

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

HEARING
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
ON
PROPOSALS TO AMEND OR OTHERWISE MODIFY EXISTING
INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS,
INCLUDING THE UNITED NATIONS

PART 5

JUNE 7, 1954
LOUISVILLE, KY.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey	WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa	THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island
WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota	J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas
HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan	JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California	GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa
GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont	HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota
HOMER E. CAPELLART, Indiana	MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*
CARL M. MARCY, *Consultant*
JULIUS N. CAHN, *Counsel*
PAT M. HOLT, *Consultant*
ALWYN V. FREEMAN, *Consultant*
C. C. O'DAY, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

CREATED PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTIONS 129 AND 190, 85D CONGRESS

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan	SPENCER L. HOLLAND, Florida
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California	JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama
JOHN S. COOPER, ¹ Kentucky	GUY M. GILLETTE, Iowa
	MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*
CARL M. MARCY, *Consultant*
FRANCIS R. VALBO, *Staff Associate*
(on loan from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)
MORELLA HANSEN, *Research Assistant*
MARY ANN SAMER, *Assistant Clerk*

¹ Appointed by the Vice President to serve with the subcommittee.

CONTENTS

Statement of—	Page
Anderson, Mrs. Walter C., State president, Daughters of Colonial Wars in the State of Kentucky.....	499
Balley, Mrs. Clark, State chairman, national defense committee, Kentucky Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.....	515
Baker, Mrs. Lisle, Jr., Louisville, Ky.....	510
Baldwin, Miss Susette, teacher, Parkland Junior High School, Louisville, Ky.....	508
Barnette, H. H., teacher, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.....	473
Bowers, R. E., professor of history, Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.....	540
Brodach, George, executive director, International Center, University of Louisville.....	513
Culter, Mrs. William M., Board of the Council of Churchwomen of Louisville.....	491
Gelder, Carl R., student, Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.....	550
Gorin, Lewis J., Jr., Atlantic Union Committee, Louisville, Ky.....	558
Harter, Mrs. John, Daughters of the American Revolution, Louisville, Ky.....	482
Horrigan, The Very Reverend Alfred, president, Bellarmine College, Louisville, Ky.....	521
Hughes, Mrs. Bennett P., Kentucky State chairman, Correct Use of the Flag in the United States, Daughters of 1812.....	470
Kirwan, Patrick S., chairman, Louisville chapter, Americans for Democratic Action.....	556
Lusky, Louis, Louisville chapter, United World Federalists, Inc.....	485
Major, Mrs. William C., president, Louisville League of Women Voters.....	538
McLain, Glenn A., director, Eastern Kentucky Center of International Relations, Richmond, Ky.....	566
Pearson, Mrs. Beatrice, corresponding secretary, Louisville branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.....	495
Verity, William, foreign relations commission, the American Legion.....	528
Walker, Morton, chairman, christian world relations committee, Louisville Area Council of Churches.....	478
Warner, Robert A., professor and chairman, division of social sciences, College of Arts and Sciences, University of Louisville.....	560
Vandenbosch, Mrs. Amry, president, League of Women Voters of Kentucky.....	476
Insertions:	
Letter from Senator Earle C. Clements of Kentucky.....	467
Report submitted by students of Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.....	549
Statement by Miss Martha Jane Brunson, president, Kentucky division, American Association of University Women.....	512
Statement by LaRue Spiker, member, Americans for Democratic Action.....	511

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

MONDAY, JUNE 7, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER,
Louisville, Ky.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a. m., in the Natural Science Building of the University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky., Senator Alexander Wiley (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Senators Wiley and Gillette.

Also present: Senator Cooper of Kentucky and Representative John M. Robsion, Jr., of Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The meeting will please come to order.

If you will all rise, we will ask Dr. W. R. Clarke of the Presbyterian Church of Louisville, to deliver the invocation.

(The invocation was delivered.)

The CHAIRMAN. We are privileged this morning to have a greeting by Dr. Davidson, president of the University of Louisville. Dr. Davidson.

WELCOMING ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT OF UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Dr. DAVIDSON. Senator Wiley and members of the committee, guests, on behalf of the University of Louisville, it is my very great pleasure to welcome you here. We believe this is an historic and very important occasion in Louisville, and I will always cherish the right of the University to have a part in whatever goes on in this community that promotes the cause of peace and the welfare of our country.

The hearings will adjourn, I understand, about 12:30. Some of you wish to stay during the entire day.

There is a cafeteria over behind us here which will be serving meals. We would be delighted to have you come and have your luncheon there during that time.

Again let me say how glad we are that you are here and how proud the university is to be associated with this undertaking.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. [Applause.]

OPENING REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN

I want at this time to express appreciation to Mayor Andrew Broaddus, Mr. K. P. Vinsel of the chamber of commerce, and to Dr. Davidson for their assistance in helping the subcommittee with arrangements for today's hearing. Everyone has been most helpful and cooperative.

As you know, this committee is here not to preach or even suggest. We are here at the grassroots to get your ideas.

We meet today for the fourth in a series of hearings which the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter is holding in various parts of the country.

This subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee is directed by the Senate to make a full study of our participation in the United Nations and other international organizations.

As you know, it is likely that a conference of the United Nations will be called sometime after 1955 to review the charter. The work of this subcommittee is part of the preparation for the conference, and this hearing is part of the work of the subcommittee.

I have been asked on a number of occasions why the subcommittee has elected to go out into the country to hold hearings on the major question of foreign policy. I think the following quotation from Ralph Waldo Emerson is as good an answer as I can give:

March without the people and you march into night; their instincts are a finger pointing of providence always turned toward real benefit.

That is the reason we are here today. We are not here to take a Gallup poll on who likes or does not like the United Nations.

What we want are ideas and suggestions which will help us in our work. We want your views with respect to the United Nations and the charter. We want, in short, the guidance of sincere Americans, so that we can better sustain the interests of this country in world peace.

There is nothing unusual in this hearing today except that it is taking place in Louisville instead of in Washington.

