it. Of course, we have a right to choose. Some are our friends and others are not. We do not see so clearly. We would expect our close friend to be a person who does not enjoy.



Snobbishness doesn't help.

But in choosing a wise person to be our friend, we should consider their abilities and points in their character. He does not choose a friend because they are different, but because they are good for other unimportant things.

Such a person will be friendly to us whether they are our friends or not. We should treat all of our friends the same. He does not limit himself better. In other words, a snob.

How Much Do You Know?

Questions

1. What four nations are in charge of the occupation of Germany?
2. What is the chief task of the Allied occupation forces in Germany?
3. How does the National Archives serve the country?
4. Why is Harold Stassen's name being mentioned in the paper?
5. What South American nation recently had a new government?

True or False

1. General of the Army Dwight Eisenhower is in charge of the occupation forces in the American zone of Germany.
2. Fiberglass is a very useful product, but must be handled carefully because it burns easily.
3. The French people voted recently to have a new constitution drawn up for their nation.

Fill in the Blanks

World Government NEWS

10 Cents

December 1945

THE BALL'S IN OUR COURT

Great Britain will support moves to convert UNO into a world government. Such was the unmistakable implication of statements to Parliament last month by the No. 2 men of both the Conservative and Labor parties. Both statements came, perhaps significantly, after Prime Minister Attlee's atomic bomb control conferences with President Truman.

Said the former Foreign Secretary, suave Anthony Eden:

"I have thought much of this business of atomic energy both before and since that bomb burst on Nagasaki, and for the life of me I have been unable to see - and I am still unable to see - any final solution that will make the world safe from atomic power other than that we all abate our present ideas of sovereignty. We have got somehow to take the sting out of nationalism. We cannot hope to do this at once. But we ought to start working for it now, and that I submit should be the first duty of the United Nations."

Next day his ebullient successor in the Foreign Office, Ernest Bevin, went even further:

"The fact is no one ever surrenders sovereignty. They merge it into a greater sovereignty for a limited and specific purpose. ... I am willing to sit with anybody of any party of any nation to try and devise a franchise or constitution for a world assembly of limited objective, the objective of peace...(UNO) must be a prelude to... further development."

Still sticking to his guns a week later, Bevin reiterated his beliefs to delegates to the UNO Preparatory Commission ("Preco") meeting in London:

"Science has developed to such a point that it has made boundaries look silly and it has forced us to seek what the poet and prophet have called 'The Parliament of Man' and 'The Federation of the World.'"

Although "constitutionalists and sovereignty merchants" had said that his proposed world assembly would be impracticable, the 64-year-old Bevin declared, "(I have) faith enough to believe that if I live a reasonable length of time I will see it."

This startling news from England, reinforced by the findings of a British Gallup Poll (see below), which showed the people to be behind their statesmen, answered pretty definitely the question, "Would the British federate?"

And while the news in no way reduced the mechanical difficulty of revising the UNO Charter into a world government constitution, it did increase hope that drastic amendments, sure to be proposed at UNO's early meetings, would be seriously considered.

Finally, it made the job of American world federalists all the more urgent. If the U. S. delegation could be got to support such amendments, there was considerable chance of their adoption. If not, they would almost certainly be pigeon-holed.

The time is riper now than ever before to let the President and your congressman know how you feel.

* * *

BRITISH OVERWHELMINGLY FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

Released in the U.S. last month by Pollster Gallup were results of a poll on world government taken by his British Institute of Public Opinion. 51% of the British said "I agree" to the following question: "Now that the atomic bomb has been invented, do you agree or disagree that each country should abolish its armed forces, having them replaced by an international force under a world government?" Only 29% of those questioned disagreed, while 20% had no opinion.

* * *

PRAVDA DISSENTS

On December 2 Pravda, one of Moscow's two most powerful dailies, came out in strong editorial support of the UNO veto and in **opposition** to a world government, on the ground that international confidence is not sufficiently strong to renounce national sovereignty now.

World federalists everywhere hoped that Pravda's opinions did not, as they have sometimes in the past, bespeak the Russian Government's attitude. Meanwhile, they took encouragement from the fact that Pravda's notice of world government was the first proof for the outside world that the subject of world federation has won discussion among the people of Russia.

* * *

SUPPORT IN THE U.S. SENATE

As debate on U.S. implementation of the UNO began last month in the Senate, world government found ardent support on the floor of that house. Senator Connally brought the subject up by declaring "we aren't ready for a world government."

