

From the Office of
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
1313 Senate Office Building
Washington, D. C.
CApitol 4-3121, Ext. 2424

FOR RELEASE: Friday A.M.'s
March 13, 1959

SENATOR HUMPHREY WILL MOVE IN SENATE TO STRENGTHEN WORLD COURT

Senator Hubert H. Humphrey (D., Minn.) announced last night that he will introduce legislation to set aside the key reservation in the American agreement to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which, he said, is greatly responsible for making the Court "an ineffective instrument of world peace -- without authority to dispose of disputes between nations by way of peaceful judicial determination."

Speaking to an audience at the Virginia Law School at Charlottesville, Virginia, Senator Humphrey said that his proposal, supported by the American Bar Association, would delete the clause in the Morse Resolution which specifically reserved to the United States the right to decide whether or not a matter in dispute is essentially domestic.

The Minnesotan said that "our great nation, which is genuinely dedicated to furthering understanding between nations and working toward a just and lasting peace, must bear responsibility for having created one of the major roadblocks to an effective International Court of Justice."

Senator Humphrey expressed the hope that if the United States, as the leader of the Free World, would take the initiative in removing this impediment to the World Court's jurisdiction, "other Free World powers would take similar steps to strengthen the Court."

He agreed with the present Chairman of the Committee on World Peace through Law of the American Bar Association, Charles S. Rhyne, that the U. S. Senate, through its insistence on the reservation "has emasculated the usefulness of the Court."

"In the face of the peril of weapons of mass destruction, and in the name of self preservation," Senator Humphrey declared, "we must bolster every available means of settling disputes by law rather than force."

"I do not claim that by eliminating this restrictive clause from the Morse Resolution we will be assured of a peaceful world," Senator Humphrey said. "There is no 'cure-all' remedy in today's troubled world. I do believe, however, that we cannot afford to leave a single stone unturned in our effort to develop the means for advancing international cooperation, understanding and peace."

Senator Humphrey pointed out that the World Court has, in its thirteen years of existence, decided only ten cases. "By any standard," he said, "this is somewhat less than an impressive record of accomplishment."

Journal

STEPS TOWARD WORLD ORDER

000423

Speech
by
Senator Hubert H. Humphrey
before the
University of Virginia Law School
Charlottesville, Virginia
March 12, 1959

In these dark times when crisis is piled upon crisis,
it is easy to lose heart, to give up hope. The Berlin crisis
is bristling with complex and knotty problems. It is perhaps
the most serious situation we have ~~confronted~~ ^{fac'd} since V-J Day.
The Formosan crisis has quieted down, but has not disappeared.

And there is always a crisis of one kind or another in the
turbulent Middle East.

With every crisis there are dangers and risks. But
there are also opportunities and responsibilities. I have
not lost hope for a more enduring peace, and I believe the
American people have not lost hope. We must keep hope alive.

Genuine hope. Not hope based upon wishful thinking, but ~~hope~~
tempered with a realistic understanding of the world we live in.

A few months ago I was in Moscow and Berlin. It was an unforgettable experience. I have a first-hand knowledge of some of the vexing problems we face. But I have not surrendered the gift of hope which gives men the courage to press on, the vision to see beyond the encircling gloom a better world.

Genuine hope does not permit us to escape the present into some utopian future of our dreams. Genuine hope helps us to come to grips with the present in the name of the future and out of respect for the values of the past. "Evil triumphs when good men fail to act."

↳ Tonight I want to talk about some steps we can take toward greater peace and order in the world. I say steps, plural, not one giant step. This may disappoint some of you, but I am convinced that new institutions and laws are not achieved in one giant step. Great preparation and even suffering precedes the birth of new forms, new ways of doing things. History

000425

teaches not to expect drastic changes overnight.

The pace of history does not discourage me. If the goal is clear and if we take genuine steps in the right direction, I am confident that our efforts will be rewarded.

The many-faceted challenge of Communism today demands bold action to meet the economic, political, and military threat of the Soviet Union and Red China. Only bold steps will be equal to the challenge of the "revolution of rising expectations" in Asia and Africa. Timidity is the counsel of despair.