This is the first time a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee has ever met in the State of Kentucky. Now, there are some people who think that all the wisdom on foreign affairs in this country is concentrated in Washington and New York. I have never been willing to accept that idea; I do not accept it now.

I think that the experience which this committee has had shows that it just is not so. We have already met in Akron, Milwaukee, Greensboro, N. C., and in each of those cities we have found a deep understanding of world problems, and intelligent ideas on how to deal with them.

In all likelihood we would never have tapped a fraction of this wisdom, the penetrating wisdom, of thoughtful ordinary Americans by sitting back in Washington. We expect to leave Louisville after these hearings today further enriched in our understanding of the problems before us.

As I stated, this subcommittee is seeking wisdom at the grassroots instead of just seeking wisdom at the capital of your country; we expect to find it where the common man and woman live and think.

A great son of Kentucky, Abraham Lincoln, once said that God must have loved the common people, he made so many of them; and in these perilous days, we go to the grassroots and find there calm and wisdom and judgment.

In accordance with our subcommittee procedure, we have invited the congressional Representative from this district to sit with us today. We are happy to have with us your Representative, Mr. Robsion. Senator Clements was also invited to be with us, but was unable to attend. He sent me a letter which I will have placed in the record at this point.

(The document referred to follows:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
May 29, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALEX: I appreciate your invitation to attend the hearings which your special subcommittee on Senate Resolution 126 will hold in Louisville, Ky., on June 7 and deeply regret that my present schedule is such that I will be unable to attend.

The plan of your committee to hold hearings throughout the country on the vital question of United Nations Charter revisions is, in my view, an excellent approach. It affords you the opportunity to obtain, at firsthand, the opinions of many who would be unable to meet with you in Washington.

I am particularly pleased that you have chosen Louisville for the site of one of your hearings; and even though your stay in the Commonwealth will be short, I am sure you will be able to enjoy the hospitality of the people there. I know that Mayor Braddock, the chamber of commerce, and the people of the city will welcome you; and those who come before your hearings will reflect the measure of serious thought being given in Louisville and in Kentucky to problems you are discussing.

The United Nations Charter is one of the great documents of history and never has mankind made a more determined effort to promote world peace, justice, and security under a like charter. Failure of the United Nations could be a mortal blow to the world's aspirations for security. It is our task to make sure this does not happen.

The United Nations Charter will probably come up for review sometime in 1955. Review and possible constructive revision is necessary, in face of the rapidly changing world conditions. It is for this reason I supported the resolution of my distinguished colleague from Iowa, Senator Guy Gillette, which set up your committee and made possible the full study of proposals for amendments and revisions to strengthen the charter and take all available steps against any failure.

When the record of the hearings you are to hold in Louisville are available, I will certainly study them with great interest, for I know I will gain much valuable information and guidance from the views set forth by those who will be appearing before you on June 7.

I trust you will convey to those who are present at the hearings my regret at being unable to attend.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

EARLE C. CLEMENTS.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I should like to introduce my two colleagues on the subcommittee, Senator Gillette of Iowa, and Senator Cooper of your own State.

Senator Gillette is, so to speak, the father of this investigation. With great foresight, he introduced the resolution which established this Special Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter in order to prepare for possible review of the charter after 1955.

Senator Gillette, would you like to give us a bit of your wisdom?

OPENING REMARKS OF SENATOR GILLETTE OF IOWA

Senator GILLETTE. Well, Mr. Chairman, there is very little that I can add to the very excellent statement that you have made, except just two thoughts amplifying a couple of the thoughts that you presented.

As the chairman has said, we are coming to the people, to the grassroots. Our Constitution, as you know, has left to the people that great reservoir of power and authority. We are tapping that reservoir, as Dr. Clarke said in his opening prayer, so that democracy,

as we know it, can be perpetuated, and we have come to that source of power.

There is no power resting in any agency in Washington except as has been expressly delegated to it.

The second thought that I have in mind is this: I hope that nobody will draw the conclusion that seems to have been erroneously drawn in some parts of the country as we have traveled over it, that we are out to sell a program. The chairman just referred to that. We are not out to sell any program. We have heard in the cities where we have had hearings, and we expect to hear in the other cities in which we will hold hearings, all sorts of suggestions from one extreme to another, from witnesses who say, "Why, the United Nations has proved ineffectual, it is worthless; let's get out of it; let's throw it in the ashcan," to the other extreme that says, "Let's transform it into one world tomorrow."

We want to have the suggestions of you people. We expect, as the chairman has said, to be thoroughly enriched and thoroughly and definitely helped by any contributions that you people, representing the great American people in this great reservoir of authority, will give us in the work that we will have to do, which is to present a recommendation so that America can go before this conference when it is called with a program which we can be assured the American people in majority number are definitely behind.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

You know that your own distinguished Senator, Senator Cooper, was appointed by Vice President Nixon to serve with the subcommittee. We are glad to have the benefit on this subcommittee of Senator Cooper's expert knowledge of international organizations. You know that your Senator has served as a member of United Nations delegations to international conferences, and has devoted a great deal of thought and energy to the worldwide issues of today.

We are happy to be in Senator Cooper's State, happy to meet his constituents, and happy that he could join up with us today.

Senator, would you care to give us some ideas?

OPENING REMARKS OF SENATOR COOPER OF KENTUCKY

Senator COOPER. Well, Mr. Chairman, as you have stated, next year in 1955, under the provisions of the charter of the United Nations, the General Assembly must vote as to whether a general conference will be called to revise or at least attempt to revise the Charter of the United Nations.

In that vote, which must be a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly, which is not subject to veto, but in which seven members of the Security Council must agree, this decision will be taken.

I think we all have agreed in our meetings that it is very probable, and we believe, that such a conference will be called and, of course, the chief purpose of that conference is to determine if there are any ways in which the Charter of the United Nations can be improved, revised, or changed, to make it more effective to prevent war. Anticipating this conference, Senator Gillette introduced the resolution

under which we function. Senator Wiley, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, is the head of this committee of 6 members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and 2 other Senators appointed by the Vice President. I believe that these meetings that have been held throughout the country are of great value.