He was quickly interrupted by Senator Glen Taylor, author of a world federation resolution now in committee (see WGN, Nov. p. 1), who interposed: "...The time has come for world government. We should surrender enough of our sovereignty to insure world peace."

Mr. Connally's rejoinder showed that his previous statements had revealed somewhat less than the whole truth of his attitude. "India ... China ... and Russia ... would outnumber us.... I don't want a world government - ever!"

Senator Ball broke into the debate by declaring that unless the U.S. takes steps toward world government "we won't be able to control weapons of war." And he added, "I don't think (Senator Connally) helps his cause (the UNO) by sneering at a lot of us who realize that the atomic bomb has changed the world."

* * *

GROWING DEMAND BY THE PEOPLE

Among the many recent indications of the people's growing demand for world government were the following:

***Town Meeting of the Air debated the subject "Does the Atomic Bomb make World Government Essential Now?" Pro: Raymond Swing, radio commentator, and Cord Meyer, Jr., advisor to Harold E. Stassen at San Francisco and executive board member of Federal World Government, Inc. Both got a big hand from the

audience. Con: George Fielding Eliot, columnist and director of Americans United for World Organization, and Regan ("Tex") McCary, former editor of Hearst's N.Y. Mirror.

***Campaign for World Government, affiliate of the recently formed World Federalists organization (see WGN, Nov. p. 4) telegraphed the President and the Secretary of State, asking world federation: "...How can there be security without laws? Obviously world legislation or enforcement of law on individual citizens is impossible under the United Nations. Therefore we must all work to establish federal world government tomorrow or we will all be dead."

***Twenty-nine prominent Canadians on Armistice Day addressed President Truman and Prime Ministers Attlee and King, urging them "to call a Convention of the United Nations to draft a Constitution for a World State with a Parliament which shall have all necessary powers to deal with international affairs in the interests of mankind, and so make it possible for the peoples of the world to live and work together in peace and without fear."

***A New York conference on atomic energy control, sponsored by The Nation Associates, discussed federation. Some form of world government was declared to be essential by all of the following speakers: Jerome Frank, circuit court of the U.S. Court of Appeals; Thomas K. Finletter, lawyer and author; Charles G. Bolte, chairman of the American Veterans Committee; Kingman Brewster and Cord Meyer, Jr., veterans.

***The American War Dads, at their St. Louis convention, adopted a declaration calling for world federation.

***Americans United for World Organization, a group formed for the purpose of promoting adoption of the United Nations Charter, adopted a resolution "that this organization work for the development of the UNO into a world government to preserve the peace."

* * *

WORLD FEDERALISTS START CAMPAIGN

First major promotional effort undertaken by World Federalists, USA, newly formed nationwide consolidation of five previously existing federalist groups (see WGN Nov.p. 4), was a large-space newspaper advertisement which appeared in The New York Times early in December.

Headed "Here is one Einstein Theory you can understand," the ad reprinted salient portions of the Einstein article which appeared in The Atlantic Monthly for November and which is currently condensed in Reader's Digest. It bore a coupon putting the signer on record in favor of world government, and suggesting that he check which of three approaches he thought most feasible - Einstein's or that of drastic amendments to the UN Charter or convocation of a new world constitutional convention.

Thirty-seven distinguished Americans signed the ad:

Mortimer J. Adler
Sholem Asch

Margaret Culkin Banning
William Rose Benet

Mildred M. Riorden Blake
George Biddle

Charles Bolte
Louis Bromfield
Henry B. Cabot
Norman Corwin
Louise Taylor Davis
Louis Finkelstein
Irving Fisher
Varian Fry
Kate Crane Gartz
Robert Lee Humber

Waldo Frank
Frank Kingdon
Albert D. Lasker
Bishop S. Harrington Littell
Thomas Mann
Cord Meyer, Jr.
Vernon Nash
Elliott Nugent
Bishop G. Ashton Oldham
Rabbi David de Sola Pool
Frederick L. Schuman

Lisa Sergio
Upton Sinclair
Raymond Swing
John R. Tunis
Mark Van Doren
Sidney Walton
Walter Wanger
Robert J. Watt
Robert Wheelwright
F. R. von Windegger

It is planned to publish the advertisement in other newspapers throughout the nation. Local groups wishing to sponsor its publication in their own communities may have mats free of charge by writing to World Federalists, 29 East 28th St., New York 16, N.Y.