The Hundred Years of Peace: 1815 - 1914

Before I suggest some specific steps toward greater world order, I would like to say a word about a remarkable period of modern history, a period which may hold some lessons for us today. I refer to the century spanned by the end of the War of 1812 to the outbreak of World War I, which some his-

000426

torians have referred to as "the hundred years of peace". More accurately, it was a century when there were no "general wars" and a considerable degree of world order prevailed. The balance of power among the European states made a measure of stability possible. No single European power could aspire to world domination. Great Britain, with its firm control of the seas, acted as a check on the ambitions of any of the European land powers.

England was neither strong enough, nor did she aspire to dominate the European continent. She acted as a balance wheel. Through this "delicate balance" stability was maintained for an entire century.

On the economic side, this century of peace was a great period of industrial development in many parts of the world. International trade was stimulated by the acceptance of the gold

000427

standard. And the London "capital market" provided the funds through which large portions of the world, including these United States, were developed.

The principles of Anglo-Saxon law and political institutions, based upon the concept of public responsibility, spread to the far corners of the earth. Everywhere people were beginning to learn, at least theoretically, the meaning of the democratic principle of "government by the consent of the governed."

During this remarkable century wars were limited both geographically and in their political objectives. In this country we had a tragic Civil War. But there was no general war. And no tyrant rose to conquer the world or even any large portion of it.

World War I shattered the hundred years of peace and economic development, and destroyed the fragile and elementary

000428

forms of world order created in the 19th Century. This order was never really reestablished in the long week end between Versailles and Pearl Harbor.

What can we learn from this century of peace? Is it too different from our present century to teach us anything? Our times are different, in some ways vastly different. Yet, I believe there are three very important things we can learn from the 100 years of peace:

1. POWER MUST BE EXERCISED WITH RESPONSIBILITY
2. PEACE IS POSSIBLE
3. PEACE MUST BE PLANNED.

First, power must be exercised with responsibility.

The key to the 100 years of stability was the responsible exercise of British power. Britain held the balance in Europe and through her Navy throughout the world. She carried her power with restraint and with a sense of moral responsibility.

She did not seek to enslave or to make the world over in her image. I am not suggesting that her Britannic Majesty was a paragon of virtue, but I am suggesting that Great Britain exercised her decisive power with wisdom and restraint.

The mantle of world leadership which Britain wore in the 19th Century has in this century fallen upon our shoulders. The key to peace and order in our century, insofar as we have control over the situation, is the wise and responsible exercise of United States power. I am not suggesting for a moment a "new imperialism", and "American century", but rather a recognition that we should have a sense of responsibility commensurate with our wealth and power. This responsibility, in our interdependent world, must be widely shared, through instruments such as the United Nations, NATO, and other multi- lateral arrangements in the political, economic and military spheres.

000430

The destiny of Western civilization and the peace of the world may well depend upon America's ability to use her wealth and power not only to defend herself, but to create a world of greater peace and justice for all men.

Second, we must believe that peace is possible. If we believe that peace is not possible, we would be among the most miserable of men. Although we are today challenged by a powerful, committed and relentless foe and the spectre of nuclear destruction hangs menacingly over our heads, I still believe we can avoid war and that peace is possible. I have worked and I will continue to work on this belief.

Third, peace must be planned, worked for, sacrificed for, Peace is not an accident, a gift from the gods or a happenstance. Peace is a difficult goal, an elusive goal, Peace must be waged. We must work for peace even as we keep up our defensive shield.

Waging peace is no substitute for an adequate defense posture.

Nor is an adequate defense posture a substitute for waging peace.

The world of 1959 does not confer upon us the luxury of choosing between waging peace and maintaining our defensive strength.

We must do both, and we must do each task with as much imagination, creativity and wisdom as we can muster.

Three Steps We Can Take Now

There is no magic key -- no easy way -- to world order, no master plan that will assure us of peace in our time. Perhaps I should amend this statement by saying there is no master plan which lies within the realm of the politically possible. Bismarck once said that "politics is the art of the possible." He was right, although there is room for disagreement on what is in fact possible. You will recall that in one of the Federalist Papers, the writer (I believe it was Madison) said that if all men were angels, then we would not need the checks and

000432

balances which the Founding Fathers regarded as essential to sound government. But since men are men and not angels, said Madison, we need the checks and balances which prevent one interest or one branch of government from taking over.

Given a world of imperfect men and nations, I maintain there is no master plan that will end conflicts of interest and ~~erase~~ all hostility. Nevertheless, there are steps, ~~important~~ important steps we can take which will move us along on the path to a more secure and peaceful world. These steps will help to accomplish in this century the stability and order which was achieved in the 19th Century.