First, of course, the chief reason for holding these hearings is to secure recommendations from witnesses which will help this committee in making its own recommendations.

Then, I think they have promoted a better and larger understanding of the United Nations and its purposes. That has been a controversial subject, and some of those controversies have been brought to the surface.

I might say that I am very happy that the committee was invited to come here by Mayor Broadbuss and by interested citizens of the city of Louisville in the State of Kentucky, and it is a matter of pride to me, Mr. Chairman, that you and Senator Gillette have come here to this city and to this State. I know your long and deep interest and your wisdom in this field.

I can say for myself that, because of my own experience, I have a deep interest in this revision of the charter. I have a deep but not blind belief in the value of the United Nations as one of the instruments of world peace.

The main point I want to make to this group here that has taken the interest to come, and to those who will testify, is that it is not an isolated act or function that you are performing; but you are actually beginning this process, you are functioning; you are taking a part in the revision of the charter, and to that degree you are contributing to the great purpose which we will hold most important, and that is the prevention of war, with honor.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

You have now heard from the 3 members of the subcommittee, 2 of whom are here representing the whole committee.

We will make an exception this morning and ask one who is not a member of the committee, but who represents this district in Congress, Congressman Robsion, if he would like to say a few words.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. ROBSION, JR., OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, feeling that the United Nations, perhaps, is the only real hope we have for a lasting peace, and recognizing that the experience of the United Nations of the last 10 years has demonstrated in several respects the need of changes, I am most grateful that your committee has selected Louisville to be one of the very few cities in the country where you think that the people can be of some assistance to the committee in arriving at a conclusion as to what changes the United States should advocate in the United Nations.

I am very happy to have you here. I am extremely proud of my representation of this district, and I deeply appreciate your committee's seeing fit to come here on your tour of the few cities in the country where you want to know what the people think.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

INTRODUCTION OF STAFF MEMBERS

We are very happy to have with us today these two distinguished sons of Kentucky, both of whom are rendering real service to the State and to the Nation.

I am also happy today to present to you Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff of our committee, who served as chairman of the division of social sciences at the University of Louisville for several years; he is to my immediate left; and Francis Valeo, staff associate of the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter, who is at the end of the table here.

Now, we are ready to proceed to hear the witnesses.

Before I do that, I want to say that to my immediate right, is the young man who is the reporter for our committee in Washington, Mr. B. H. Firshein.

Now, we will have the first witness, Mrs. Bennett F. Hughes, who represents the Zachary Taylor Chapter, United States Daughters of 1812 in Louisville.

SUBCOMMITTEE'S WORK

Let me make it plain again that all this subcommittee can do is to assemble the facts and draw conclusions, and then, when we are through holding these hearings, we will submit the facts and the conclusions to the executive branch of the Government, so that it can have the judgment at the grassroots when it sits in with the representatives of the other nations.

We are glad to have you, Mrs. Hughes. Carry on in your own way, please.

STATEMENT OF MRS. BENNETT F. HUGHES, KENTUCKY STATE CHAIRMAN, CORRECT USE OF THE FLAG IN THE UNITED STATES, DAUGHTERS OF 1812

Mrs. HUGHES. Senator Wiley, distinguished officials and guests, I am Mrs. Bennett F. Hughes, Kentucky State chairman, Correct Use of the Flag in the United States, Daughters of 1812. I represent 104 Kentucky daughters of the United States Daughters of 1812. Each one has a true following of 50 or more adherents who believe as we do. We hold the Bible and the United States Constitution in our hands.

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL COUNCIL

We, in national council assembled in 1952, 1953, and 1954, passed resolutions including the preservation of our constitutional liberties against all forms of world government which would lead to losing our Constitution and Bill of Rights, and for the veto power being retained in the Security Council, above all things; opposition to Red China being admitted to the United Nations; for amendment to limit treaty-making power of the Bricker type; opposition to all forms of world government; opposition to UNESCO booklets; opposition to genocide convention; and other fine resolutions.

UNITED STATES SHOULD HAVE 48 VOTES IN U. N.

Get us 48 votes in that United Nations or close the American pocket-book to do it; that is the only way we can now be heard.

VETO POWER SHOULD BE RETAINED AND USED

Save that veto power above all opposition, and use it. The Soviet Union has 5 guaranteed votes, 1 vote for each 56 million, and poor little deceived and misguided Guatemala may now be her sixth guaranteed vote.

U. N. COST TO UNITED STATES DISCRIMINATORY

By courtesy of Alger Hiss we, the United States, are paying 35½ percent of all United Nations expenses, and we have only 1 vote, 1 vote for 165 million intelligent people. The grassroots American people are not for this vicious taxation and discrimination, and never were for this.

UNITED STATES DELEGATES TO U. N. NOT REPRESENTATIVE OF GRASSROOTS CITIZENS

The men who go from our United States to the United Nations as so-called representatives are not elected; they are appointed. God helped Gideon; He surely will help us.

Those people are appointed, and they never have represented us, the grassroots American citizens. All they have done that is concretely noticeable is that they have opened our United States pocket-book, poured out our money, bled us taxpayers white, and by so doing, lost practically every friend we had.

Was it Benjamin Franklin or Shakespeare who said if you want to lose a friend lend him money. If the United States of America goes deeper into this undesirable world-government idea and sells us down the drain, there surely will be a great migration to Australia, and there is a reason. I will tell you about it. I, for one, would rather live on a leaking houseboat under a poison-ivy vine in a crocodile-infested lagoon in a farflung lost island than to live in any country which deprives me of the Ten Commandments, the Golden Rule, and the United States of America Bill of Rights.

I could live with the crocodile. We each know what to expect of the other. But who knows what the Communists will do next?

Much of the resplendent phraseology in the United Nations Charter veritably reeks with despotism, absolutism, and divine right of kings—references: the article in the charter, and also the International Court of Justice, articles 31 and 38.