* * *

POLITICIANS, TAKE NOTE

An atom-bomb-equipped UNO army ran as a poor second choice to world government in a public poll taken last month by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Denver. NORC asked:

"If the world organization does try to prevent any country from using atomic bombs in another war, which way would have the best chance of working:

- 1) World police force have atomic bombs to use against any aggressor nation, but otherwise let countries in United Nations develop them for themselves, if they could.
- 2) United Nations to become a world government and pass a law that no country may make atomic bombs and could set up a world-wide FBI to enforce this law."

Results: 1) 31%; 2) 54%; Undecided 15%

* * *

MAGAZINE PLANNED

A new magazine forum of opinion on the problems of federation will soon make its appearance if the plans laid by Federal Union, Inc., at its annual convention in Pittsburgh last month are realized. A division of opinion within the organization on fundamental policy led to a decision to transfer emphasis of the group from membership to magazine publication. In such a magazine, to be edited by Clarence K. Streit (author of Union Now), the opinions of both sides could be aired in a constructive manner, it was held.

Streit has long advocated formation of a federal union of democracies as a nucleus from which, he contends, a world government might grow.

Strong opposition within the organization urged that it would be fatal to form any international group from which Russia is excluded. Both viewpoints will be aired in the new magazine.

* * *

CAPTAIN STASSEN - WORLD FEDERALIST?

Captain Harold E. Stassen, U.S.N.R., former Governor of Minnesota, has often been quoted as one of the leading proponents of world government. Unlike so many other politicians he has not been afraid to speak up for "world government" and he has made statements that left little doubt in most people's minds that he is our leading young statesman in the great move towards a governed world.

On November 9, addressing the Academy of Political Science, Stassen spoke again of the need for "world government." Said he:

"To my mind, the splitting of the tiny atom, and the destructive release of its tremendous energy, urgently requires the uniting on this great earth of the constructive energy of all mankind.

"This new development is one additional powerful reason for developing a new and higher level of Government to serve mankind. The progress of science, of communication, of travel and of mass production, have already brought the people of the world close together. All of history tells us that whenever men are living close together, they require a government of some form to prevent anarchy and chaos, to establish order and justice, and to facilitate progress and well-being. The world needed government on a world level before the atomic bomb. Now it has become an imperative."

However, reading on in Captain Stassen's speech one begins to doubt whether he has a real world government in mind and whether he understands fully the implications of such a government.

Stassen proposes an amendment to Article 43 of the United Nations Charter which would grant "to the Security Council the right and the duty to establish and maintain a small United Nations Air Force of five bomber squadrons and ten fighter squadrons...to be based at five different suitable bases around the world...and that the United States furnish five atomic bombs to each of these bomber squadrons at the five bases around the world to serve as the stabilization force for world order."

The fundamental characteristic of world government is its direct relationship to the individuals in the various countries. It has to be directly responsible

to these individuals and it has to have the power to make laws immediately applicable to, and enforceable upon, these individuals. It is obvious that Stassen's "stabilization force" would not have this immediate relationship. It is further obvious that enforcement through the "stabilization force" would be enforcement upon whole nations, which means war. In fact, Stassen's "stabilization force" would be an army for the purpose of waging war, not a constabulary under a responsible government for the enforcement of peace.

An international army, such as that envisaged by Captain Stassen carries with it two grave dangers. The first is that people might rely upon its ability to enforce peace, while its every action would constitute war. The second is that by its power to threaten or wage war this international army would be likely to grow into the most oppressive tyranny ever known to man.

We have submitted to Captain Stassen several precise questions as to his attitude toward genuine federal world government. He did not answer them, but wrote us that he will make his "position increasingly clear on the details of this question."

* * *

AN ANSWER TO DR. EVATT

Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, Australian Minister for External Affairs, on his recent visit to New York, expressed disapproval of the growing demand for a federal world government, declaring himself satisfied that "at the present time little or no assistance can be derived from premature and futile attempts to amend the present constitution drastically."

Later on the same occasion, however, he charged that with the veto power it would be possible for "any one of the five permanent members to throw the consideration of international disputes out of the Security Council into the area of private and secret bargaining along the lines of power politics." He added that such a situation would be analogous to the Munich agreement. And his only remedy for this state of affairs was to rely on the Assembly which, he thinks, "may save the world."

Following are excerpts from a letter sent to Dr. Evatt by Mark Van Doren and Mildred Riorden Blake on behalf of the Executive Council of World Federalists, USA:

"However much the world may dislike the harsh realism of Big Five domination, is it likely that it will consent to be governed by a one-nation-one-vote body like the Assembly? From the Australian point of view, it is very desirable to have 7 million Australians carry the same weight as 140 million U.S. Americans. But surely they cannot expect U. S. Americans to agree. And can it really be imagined that permanent decisions can be taken on world affairs in a body where the 150 million Americans below the Rio Grande have 20 votes and the 150 million Americans north of it have two?