Some of the greatest opportunities lie in the economic realm, especially in the areas of international trade and economic development. We need present-day counterparts to the "gold standard" which facilitated trade and the "London

capital market" which provided development funds in many areas throughout the world. The International Monetary Fund and GATT, (the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) are in a real sense the counterpart to the gold standard. The International Bank for Reconstruction (World Bank), the Point 4 Program, the Columbo Plan, and other similar instruments are the counterpart to the London Capital Market.

In the military sphere NATO and other free world alliances are the counterpart to the balance achieved by British Naval power.

I merely mention the economic and military aspects in passing.

I thought I would like to confine my remarks to the political sphere. In the political sphere we can take three positive steps:

000434

1. WORK FOR EFFECTIVE ARMS CONTROL WITH INSPECTION
2. STRENGTHEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND WORLD LAW.
3. MAKE FULLER USE OF THE WORLD COURT

1. Work for Effective Arms Control with Inspection.

Peace and a more stable world order can scarcely be attained if nations are constantly developing postures of hostility toward each other. Demands by one great power that another great power surrender some valuable position, loud and repeated threats of annihilation if demands are not met, all backed up by a feverish race to concoct new weapons and amass them in ever growing stock-piles -- these developments do not create an atmosphere conducive to a more just and peaceful international order.

This is why steps **toward** disarmament now are so important to mankind's hopes for peace. We must act, even if only a small step is possible. The failure to act is to act negatively!

000435

For years the United States and its allies planned and worked for disarmament with "grandiose" plans which covered the whole range of military defense and that envisaged comprehensive machinery of administration and control. We learned gradually the futility of this approach. We lowered our sights to more realistic goals, and we have now arrived at a point where we are seeking to conclude a "first-stage" or a partial disarmament agreement. Complete disarmament all at one stroke need not and cannot be obtained. What we should have, and must have, is a limited agreement, that will help deflect the world from its present hazardous course. Once course has been changed, there will be ample time and opportunity to pursue the larger goals toward which we aspire.

The conclusion of an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests with inspection, or to install an inspection system

to prevent surprise attack in some region of the world would be a small, first-step agreement of great value for initiating a new trend in world affairs. Either one of these agreements would slow down or perhaps even halt the forward momentum of the arms race. Once the fever of competition has been lowered, sanity and reason can then operate more freely in our quest for peace with justice.

Within the past year progress has been made toward conclusion of a first-stage agreement. Negotiations for a ban on nuclear weapons tests have advanced to an extent scarcely hoped for this time a year ago.

Last summer the Soviet Union suddenly **accepted** our Government's invitation to hold a technical conference on devising methods of inspection in order to guarantee fulfillment of any international agreement for suspending nuclear weapons tests. This conference of scientific experts from the Communist

000437

bloc and the principal Western powers was convened at Geneva. By the end of last August it issued conclusions concurred in by both sides. This was an unprecedented step in the history of postwar disarmament negotiations. For the first time Soviet and Western representatives had seen eye to eye, and had agreed on the technical details of an international arms control and inspection system.

It is necessary to recognize what these Geneva conclusions were and were not. They were not in themselves an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests. They were, however, an aid, a spur, and a necessary basis for any such future agreement.

Last spring immediately after concluding a very intensive series of nuclear tests, which shot a large barrage of radioactive debris into the atmosphere encircling the globe, the U.S.S.R. announced to the world that she was unilaterally

suspending nuclear weapons tests. She further announced that she would continue such a suspension provided the United States and Great Britain, the other two nuclear powers, would do the same. This was a clever maneuver, but it was not clever enough.

The primary aim of this unilateral and conditional suspension was to impress world opinion. To a degree it succeeded. But the more perceptive people around the world knew that the Soviet plan would have resulted in a suspension of tests without effective inspection. Such a suspension would have been worse than no suspension at all, because there would have been no guarantee that one side was not cheating. Under such conditions, fear, suspicion, and tension would have increased and not abated.

The United States wisely pressed ahead with its endeavor to obtain an internationally agreed termination of

testing, backed up and safeguarded by an effective inspection system.

Immediately after the close of the Geneva Conference of experts, the United States invited the Soviet Union to a political conference. The purpose of the second conference was to work out a test ban which would utilize the technical and scientific foundation reached at Geneva. The United States said she would suspend her tests for one year provided the Soviet Union would do the same. This would allow time for the political conference to hammer out an agreement.