Anybody with the medulla oblongata of an angleworm would know it is a trap for the United States.

Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White and company were having a field day when they joined their pals in arranging the military department control.

Article 53: I interpreted that as being that the United Nations has committed its own genocide by its own definition, not by my definition, not by the dictionary definition, but by theirs, "mental harm." At least a black widow spider has bitten herself. That is

explained. Stalin and Lenin are on our side now, whichever place they went, they are believers now.

Alger Hiss and company represented our trusting United States officials at the U. N. organization meeting in 1945. There the American pro-Communists have had their inning, so this time in 1955 send such representatives as Frank E. Holman; John W. Bricker; Harry Byrd, of Virginia; Mrs. Frances Barrett Lucas, of Washington, D. C.; Mr. Willis Ballinger; and let us send some real patriots this time. Let us, who love America, we who seem to be the forgotten people, let us have the inning this time. We, our great grandparents, our sons and grandsons have fought and worked for America for 200 years. Please, please give us a hearing at long last.

If the five named representatives listed above cannot improve on the United Nations Charter, it is not worth having. They could at least close the pocketbook to those who would destroy us.

Articles 80 and 103 contradict each other. Clear that up. Make up their minds, either previous commitments prevail or they do not. Which holds?

Article 107 commits the same genocide as 53. There can be no divine spark of inspired statesmanship in any document on earth which holds vengeance. God says, "Vengeance is mine." You had better leave vengeance to him.

George Washington said, "Let only Americans watch tonight." And truly this is the night, and the dawn will never come if you and I let this blessed United States go into world government. World government is nothing but a trap. What gain can come to us?

Socialist communism was tried at both Jamestown in 1607 and Plymouth Rock later. They stopped. They did not like it, and so stop right here.

ALASKA AND HAWAII AND 48 STATES SHOULD EACH HAVE A VOTE

I hold that at San Francisco, the men from our United States who were sent there, namely, Alger Hiss and his cohorts, were giving our enemies aid and comfort. What is the name of that? If those men were agents of a foreign government, we in the United States had no representatives. There, it seems, might be a flaw in our membership card. Anyway the 48 States in the United States should have 48 votes, and we should also bring in Alaska and Hawaii, if they will come.

In 1955, the revision meeting, there will be great pressure for admitting Red China. Held for these 48 or 50 votes, or nothing.

Freedom for all without distinction as to sex, I do not believe in it. I do not believe in women digging ditches, driving railroad spikes, and lifting heavy loads. I have always had 125 percent of equality with the sexes.

SITE OF U. N. BUILDING

The United Nations Building would have been better if it had been built on Wrangel Island in the Northwest Bering Sea; perhaps a few people in it would have had a cool head. It could be moved up there now. It would simply be the Soviet Union bringing her private property home.

When God gets tired of this mess, rest assured he could move it. He built Reelfoot Lake in Kentucky and Tennessee in 1 night in 1811. When God is locked out, Satan is in.

NEED FOR U. N. TO BE MEETING PLACE FOR GOOD NATIONS

I would like to see the United Nations Organization where the good nations of the world can meet and endeavor to be of mutual benefit and strive to honestly understand each other. But when it suggests world government in the name of all that is holy, close our United States pocketbook and tell them "No."

Send genuine American patriots to that 1955 meeting, and tell them, "Don't give up the ship of state."

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

Any questions, gentlemen?

Senator GILLETTE. I have no questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. I have none.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Dr. H. H. Barnette, professor of history, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

In view of the fact that there are 9 or 10 witnesses scheduled for this morning's meeting, we would like to ask the witnesses to make their suggestions as to the continuation or modification of the charter or other matters relating to the United Nations, and then if they desire to say anything outside of that, we can put their statements in the record.

Carry on, sir.

STATEMENT OF H. H. BARNETTE, TEACHER, SOUTHERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Mr. BARNETTE. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, ladies and gentlemen, my name is H. H. Barnette, and I teach at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, Ky.

As I understand it, this subcommittee is not concerned with whether the witness likes or dislikes the United Nations. Rather, it wants to discover what changes, if any, could be made in the charter in order that it may most effectively promote the security and well-being of this country and best contribute to general world peace.

CHARTER AMENDMENT IS DIFFICULT

Amendment to the charter is difficult, if not almost impossible. Any permanent member of the Security Council can prevent the adoption of any proposal for reform of the charter. In the light of the present situation, the Soviet Union is not likely to approve any revision of the charter which will make for the security and well-being of this country or promote the peace of the world.

Nevertheless, assuming that the charter can be changed, at what points should it be revised?

GENERAL REVISION

1. There should be a general revision of the charter. It is involved, repetitious, and loaded with ambiguous provisions. No doubt this is due in part to the fact that it was conceived for the preatomic era. It should be made more simple, direct, and relevant to the needs of this solemn hour.

VETO POWER

2. More specifically, the veto power should be eliminated as it applies to membership and constructive measures which the majority of the nations would approve. Under the present arrangement, any permanent member of the Security Council can blackball the admission of a new member.

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

3. Revise the charter so that regional security arrangements will be more intimately integrated into the U. N. system of collective security. This would preclude the possibility of a regional agency undercutting and weakening the U. N. collective security and avoid the polarization of power into two major opposing camps. Negotiations would then be on a multilateral rather than a bilateral basis.

CHARTER CHANGE BY INTERPRETATION

These proposed changes in the charter would strengthen it. But even if the charter is not changed as to text, it is de facto changed in content by interpretation, nonapplication, and supplementary agreements whereby members extend or restrict their obligations under the charter. So we need not greatly despair at present if the charter is not revised.

U. N., DESPITE WEAKNESSES AND FAILURES, IS STILL AN EFFECTIVE MEDIUM

Finally, we must beware of falling into utopian quicksands by thinking that plans for charter revision, universal disarmament, and the elimination of the veto are nostrums which can quickly cure the radical ills of our time. Certainly we must keep these goals before us, but at the same time be willing to take the next practical steps in their direction. The U. N., despite its weaknesses and failures, is still the most effective medium by which international ethos and a relative world peace can be achieved.