"You speak of 'the tiny and very insignificant representation' which most nations would have in a true world legislature. But is it not true that when real action is under consideration in the present UNO, the small nations have virtually none at all? They have the pleasure of feeling as large as anybody in a debating circle, and for that they are foregoing the definite power they would wield (which in combination might be very considerable) in a true voting body whose decisions are meant to stick.

"In the present UNO, the small nations have an out-size influence in small, harmonious non-critical matters, and in practice have none at all in vital questions and in the climactic struggles that may break out in war.

"When you speak of 'surrendering the rights of self-government' to a world legislature, are you not ignoring the nature of federal government? Local self-government (which in the world is national self-government) is always retained in a true federal union. World affairs, and world affairs only, would be delegated to the world government. These are affairs that in our present chaotic age are under the management of nobody. Or worse yet, of the most ruthless or the most stubborn. With a federal world government, they would come under the reasoned and debated management of us all.

"The questions of the franchise and the basis of representation are difficult, but there is nothing insoluble about them. They can and should be the subjects of debate, compromise and growth.

"But the world government itself cannot wait. It must come and come soon, or this civilization will go and a new Dark Age will close in."

* * *

QUOTES

Port Elizabeth Advertiser (Cape Province, South Africa) in an editorial, Oct. 23:

"'There is no known defense against atomic power,' declared Mr. Robert P. Patterson, United States Secretary of War, to a Congress Committee recently. He is wrong. There is a defense. There is the defense of a World Government running the affairs of the world on the recognition that the atomic bomb, if it is ever used again in war, will scorch and blast all mankind into oblivion."

*

Rev. Rowland F. Nye, Rector of St. Thomas's Episcopal Church, Lyndhurst, N.J., in a sermon, Oct. 28:

"In addition to moral and spiritual influence there resides in every community a court and police power. Both are needful for secure and peaceful civil life. World peace depends upon world government. The President of the United States

should direct the United States delegate to present, at the coming annual meeting of the United Nations, a resolution, under the review provision of the Charter, calling for a constitutional convention for a federal world government. Only within the framework of such atomic politics has this war-cursed world any hope of peace."

*

Cord Meyer, Jr., at the New York Herald Tribune Forum, Oct. 31:

"...The United States ... must take the lead in creating a world authority in which the control of the atomic bomb and other weapons of war can be exclusively vested. This means binding world law, for power unrestrained by law is violent and arbitrary. It means institutions such as courts, legislative assemblies and police forces, because such agencies representative of the people of the world must exist to adopt, administer and enforce the law. I only propose that the nations of the world do what our states did voluntarily in 1787 under the compulsion of a far less awful necessity, that they retain control of those affairs which are domestic in nature, but that they give to a superior authority, in which they are justly represented, control of the relations between themselves."

*

The Christian Science Monitor in an editorial, Wednesday, November 14, 1945:

"The people are becoming aware that their own national governments cannot provide security. They are becoming vitally interested in erecting an international government which will give more promise of keeping the peace. They are more ready than the politicians - who have the biggest vested interest in nationalism - to back such a government."

*

Wellesley College News in an editorial, November 1, 1945:

"The world is scared stiff. The tremendous energies of the war period left civilization with the atomic bomb on its hands, and with no strong international organization to cope with it. A world federation above national sovereignty is our one hope for an orderly world. Every able individual must work toward such a federation with a total miracle of energy comparable to that which produced the bomb."

*

Dr. Henry D. Smyth, author of "The Smyth Report" on atomic energy, at the Americans United Atomic Age Dinner, Nov. 28:

"Let us now be willing to delegate our national sovereignty to the larger sovereignty of world law."

*

Senator Glen H. Taylor, in his article "Why a World Republic?" in Free World, December 1945:

"President Truman had this to say to his neighbors in Kansas City, before the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima:

"It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for us to get along in the Republic of the United States."

"I know that he spoke from his heart, but I think that since that time he has had too many 'practical' advisers tell him that it is absolutely impossible even to think of a World Republic and, therefore, we should arm to fight instead of seeking peace through such a world government."

* * *

BOOKS & PUBLICATIONS

More and more of the leading magazines in the United States are giving serious and intelligent consideration to the problem of world government.