The conclusions of the Geneva conference of experts confined themselves strictly to scientific matters of a politically non-sensitive nature. They indicated the number of inspection stations and the kinds of inspection instruments and procedures that should be adopted for an effective control system, but they did not go into such controversial matters

000440

as to where the inspection stations should be located, who should man them, or what powers the control administration should exercise. These were questions to be thrashed out at the political conference.

The Geneva political conference on suspending nuclear weapons tests has now been at work for about four months! When Mr. George Kennan testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament early this month, he stressed that one of the main obstacles in the way of an arms understanding with the U.S.S.R. is its philosophy and tradition of secrecy. This has been one of the main stumbling blocks on the road to any reliable arms control agreement in the post war period, and it is one of the main obstacles to success in the current Geneva negotiations.

To be reliable, arms control inspection must be genuinely international. National self-inspection is not

genuine inspection, and self-inspection is essentially what the Soviet Union has been insisting upon at Geneva. Control stations under the Geneva experts plan would be located in each participating country to check on its activities. But the Soviet has been saying, "These control stations must be manned by nationals of the country wherein they are located." Communist Russians would be checking up on Communist Russians, according to this plan, and it is not difficult to see that Americans will not stake their security, or survival, on such paper promises.

The United States and Britain, in contrast, have taken the position that stations should be manned by outside nationalities, so that the resulting surveillance is truly international, mutual and reciprocal. These opposing views on inspection are responsible for the deadlock at the present moment. This is a point on which

000442

the Soviet Union must make a substantial concession if there is to be an effective and dependable inspection network.

Another crucial point of issue in the negotiations is the amount of authority that should be vested in the countries administering the control commission. The Soviet Union insists that there should be unanimity among the major powers on the control authority to make major decisions. In other words, the Soviet negotiators want a veto over the control authority. The American and British position, however, is that at least certain important decisions on the functioning of the control mechanism should not be subject to a one-nation veto, but should be reached by a majority vote.

If, for example, the inspection stations recorded an event that might be an underground nuclear test it would be necessary to send inspectors immediately to the location to investigate. "On the spot" inspection of this type is very

vital to the effective functioning of the entire control system, otherwise the purpose of inspection could be frustrated and a violator of the agreement might readily escape the consequences of his violation.

The United States says, "This kind of decision can not be blocked by a veto". The Soviet Union says, "This kind of decision must be subject to a veto, or it is a violation of sovereign rights."

Soviet intransigence is again responsible for the deadlock on this point. Unless the Moscow Government modifies this position, it will be impossible to have an effective and dependable inspection system.

The issue of international inspection in the Geneva disarmament negotiations highlights one of the most significant potential contributions of disarmament to the cause of peace and harmony in the world today. If I had to single out any

one factor as the main barrier to peace in the world today, I would point my finger at the Iron Curtain, or in other words the barrier of secrecy and isolation which the Soviet Union has erected between its own people and the outside world.

International inspection for suspension of nuclear weapons tests would pierce this barrier in an unprecedented way. The political effect of getting an international authority into the silent and secret land of the Soviets would be inestimable.

I am dedicated to national security. I believe our defenses should be strong in order to back up our international negotiations and commitments. We arm to parley, we develop strength in order to negotiate as well as to deter attack, limited or general.

We must arm and at the same time strive to turn back the tide of fear that is engendered by the mounting arms race.

000445

We must make a start somewhere in tearing down the veils of secrecy that breed mistrust and suspicion between the Communist and free worlds. An agreement to end nuclear weapons tests, backed up by an effectively functioning inspection system within the participating nations, would be a significant step in the direction of world peace and order.

2. Strengthen the United Nations. The United Nations is a continuing conference of over 80 sovereign states. It is a limited instrument. But it is a valuable instrument. The United Nations can be used, abused, or ignored by its member states, and it would not be difficult to cite examples of these three attitudes toward it.

I believe the U.N. can be strengthened through a fuller use of its peace-making and peace-keeping facilities. The member states can make a contribution to greater world order by participating in the long-range economic and humanitarian

activities of the U.N. which help to weave the fabric of peace and understanding. I refer to the Children's Fund, the World Health Organization, UNESCO, the U. N. Technical Assistance program, FAO, and other essentially nonpolitical activities carried on under the aegis of the world organization.