I am not giving uncritical and blind worship to the U. N. If I wanted to give it a theological sanction, I could do that, because there are 111 articles in the United Nations Charter, there are 111 verses in the Sermon on the Mount, and we are meeting in room 111.

[Laughter.]

IF U. N. ABOLISHED, WOULD NEED AN ALTERNATIVE

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment.

Is it your opinion that if the U. N. were to go out the window, so to speak, be abolished, the nations of the earth would have to have a substitute if they wanted to try to formulate some plan for peace?

Mr. BARNETTE. Yes, sir. I think there would have to be some sort of alternative; and the critics of the U. N. have not come up with a realistic alternative.

U. N. MEMBERSHIP AT FAULT

The CHAIRMAN. Well, is it not also true that if in an organization—I care not what the organization be—the members of the organization are not morally straight, then the organization is not at fault; it is the membership that is at fault?

Mr. BARNETTE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you apply the same rule to the U. N.? Assuming that the Kremlin and its stooges would play the game according to the rules that we think should be applied in international procedure, do you not think that we could get along lots better?

Mr. BARNETTE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Senator Gillette?

U. N. AN EFFECTIVE MEDIUM

Senator GILLETTE. No questions, Mr. Chairman, but I want to compliment this gentleman on his closing statement that the U. N., despite its weaknesses and failures, is still the most effective medium by which international ethics and a relative world peace can be achieved.

There are many of us who feel that it does mark the high point in attempts to achieve international cooperation.

We also recognize at the same time the thing that you have recognized, that it has weaknesses and has failures; but your suggestion that, instead of abandoning it, we continue the efforts to try to make it as effective as we can, is very helpful.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. I, too, would like to say that I think his statement was a very moderate and sensible statement. I think he would agree that the troubles in the U. N. reflect the troubles in the world. Things cannot be any better inside the U. N. than the things that are happening in the world.

RESULT OF UNITED STATES WITHDRAWAL FROM U. N.

What would you consider would be the result if the U. N. should disintegrate, if we should withdraw, which I think would mean disintegration? What avenues would you see that many countries throughout the world would then have as to any consultation upon peaceful measures?

Mr. BARNETTE. Excuse me, Senator, I did not hear that.

Senator COOPER. What avenue would a small country have, such as a country in southeast Asia, to consult with us, or how could we reach them effectively?

Mr. BARNETTE. All of the lines of communications would be closed to the smaller nations. They would have no recourse to an organization whereby they could bring their grievances and their hopes and their desires as a nation.

Senator COOPER. Do you think that, in all likelihood, the struggle between the great powers would then be intensified?

Mr. BARNETTE. Yes, sir; because there are moral forces which are brought to bear upon the situation through the U. N. that could not possibly be brought to bear otherwise.

Senator COOPER. Very well; that is all.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS WHO HAVE REPRESENTED UNITED STATES AT U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. At this time, I desire to place in the record the names of Members of Congress who have served this country at the U. N. There were Senators Austin, Vandenberg, Connally, Dulles, Cooper, Sparkman, Mansfield, Lodge, Congressmen Eaton, Bloom, Richards, Vorys, and Bolton, and I also had the privilege of serving at the U. N. There may have been someone else, but they all, at least outside of the speaker, represent Members of patriotism and character and ability, seeking to find the way. And all humanity is trying to find the meaning of life, as Browning has said, and certainly what we are doing is to try to find not only the best mechanism, but also trying to see that humanity itself, which operates that mechanism, will do a better job than it has done in the past.

I thank you, sir.

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, may I amend your statement when you excluded the chairman of this group, to say that your statement should have included the chairman of this group in the contribution that he has made in our relationships in the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. [Applause.]

Mrs. Amry Vandebosch. She represents the League of Women Voters of Kentucky and Lexington, and her husband is a very distinguished doctor and professor of international law and relations in the university there. We are glad to have you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. AMRY VANDENBOSCH, PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF KENTUCKY

Mrs. VANDENBOSCH. Thank you.

I am Mrs. Amry Vandebosch, speaking for the League of Women Voters of Kentucky.

Senator Wiley and members of the committee, speaking for the 1,200 members of the League of Women Voters in Kentucky, I wish to thank you for the honor and opportunity of expressing to you some of our ideas about the United Nations and possible changes in the United Nations Charter. These hearings, being conducted by your committee, are of inestimable value in increasing public understanding of the United Nations.

SUPPORT FOR U. N.

Today the League of Women Voters of Kentucky reaffirms its support of the United Nations as the world's best hope for keeping the peace and fostering the general well-being of the peoples of the world through the development of peaceful conditions.

FAILURES AND SUCCESSES OF U. N.

It is true that all of the hopes of the supporters of the United Nations to fulfill its security functions, specifically control of atomic energy, regulation of armaments, and provision of armed forces are not due to organizational weaknesses of the charter that could be remedied by structural changes.

We believe these failures are due to the deep chasm of disagreement between members. These failures, like the successes of the United Nations, are in direct relation to the willingness of the members to find a way to come to an agreement. If no such willingness to cooperate exists, then no machinery can be devised that would be adequate to guarantee that cooperation.

INCREASING U. N.'S EFFECTIVENESS WITHIN PRESENT FRAMEWORK

But we do firmly believe that within the present framework of the charter, the member nations could do much to increase the effectiveness of the United Nations. But, again, realization of these possibilities is dependent upon sufficient agreement on ends in view, and sufficient will to achieve these ends. An excellent illustration of this possibility was the Uniting for Peace Resolution of 1950.

ANY CHANGES SHOULD STRENGTHEN, NOT WEAKEN, U. N.

Now, the League of Women Voters knows that the United Nations is not the ultimate in world organization. Our study has revealed the need for arriving at a solution to a number of very serious problems, but at this time the league does not have any specific changes to recommend, but we are united in believing there should only be changes that would clearly strengthen the United Nations in its ability to carry out its purposes as stated in the charter. We could not accept or approve any changes that would serve to weaken the United Nations in promoting international cooperation.