For years The New Yorker in its "Talk of The Town" has spoken courageously, though casually and even whimsically, for a world government. These editorials were reprinted last spring in a small booklet, entitled "World Government and Peace", a few copies of which are still available from Federal World Government, Inc., 29 East 28th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

*

Also The Saturday Review of Literature has time and again printed editorials by Norman Cousins full of sound reasoning on the need for world government. One of these editorials, entitled "Modern Man Is Obsolete", has recently acquired considerable fame, and was expanded into a small book with the same title. This book (\$1.00 apiece) can be ordered from Federal World Government, Inc., 29 East 28th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

The Massachusetts Committee for World Federation has reprinted excerpts from the Saturday Review editorials in an attractive twenty-page booklet, entitled "Sovereignty in an Atomic Age". This booklet can be obtained from the Massachusetts Committee for World Federation, 9 Park Street, Boston 8, Mass., or from World Federalists, 29 East 28th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

*

The Atlantic Monthly printed in its September issue the very excellent piece on world government by Cord Meyer, Jr., "A Serviceman Looks at the Peace", and in its November issue Dr. Albert Einstein's startling proposal that the Soviet Union be invited to prepare and present the first draft of a constitution for a world government. The Atlantic will publish in its January issue an article by Sumner Welles, former Under Secretary of State, columnist, and director of Americans United for World Organization, against Dr. Einstein's plea for world government.

*

The Reader's Digest carried in its November issue a reprint of Stephen

King-Hall's "World Government or World Destruction?". In its December issue The Digest reprinted Einstein's article (mentioned above) and the first installment of excerpts from Emery Reves' brilliant best seller The Anatomy of

Peace. In its January issue The Digest will print a second installment, and its February issue will carry a new article by Mr. Reves on national sovereignty.

Reprints of the Einstein article as it appeared in the December issue of Reader's Digest are obtainable from World Federalists, 29 East 28th Street, New York 16, N.Y., for 1¢ apiece.

*

For several months past Free World has been dealing editorially with the question of world government. In the editorial of its December issue it calls upon "the conscientious citizen of any country" to "study and begin to fight for the ultimate goal of Twentieth Century humanity, which is World Federation."

The editorial in the November issue of Free World by Louis Dolivet entitled "Primer for World Government", has been reprinted in a four-page leaflet which may be ordered from World Federalists, 29 East 28th Street, New York 16, N. Y., for 1¢ apiece.

The December issue of Free World, in addition to its editorial dealing with world government, contains the text of Senate Resolution 183, introduced in the Senate by Senator Glen H. Taylor of Idaho, Oct. 24, 1945 (see WGN Nov. p.1), and since introduced into the House of Representatives by Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas and Congressman Charles LaFollette. This Resolution urges: "That every possible effort of our delegates to the United Nations Organization be directed toward the ultimate goal of establishing a world republic based upon democratic principles and universal suffrage regardless of race, color or creed."

In the same issue of Free World Senator Taylor tells why he introduced his Resolution. In his article entitled, "Why a World Republic?" he draws a parallel between the history of the formation of the United States of America and our present international situation, and he concludes that we can do what the founders of our own country have done. Taylor says "My best hope is that developing events and the pressure of public opinion may eventually bring action before we have travelled too far down the road of military might to bring the monster of armed force under control. The Resolutions are before the two Houses of Congress. They have been submitted. It is up to the people of America to make known their wishes in the matter."

WORLD GOVERNMENT NEWS - DECEMBER 1945 - Vol. 3, No. 34, Subscription \$1.00 a year.
Published by FEDERAL WORLD GOVERNMENT, INC.
29 East 28th St., New York 16, N.Y.

WORLD GOVERNMENT NEWS, 29 East 28th Street, New York 16, N.Y.

Enclosed is \$_____ for subscriptions to WORLD GOVERNMENT NEWS to be sent to:

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

Name _____ Address _____

FEDERAL WORLD GOVERNMENT, Inc.
29 EAST 28th STREET
NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

Sec. 562, P. L. & R.

San Francisco Conference

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

610 FIFTH AVENUE · NEW YORK 20, N.Y.

CABLE: ALLINFORM, NEW YORK

CIRCLE 5-8060

PARALLEL ORGANIZATION

LONDON:

38 RUSSELL SQUARE

CABLE: INTERFORM

WASHINGTON:

2841 MCGILL TERRACE, N.W.

DECATUR 6565

Dear Sir or Madam:

Enclosed herewith is a prospectus of the
DOCUMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATION,
San Francisco, 1945

The first few volumes of the documents as distributed to the delegates have just come from the press and a volume a week is anticipated until the set of 15 volumes plus an index volume is completed. These volumes will be as essential to the student of world affairs as are the documents of the Constitutional Convention to the student of American Government.