I favor the fullest possible cooperation of our government with other nations in the great problem of assisting economically the less developed areas of the world.

In the peace keeping or political sphere, I believe the present U.N. is capable of serving the cause of peace when the nations really want to use it. But there is no way we can force the nations to utilize the U.N.. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt once said: "The United Nations is not a cure-all. It is only capable of effective action when its members have a will to make it work."

In spite of the Soviet bloc's frequent use of the veto in the Security Council and other obstructive tactics, the U.N. has a solid record of achievement even in the political sphere. Through the U.N., aggression was thrown back in Korea. Through the U.N., Soviet troops were forced to withdraw from Iran. Through the U.N., fighting was stopped in Greece, Indonesia and the Middle East.

This suggests one possible immediate area where we can strengthen the United Nations. I refer to the U.N. Emergency Police Force now deployed in the Gaza Strip between the United Arab Republic and Israel. This force has limited functions and no one pretends it is powerful enough to hold back a full-scale attack by either side. But it is a beginning, perhaps a symbol of a "greater international force" which one day may be used to bring stability in trouble areas.

000448

It is difficult to foresee the time when a U.N. force could deal with a situation such as the present Berlin crisis in which the two super powers are so deeply involved. This could not take place short of a radical change in the nation-state system in which states would have already surrendered their military establishments, the ultimate symbol of their sovereignty.

But, even if a U.N. police force is not capable of dealing with the major security problems in the world today, it is quite possible that a "mobile force" dispatched to minor trouble spots would be capable of putting out brush fires before they blazed into a global conflagration. This would be eminently worth the relatively small investment.

I believe we should also explore the possibility of creating international rules and machinery for the regulation of outer space. In this area the U.N. can also make a contribution.

~~U.N. For Peace~~

000449
-28-27

Capital - P+Y

U.N. Agencies!

Police -
Economic

I have no illusions. I know the U.N. can work effectively on any major security question such as arms control, or regulating outer space only when the Soviet Union is willing to go along with the majority position. And we have no means of forcing the Communist bloc to give in to the majority. But we can try, and in trying we can lay bare the intention of any nation which obstructs the plans of those nations which are genuinely working for greater order and peace. Even if the U.N. serves primarily as a mirror of our divided world, it is performing a valuable function. For without a clear picture of the world situation, we cannot act with political insight or moral wisdom.

3. We Should Make Full Use of the International Court of Justice.

↳ One of the most disappointing aspects of the work of the United Nations has been the International Court of Justice.

Put

000450

This Court, established as a forum whereby international
disputes would be resolved by law, has had all too little
opportunity to fulfill this function. In the 13 years since
it was established, the International Court of Justice has
in fact decided only ten cases. I repeat, ten cases in
13 years.

By any standard, this is somewhat less than an impressive
record of accomplishment. Here is a court made up of 15 judges
who are each paid \$20,000 a year, and yet it has decided less
than one case a year.

Of all the United Nations organs, the International Court
of Justice has by far the least impressive record. To me this
is indeed tragic. For in this day and age the rule of law in
international affairs should be looked upon as one of the
main ways of peacefully settling disputes between nations.

Rut

The sorry record of the Court is due in large measure to the United States' refusal to give it full backing and support. The damage was done, I regret to say, by the United States Senate when in 1946 it added to the so-called Morse Resolution, S.Res. 196, which declared our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, six words - "as determined by the United States, ~~of America~~".

In 1945, the United Nations Charter was approved.

Chapter XIV of the Charter provided for establishment of the International Court of Justice to replace the Permanent Court of International Justice. Under Article 93 all members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice. However, no member nation is bound by compulsory jurisdiction of the Court without a specific declaration accepting such jurisdiction.

Less than half of the 81 member nations of the United Nations have by declaration accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court

Part

in specified areas of international law stated in the Statute of the Court. It is of interest to note that none of the Communist nations in the United Nations - including the Soviet Union - have accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Senate Resolution 196, which gave the consent of the Senate to the United States accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, was introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, Mr. Morse, in November of 1945; it was cosponsored by 14 other Senators from both parties.

L Hearings were held on S. Res. 196 in July of 1946 by a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee. Not a single witness appeared before the subcommittee to oppose the Resolution. Moreover, not a single letter or telegram was received in opposition to the Resolution.