We cannot too emphatically state our conviction that in examining the charter for possible revision, it is of prime importance to bear in mind that the success of the United Nations depends upon the willingness of the member nations to cooperate; that there have been very notable achievements in international cooperation during the past 9 years; and that we should make maximum use of the tools we have in hand while we search for better ones.

The United States has a grave responsibility in its role of leadership in the United Nations. We, the league, have confidence it will rise to the demands of the occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you personally have any specific recommendations, even though the statement of the league indicates it has none?

Mrs. VANDENBOSCH. Well, I am speaking today as president of the league, and to speak as an individual would be at the risk of compromising the position of the league, so I would rather not comment as an individual at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, apparently your statement suggests that what we should do, instead of working on the mechanism, is to work on the mechanics, the bad boys, the Russians, and the others, to get them to see it our way; is that right?

Mrs. VANDENBOSCH. Well that, of course, is fundamental to every negotiating process; is it not; that you seek to convert the opposition to your point of view?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you have asked me the question. I would just simply say, of course, I agree fully with that. But I was wondering whether you were always so judicial when it was a question of whether you were expressing your husband's view or your own. [Laughter.]

Mrs. VANDENBOSCH. I am sure he would like to have me be equally judicious.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, gentlemen?

Senator GILLETTE. No questions from me.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mr. Morton Walker, chairman of the committee on Christian world relations of the Louisville Area Council of Churches.

STATEMENT OF MORTON WALKER, CHAIRMAN, CHRISTIAN WORLD RELATIONS COMMITTEE, LOUISVILLE AREA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am Morton Walker of the University of Louisville, and I am speaking this morning as the chairman of the Christian world relations committee of the Louisville Area Council of Churches. I would like to read a prepared statement.

We come as members of the Christian world relations committee of the Louisville Area Council of Churches. The Louisville Area Council of Churches is the principal interdenominational agency supported by and representing a large proportion of the churches of evangelical faith of Louisville and Jefferson County, Ky. While the churches that cooperate with our organization include a membership of more than 150,000 persons of Louisville and Jefferson County, this report does not purport to speak for them. It does give what we feel would be an acceptable statement to many of the protestant church population.

Our Protestant group, by and large, has favored the establishment of the United Nations, has had high hopes for what it might accomplish, has had great satisfaction wherein it has ministered to world needs, and has been disappointed in matters in which it has failed to achieve its declared purposes. We want the U. N. to continue and to have the wholehearted moral and material support of our Government and people.

REVIEW CONFERENCE SHOULD BE DELAYED

We can think of some modifications in the charter that might strengthen its operation. But in the present climate of world opinion we feel that desirable changes in the charter could not be made effective. And so it is our opinion that when the question of holding a review conference on the charter is submitted to vote in the U. N. the representatives of the United States should seek to delay such conference until a more favorable time. In the meantime we urge that within the framework of the present charter efforts be made to further every desirable end.

This committee will use its influence to encourage church groups to study the United Nations and its charter in cooperation with the current denominational and interdenominational U. N. study programs. We shall also be glad to cooperate with our representatives in the U. N. both in attempting to interpret the U. N. to our people and to communicate convictions of the local community to them.

The CHAIRMAN. What was your basic reason for suggesting that the conference should be delayed? Do you feel that the suggestions of the Kremlin and its satellites and the Western World are not of such a nature that anything could be accomplished?

Mr. WALKER. Basically that, sir. I think there are probably two reasons why we would take this stand: One is that there is the current problem of Indochina and Indonesia, and we feel that in this general area, this general period of conflict, that nothing could be accomplished. We feel that it is entirely possible that it will become purely a propaganda meeting, and that Russia would use it to continue to give its points of views, and simply prolong the meetings, so it would be entirely worthless.

Then, there is always a possibility, it seems to some of us, that as a result of such a meeting, conceivably there might be an outside chance that Russia would withdraw, and while they have certainly done everything that seems possible to deter, maybe to delay, any action, we think it is best that they do remain in the United Nations as one of our ways of being able to get our ideas across to the members, and we think the possibility of it might be the withdrawal of Russia.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Senator GILLETTE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I was very much interested in the suggestion of Mr. Walker that the present world climate might not be conducive to success of a review conference or that the success that we hope for would be postponed.

The unfortunate situation, Mr. Walker, as the present speaker sees it, is that article 109 of the charter provides that a conference for reviewing the present charter may be held at any time by a vote fixed by two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and any seven members of the Security Council. But there is also a provision in article 109 that if such a conference has not been held before the 10th annual session of the General Assembly, the proposal to call a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held, if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

EFFECT OF REVIEW CONFERENCE POSTPONEMENT

Senator GILLETTE. Now, this proposal to call a conference is placed on the agenda compulsorily. If the calling of a conference is postponed, don't you feel that the United Nations machinery which would thereby throw into gear the requirement of a two-thirds vote, would make it very, very difficult to call a conference in the future? If you postpone it, have you not passed the golden time for giving the matter consideration?

Mr. WALKER. Well, no, sir, Senator; I do not think so. I think there is always the difficulty of getting two-thirds of a vote on any-

thing, but it would seem that now is not a good time. I frankly think that nothing good would come of such a meeting now. I think conceivably in a few years—I would not pinpoint it and say 1958 and 1960—but I think there is the possibility that would be a time when some good might come of a review of the charter. I do not think so now, and I think that it is a situation where rather than have one that would be an abortive session, it would be better to have none now, and hope that it would be possible to set up a review later; that is my personal opinion.

Senator GILLETTE. Don't you feel that the consideration of any matter of importance by calling a conference is always valuable, whether it accomplishes what its sponsors hope or not?

Mr. WALKER. In theory. I doubt that at the present time it would result in that. I do not mean to say that we could not study the United Nations Charter. I think certainly we ought to—it ought to be under constant review and constant study as any group, any organization, is and should be.