No previous conference has had such full and rapid publication. Many have issued no records at all; others, notably the Conference which led to the Treaty of Versailles, have issued their records only partially or after long delay; and even the best conferences from this viewpoint, those of the League of Nations, were not so rapid in their action.

Anyone who wishes to examine the documents of the San Francisco Conference, in the actual form in which they were distributed to the delegates will be able to do so. The whole record is being printed by photo-offset, requiring over 11,000 pages. The publicist of today or the historian of the future can read for himself exactly what was submitted to the delegates day by day throughout the Conference, even including typographical mistakes and corrections. Thus, anyone wishing to trace out any particular development or any national viewpoint can do so from the full records.

While the importance of complete and rapid publication was generally recognized, the practical difficulties were very great. First of all, the Secretariat which had staffed the Conference was purely provisional for the period of the Conference and did not feel able to undertake a continuing responsibility into the future. Next, the Preparatory Commission which grew out of the Conference was not scheduled to meet for weeks and its mandate was limited to setting the permanent machinery into operation. Finally, the maze of documents, over 5,000, was great and the expense of reproducing very heavy.

In view, however, of the importance of early publication and the lack of any other method of assuring it, the officers of the United Nations Information Organization who were in San Francisco in connection with the Conference notified the Conference authorities that the United Nations Information Office would be prepared to undertake the task if assured of reasonable support. This letter was transmitted to all delegations by the Secretary-General of the Conference and its substance reproduced in the Journal.

Simultaneously, the Secretary-General took the steps necessary to secure Conference authority for the release of documents, which was given at the Ninth Plenary Session on June 25, on the proposal of the Chairman, Lord Halifax.

A large proportion of the total edition was subscribed for by governments, libraries and other institutions in advance of publication. An order form is attached for your convenience.

Very truly yours,

W. B. Mumford

W. B. Mumford
Secretary-General

ORDER FORM

To the Secretary-General
United Nations Information Office
610 Fifth Avenue
New York 20, New York

Dear Sir:

Please send on publication sets of the Documentation of the United Nations Conference on International Organization to the address given below.

.....Please bill us at \$90.00 a set on publication.

Name:

Address:

DOCUMENTS

of the

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION
SAN FRANCISCO, 1945

Volume XI

COMMISSION III
SECURITY COUNCIL

Published in Cooperation with THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

1945

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION ORGANIZATIONS

LONDON

NEW YORK

DOCUMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION, SAN FRANCISCO, 1945

Published in cooperation with the Library of Congress, by the
United Nations Information Organization
610 Fifth Avenue, New York 20, New York

15 Volumes — \$90

THE arrangements for the publication of the documents of the United Nations Conference on International Organization held in San Francisco, April 25, to June 26, 1945, were made during the last days of the Conference in an interchange of correspondence between the Secretary-General of the Conference and the Chairman and the Associate Chairman of the United Nations Information Board, when it appeared unlikely that the documents would be published by the Conference itself.

The edition presents the texts in facsimile, and in a subject arrangement which makes them convenient for use. All documents are presented (if they were so issued) in the two working languages of the Conference, English and French; and the final documents (the *Charter*, the *Statute of the International Court of Justice*, and the *Interim Arrangements*) are presented in all five official languages, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish.

The material includes:

1. The Journal, and verbatim Minutes of all plenary sessions.
2. Verbatim Minutes of Commissions and Agenda, reports and précis of Technical Committees.
3. Working papers for Commissions and Committees and Drafting documents of sub-Committees.
4. Comments, proposals and amendments relating to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals submitted by participating Governments.
5. Special documents submitted by delegations for distribution to all delegations.
6. Secretariat notices or communications distributed to all delegations.

CONTENTS OF VOLUMES

Volume I—General
General
Plenary

Volume II—General
Journal
Précis of Committee Proceedings
International Secretariat

Volume III—Dumbarton Oak Proposals, Comments and Proposed Amendments

Volume IV—Propositions de Dumbarton Oaks, Commentaires et Projets d'Amendments

Volume V—Delegation Chairmen, Steering and Executive Committees
Delegation Chairmen
Steering Committee
Credentials Committee
Executive Committee

Volume VI—Commission I, General Provisions
Commission I
Committee I/1

Volume VII—Commission I, General Provisions
Committee I/2

Volume VIII—Commission II, General Assembly
Commission II
Committee II/1

Volume IX—Commission II, General Assembly
Committee II/2

The separate documents of the Conference totalled approximately 5,000. In the interest of compression, the editors excluded lists later superseded and all documents in other than the working languages, with a few exceptions where the original text was in a language other than French or English. (These exceptions occur exclusively in the series of comments on and suggested amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals.)