L Against a backdrop of overwhelming public support, the subcommittee decided to report the Resolution favorably to the

full Foreign Relations Committee with only one minor amendment.

On July 24, 1946, by a unanimous vote, the Committee reported the Resolution to the Senate for favorable action in exactly the form recommended by the subcommittee.

∠ The resolution was considered by the Senate on August 1 and 2; it was approved August 2 by a vote of 62 to 2 and the Senate adjourned sine die some two hours later. During consideration of the resolution three amendments were adopted.

The most controversial amendment, offered by Senator Connally, added to paragraph (b) the words "as determined by the United States" to the language of the Resolution which excluded from cases on which compulsory jurisdiction would be accepted "matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." This amendment was adopted by a vote of 51 to 12.

But

1000454

Many observers at the time felt that this amendment, by reserving to the United States the right to decide whether or not a matter is essentially domestic, rather than having the Court make such determination, demonstrated a lack of confidence on our part in the competence and integrity of the new Court.

Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then Under Secretary of State, in testifying on this Resolution expressed the argument against any such reserve clause as follows:

"The rule of law becomes effective to the extent that states agree to submit themselves to the decision of the Court in all cases involving questions of law. It cannot become effective if States may reserve this decision to themselves, regardless of the degree of good faith by which they govern their actions."

The effect of such reserve clauses has been to seriously

Part

limit the role of the International Court of Justice in settling international disputes. As I have stated, the Court has decided only 10 cases in 13 years.

I hasten to add that this sorry record is not due to any fault of the Court itself. The 15 Judges are competent and qualified men. The Court is ready and willing to aid in the settlement of international disputes. The reason for the ineffectiveness of the Court lies principally in the various reservation clauses contained in the declarations of nations which have accepted the jurisdiction of the Court.

The United States, and in particular the United States Senate, cannot escape responsibility for the Court's ineffectiveness.

The distinguished lawyer, Charles S. Rhyne, past President of the American Bar Association, and presently Chairman of the Committee on World Peace Through Law of the American Bar Association, in an address delivered only this past Tuesday,

March 10, assessed the blame quite candidly when he said:

"I am therefore firmly convinced that one of the major causes for the empty court room of the United Nations Court is the Connally reservation which was created by the U.S. Senate, is maintained by the U.S. Senate, and can be removed by the U.S. Senate...Every report I have seen by the many experts who have studied this situation agrees that the Connally reservation has emasculated the usefulness of the Court and rendered it impotent as an instrument for world peace. The cancerous effect of the Senate's action has spread as other nations have copied it; it has an ever-widening scope. The tremendous responsibility of the United States Senate for continuing through this reservation to stifle use of the United Nations Court is a most serious one when one considers the value of and need for any mechanism which can aid in preventing war under present

But

world circumstances. The Connally reservation is unsound in principle and effect and should be eliminated."

This is a strong statement indeed. A statement of a highly respected and learned lawyer - a man not given to making reckless or rash statements. Mr. Rhyne is a sound and realistic student of international affairs, and his views cannot be casually dismissed. Mr. Rhyne's forceful address indicates a realization of the peril we face in view of the lethal weapons of mass destruction, and the absolute necessity, in the name of self preservation, that we bolster the available means of settling disputes by law rather than force.

It is indeed unfortunate, that our great nation, which is genuinely dedicated to furthering understanding between nations and working toward a just and lasting peace, should bear responsibility for having created one of the major roadblocks to an effective International Court of Justice.

I believe that the time is long overdue for the Senate to remove this reserve clause in the Morse resolution. It is my intention to offer in the near future a resolution to amend the Morse resolution by deleting from paragraph (b) the words "as determined by the United States."

In the absence of action by the Senate, I fear that the International Court of Justice will remain an ineffective instrument of world peace without authority to dispose of disputes between nations by way of peaceful judicial determination.

It is time that we in the United States Senate acted to remove the shackles which restrict the United Nations Court. I hope most earnestly that prompt consideration will be given to the resolution I intend to offer.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I return to where I started. I said we must have hope, hope in certain specific small steps we can take in the direction of greater world order. I believe peace is

Rut

possible, and I believe we must work for it in the small and
undramatic ways -- through painstaking arms control negotiations,
in the day-by-day business of the United Nations, in all those
daily acts of fidelity which help create a fabric of peace, justice
and understanding, ~~the basic substructure of any enduring order.~~

3/12/59

201



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