I feel at that present time though that so little good would come of it and so much possible harm might come. It seems to me if we spent the whole time with Russia objecting to everything that is coming across, and giving more Russian propaganda, that the good would certainly be more than offset by the bad.

Senator GILLETTE. I don't want to use your time or the time of other witnesses, but I just want to make this comment: Over a year and a half ago there was such a feeling that there should be an examination, a possible revision, of the charter that I introduced a resolution in the United States Senate urging our State Department to throw into gear the machinery as to the possible calling of a conference. This resolution referred to the first provision I read, the one requiring a two-thirds vote.

The State Department took the position that it would be too voluminous and too difficult, but that it would be preferable to wait until, under the provisions of the charter, the question came up automatically on the agenda of the General Assembly in 1955.

Now, they felt that they should not initiate a review conference, but that we should proceed under the compulsory agenda in 1955. Now you are suggesting that we abandon that situation under which we have to proceed and then throw the whole question to an improbable future. Don't you have that in mind?

Mr. WALKER. I would not say an improbable future, sir; I would say an uncertain future, an indefinite future, but I do not think improbable.

Senator GILLETTE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper, do you have any questions?

TIME NOT RIPE FOR REVIEW CONFERENCE

Senator COOPER. Mr. Walker, I have been interested, too, by your suggestion.

A vote must be taken at the General Assembly in 1955 as to whether or not this conference can be called.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

Senator COOPER. You think it would place the United States in a good position to vote against such a conference, and only the United

States, I think, could prevent such a conference being called. Actually, we would kill the conference.

Mr. WALKER. Well, we thought about that, sir, and we thought that it might be used also by Russia saying that we were trying to hurt the United Nations.

The only thing is, of course, that Mr. Malik himself has said he does not believe, if I remember it correctly, that a conference would do any good. So I thought if the United States took the position that this is not the time for it, that certainly Russia could not use that as a basis for saying that we were against any study, simply to say this does not seem the time for it. I suppose it could be used against us propagandawise. I still say that I think we would be better off not having the conference now.

Senator COOPER. I would agree with you that I doubt if any extensive changes would be made. But in view of the world situation and in view of criticisms that the United Nations has not been effective, do you think you can avoid or should avoid a discussion before the world of the ways in which it might be made more effective?

Mr. WALKER. Well, Senator Cooper, I feel that the United Nations, under its present charter, can do more, of course, than it has.

Senator COOPER. I agree with you.

Mr. WALKER. Of course, it is the same sort of thing, as one of the other speakers says, of working with individuals. I do not think there are a number of weaknesses in the United Nations Charter anyway—this is my personal feeling. I suppose that maybe ideally I would like to have the veto taken away from Russia and given only to us and other nations, but I doubt if that can be taken care of at this time. [Laughter.]

I think that, as I say, so little would be accomplished that maybe at a later time we might better have such a conference.

U. N. MACHINERY TO CONTROL ATOMIC WEAPONS

Senator COOPER. I do not want to take up your time, but I have one other question.

The real problem, one great problem, is, of course, the control of atomic weapons. The only organization which exists in the world today, which is dealing with this problem, is the United Nations. It has been ineffective, but they have been working.

Do you think there is some possibility that such a conference could discuss better methods, better mechanisms, toward that control?

Mr. WALKER. May I ask you, sir, Is it impossible to have that discussion within the United Nations now?

Senator COOPER. No, it is not impossible, but the Commission today is under the control of the Security Council.

Mr. WALKER. Yes.

Senator COOPER. Some people believe that it might be possible to place it under the General Assembly, which would make it more flexible. I doubt if Russia would ever agree to it, but it seems to me that even the discussion of it would be valuable at a time when people were thinking about it very, very much.

Mr. WALKER. I think a discussion of it would, but whether we need to have the review conference called for that, when you have appropriate channels now, I doubt that it would be wise or advisable.

Senator COOPER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. My attention has been called to the fact that even with the microphones the reporter for this meeting is having difficulty in hearing the witnesses, so I will ask my fellow associates to speak up and let their voices be heard or forever hold their peace.

One other question, sir.

Mr. WALKER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you given any thought to what might be called the inherent powers in the Assembly to handle some of these situations?

Mr. WALKER. No, sir; I am sure there are, but I have no statement to make on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. John Harter. [Applause.]

Carry on, please.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN HARTER, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mrs. HARTER. Before I present my prepared statement, I would like to say just two things. First, that we are very pleased that the grass-roots you brought your hearing to are bluegrass roots; and, secondly, I would like to summarize my position before I go into my statement.

I am opposed to world government; I am in favor of the United Nations as to world cooperation.

I feel that the charter can stand revision, of course, as its framers expected. What worries me most are the fringo-area things, and I am looking for protection of the inalienable rights of the American people.

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has asked me to testify before you concerning my feelings about the United Nations and the United States.

I am glad to do this because I am interested as a patriotic citizen of the United States who is interested in the past, the present, and the future of our country. I am interested in the future because I have a young son who will live in the world we protect and build; who may have to fight for it. I am vitally interested in the present as a mother, a daughter, a wife. I am interested in the past because I am proud of the heritage built for us by our forefathers, and because I had ancestors on the *Mayflower*, in the Revolution, the War of 1812, and the War Between the States.

OPPOSITION TO COVENANT OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Naturally, I am not qualified to advise you, who are experts in political science and legislation, but as an average citizen I would like to voice more fears concerning the United Nations and some of its proposed covenants and conventions.

I believe that the proposed Covenant of Human Rights and the adopted Universal Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations are dangerous to the foundations of our country and to its future well-being.

Since the United Nations Charter was adopted as a treaty, according to our Constitution, present or future treaties and covenants adopted by the United Nations could become the supreme law of our land and could direct or replace our domestic laws.

I believe that the Genocide Convention, along with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenant of Human Rights, could destroy our own Bill of Rights, without benefit of legislation by the Congress of the United States.

The state could control religion, could control the press, could prevent trial by jury, through directives, not of our Congress, but of a foreign, alien body, the United Nations.