This edition does not include certain papers of the Coordination Committee which have not been released for publication. Among the documents included, a choice has been made in the case of several versions of the same document. Where these are textually identical, or where a document was repeated (e.g., as an annex to a later document), it is here reproduced but once, with an appropriate footnote reference at the point at which it was omitted. Where, however, a document appears in this edition in only one of the working languages, the omission is not due to exclusion, but to the fact that no issue in the other language has been located.

There has been no textual editing in this presentation. The material has been reproduced photolithographically from the mimeographed, printed or photolithographed originals. The pages of each volume have been renumbered, but original pagination has also been retained. In a number of instances, it has been found convenient to reproduce a brief document, originally issued as a separate sheet, on a part of a page. Errors in document numbers or symbols, or changes introduced at a later date, have been recorded in footnotes. Corrigenda and addenda follow the documents to which they refer, but attention is called to them in footnotes at the place requiring correction. Editorial notes of any kind are enclosed in square brackets.

In the arrangement of the papers of individual Commissions and Committees, the agenda and reports of meetings are placed first in chronological order, together with those documents and working papers which formed the substance of discussions at particular meetings; following these are the more general papers serving as documentation throughout the work of the Commission or Committee.

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

610 Fifth Avenue, New York 20, N. Y.

DOCUMENTS

de la

CONFERENCE DES NATIONS UNIES
SUR L'ORGANISATION INTERNATIONALE
SAN FRANCISCO, 1945

Tome XI

COMMISSION III
CONSEIL DE SECURITE

Edités en collaboration avec la LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

1945

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION ORGANIZATIONS

LONDRES

NEW YORK

CONTENTS OF VOLUMES (*Continued*)

Volume X—Commission II, General Assembly
Committee II/3
Committee II/4

Volume XI—Commission III, Security Council
Commission III
Committee III/1

Volume XII—Commission III, Security Council
Committee III/2
Committee III/3
Committee III/4

Volume XIII—Commission IV, Judicial Organization
Commission IV
Committee IV/1
Committee IV/2

Volume XIV—United Nations Committee of Jurists

Volume XV—Coordination Committee, Charter, Lists
Coordination Committee
The Charter
Lists

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE
610 Fifth Avenue, New York 20, N. Y.

PIONEER PRESS, ST. PAUL OF APRIL 21, 1946

WORLD DEMAND GROWS
FOR U.N. BILL OF RIGHTS

By Sigrid Arne

WASHINGTON, -(AP)-The United Nations, in writing rules for themselves, seem to be taking the same road which the fathers of the American Constitution traveled.

The Americans wrote a constitution which sounded like the answer to the common man's prayer the world over. But they quickly found it had a hole in it big enough for several men on horseback. It failed to name the specific rights which the common man could expect.

So the bill of rights was added. That's the section which says you have a right to trial by jury, that you can choose your own religion and so on.

Now the United Nations have written a charter. It says in eight separate sections and in various ways that the basic goal of the United Nations is to "promote and encourage respect for human rights."

But it fails to name the rights. A demand to name them is burgeoning up from all over the world.

The most detailed and studious effort to write such a bill of rights has come from the American Law Institute, in Philadelphia. Its director, William Draper Lewis, has guided a committee of 25 international lawyers from many nations.

The work started in 1941 when Warren A. Seavey, a Harvard law professor, proposed that such a job be done. Money was given by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the American Philosophical Society and the Commonwealth Club.

By the spring of 1942 a committee of lawyers was collected which represented, in addition to the United States, the cultures of the Arabic, British, Canadian, Chinese, French, pre-Nazis Germany, Italian, Indian, Latin-American, Polish, Soviet Russia and Spanish peoples.

The group collected the constitutions of the world, broke them down for whatever human rights they recognized and then wrote a bill of rights which they thought came closest to what the world will accept.

The bill was sent to all the diplomatic missions in Washington for the study of their governments. It was circulated at San Francisco when the United Nations met and at their London meeting.

At the February meeting of the Anglo-American Caribbean commission, a bill of rights was suggested for that area by the chairman of the American delegation, Charles Taussig.

One human right--freedom of the press--is so important to many nations that at London the philippines proposed a special conference to adopt it. Naturally, the United States agrees.

Why the fuss about essential human rights?

That was the first thing Hitler, and the Germans, destroyed when they

HUMAN RIGHTS--2

x x x when they started building their war machine.

The United States has issued a blue book accusing Argentina of about the same thing--at a time when Argentina is voting the largest military budgets in its history--and a somewhat similar document on Spain.

1. The first five articles insure freedom of religion, opinion, speech, the right of assembly and the right to form associations.
2. The sixth insures the citizen against wrongful interference with his home, property and reputation.
3. The seventh, eighth and ninth articles insure a man fair trial.
4. The tenth insures a man's right to property. This, Lewis points out, should be acceptable to Russia. Her constitution declares only that production goods--equipment needed to manufacture other goods--can not be privately owned.
5. Articles 11 to 15 insure the right to an education, to work, reasonable conditions of work, adequate housing and food and social security.
6. The last three articles mention a citizen's relation to his government--his right to take part in it, his right to protection from discrimination under the law and his obligation to a democratic state not to abuse his rights.

UNITED NATIONS
RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

1344 CONNECTICUT AVENUE
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

November 13, 1946

Ben Howard

I enclose, herewith, UNRRA's report which I have just submitted to the Economic and Financial Committee of the United Nations.

There seems to be no question as to the need of continued assistance to several of the liberated nations. UNRRA terminates on December 31, 1946. But the need for food in 1947 will continue.

There are two schools of thought on the way to deal with this problem. First, that each nation in a position to aid will select the recipients to which it will give help. The other, is to establish, under the United Nations, an international board to which contributions from the nations would be made, with distribution and allocations made from it.

Personally, I feel that nothing could be worse than to leave the needy nations to the mercy of one or a small group of nations. This would revert to power politics which has brought so much disaster and ruin to the world. There are many who are of this opinion.

In our country, the issue has not been crystallized. A presentation of two different schools of thought to the people of our country, I think, is necessary.

Please let me have your views on the subject. The matter is now before the United Nations. Decision may be made in a few days. We need, at once, all the help we can get.

We have in mind releasing, on Sunday, the attached statement with signatures of other prominent persons who are in agreement with it and to whom it is being sent.

If you agree with it, will you please wire me, collect, at 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, and also let me have your views on this urgent question by mail, so that the necessary action can be taken to mobilize public opinion?

Sincerely yours,

F. H. LaGuardia
F. H. LaGuardia
Director-General

Ben Howard:
If you will release a statement direct to the press - it will be most helpful. Thank
F.

AN APPEAL FOR INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

UNRRA's work of providing relief and rehabilitation aid to the devastated countries ends December 31, 1946. UNRRA was created as a temporary operational agency, to step in as countries were liberated. It has completed its task. There is no longer any case for an operational agency. There is need for an international agency to provide for continued aid in 1947. Without such aid much of the good done by UNRRA will be destroyed, and the progress of economic recovery will be seriously delayed.

A grave situation has now arisen. On the one hand these needs can be met by continued United Nations action: that is by the creation of a new small international authority operating under the control of the United Nations to meet food relief needs without any consideration of race, creed or political belief, being guided only by the existence of true need.

On the other hand there is the national approach: each nation deciding whether the giving of relief will further its own foreign policy or not. This is a reversion to power politics, the use of food relief as a weapon of foreign policy--an approach to world problems utterly opposed to the concept of the United Nations and wholesome international collaboration.

Unhappily the United States Government, despite the generous attitude of the American people in their support of

UNRRA, has indicated that it will follow the course of national politics. This short-sighted policy can gain only temporary advantage--and at the expense of the great good will built up in the past.

The American people have a vital interest in the course of action taken in meeting these food relief needs. Action such as the United States Government now proposes to take will surely deepen the cleavage between nations and increase the suspicions of United States foreign policy. Such a policy smacks of bread diplomacy.

We, the undersigned, concerned and interested in permanent peace and the establishment of wholesome, friendly relations among the nations of the world, believe that such aid in food as may be required in 1947 should be under the control of an international agency created by and responsible to the United Nations. We therefore approve the principles contained in the LaGuardia plan submitted to the United Nations Committee which is now considering this subject.

Such a plan is in keeping with the ideals of our late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt as stated by him on the signing of the UNRRA Charter November 9, 1943, when he said:

"Responsibility for alleviating the suffering and misery occasioned by this so-called New Order must be assumed not by any individual nations but by all the United and Associated nations acting together...The sufferings of the little men and women who have been under the Axis heel can be relieved only if we utilize the production of ALL the world to balance the want of ALL the world. As in most difficult and complex things in life, nations will learn to work together only by actually working together."



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