The Declaration of Human Rights is definitely socialistic. It can bring such things as socialized medicine, even though the Congress has rejected socialized medicine. Through UNESCO propaganda, socialism is being taught in our schools now.

This Declaration of Human Rights says "everyone as a member of society has a right to social security" but no mention is made of how this international social security shall be paid for. I am afraid it will not be "the American way," but "the Americans will pay."

OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

I understand there is a plan to amend the United Nations Charter into a world-governing document in 1955. In such an organization we would be a hopeless, helpless minority. We Americans, who oppose socialism which leads to communism, and who believe in private ownership and free enterprise, with its incentive and initiative and accomplishment, will find ourselves restricted and taxed to produce a socialistic order in our own country and, in addition, to pay for a communistic leveling off for the world.

Worst of all, we will be forced to abandon our rights, our fundamentals, our principles.

My plan is that you find some way to prevent abuse of this treaty power. If the Bricker amendment was not the answer, then devise an amended amendment. When the treaty clause was written into the Constitution there was no international organization in existence. Make an amendment that will prohibit any interference in domestic affairs of the United States. I want to see the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of our Government continue their proper functions, without McCarthyism. Protect your own right to legislate.

Though I came here to speak at the instigation of the DAR, I might just as well be speaking for any or all of the organizations I belong to: for the Parent-Teachers Association, or my church, or the medical auxiliary, or the American Association of University Women, or the Mayflower Society—but most of all, I speak for myself, an American housewife.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions?

Senator GILLETTE. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator COOPER. I certainly thank you for your statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank you for your statement.

Of course, I might just ask, why is the Declaration of Human Rights dangerous when it is not binding upon us? It is merely a statement of ideals, most of which are already in our Constitution.

Mrs. HARTER. Well, I understand that some of these things they advocate could become dangerous to us, because it was accepted as a treaty, I mean the charter was, and, therefore, those directives could apply to us without having to go through regular channels of amend-

ments to our Constitution, and they are in opposition to some of the Bill of Rights amendments.

THE MODERN AGE IN WHICH WE LIVE

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, the declaration is not any treaty. You have raised many points that I personally could not agree with, but I am not here to answer them.

I would be very happy, if you desire, to have forwarded to you what I think is a basic understanding of many of these things that you have mentioned.

We realize in America that there are folks who want to retreat to what we were even 15 years ago. Fifteen years ago we practically did not have an airplane that could cross an ocean. Now we cross the ocean in 4 hours. We cross the continent in less than 4 hours.

We did not have the H-bomb or the A-bomb. We did not have the circle route that brings the threat of the Kremlin so close to our beloved America. Most of us would like to live back in the days of George Washington if we could, but the world has been shrunken a great extent by man's ingenuity.

Now, we have to be careful that in the course we take we do not shrink our minds accordingly. If we do we will not be the valiant soldiers for this beloved country that we all want to be.

The changed facts in this world require that we recognize those everyday facts, and not simply go back to all principles, many of which were proper in the days of George Washington, when he said, "No foreign entanglements." In other words, we cannot now live unto ourselves alone, and I am sure you realize that.

Mrs. HARTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any suggestions for the modification, for the revamping, for throwing out of the window of the United Nations Charter?

Mrs. HARTER. I do not want us to throw it out the window; I want it adapted.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much.

[Applause.]

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT INTERFERENCE IN UNITED STATES DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Senator GILLETTE. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to ask the witness a question for clarification of her statement.

I read from your statement that when the treaty clause was written into the Constitution there was no international organization in existence. You said, "Make an amendment that will prohibit any interference in domestic affairs of the United States."

Because that was in your statement, referring to the Constitution, are you suggesting an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or an amendment to the Charter of the United Nations?

Mrs. HARTER. I am suggesting to the United States, not the United Nations.

Senator GILLETTE. An amendment to the Constitution of the United States which prohibits interference by any foreign group?

Mrs. HARTER. Yes.

Senator GILLETTE. In our domestic affairs?

Mrs. HARTER. Yes.

Senator COOPER. Mr. Chairman, can I ask one thing? Since we seem to be going back again into this, first, I would like to say I think Mrs. Harter has evidently prepared her own statement and it is a very sincere statement of her own beliefs.

The CHAIRMAN. Louder, Senator.

Senator COOPER. I just said that I think Mrs. Harter evidently has prepared this statement herself and it is a very sincere statement of her own beliefs. But there is a question raised which I do not believe ought to be left hanging, and because it is a belief of a great many people, I would like to make this statement. There are a great many people who believe that some convention, some treaty, some agreement which has been proposed by some subsidiary body of the United Nations supersedes the Constitution of the United States or the Bill of Rights. Now, there is just no basis for such a statement, but people all over the United States have been led to believe that.

There is no court that has ever held that, but yet it is promulgated throughout the whole country. If a treaty should be approved by the United States itself, by the Senate of the United States, it could have some effect upon the statute law of the United States. It might have some effect upon State law, but as far as it superseding the Constitution or the Bill of Rights, there has never been a holding of any court in the United States upon such a subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Correct.

[Applause.]

Thank you very much.

Mr. Louis Lusk, United World Federalists of Louisville.
Carry on, sir.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS LUSKY, LOUISVILLE CHAPTER, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC.

Mr. LUSKY. Senator Wiley and members of the subcommittee—

The CHAIRMAN. You look like a husky lad; speak so that the people on the top row can hear you.

Mr. LUSKY. I will do my best, sir.

First, Senator Wiley, in order to respond directly to the question which you have asked some of the other witnesses, I would like to state quite briefly what recommendations I propose.

I should say, first, that I am a lawyer, I live and practice in Louisville, and I am speaking on behalf of the United World Federalists, the Louisville chapter.

As I am sure the committee knows, the United World Federalists is a nonpartisan organization which believes that lasting peace can be attained only by the abolition of national armaments, and that the abolition of national armaments can be obtained only by the strengthening of the United Nations into a world federation which would have direct and exclusive control over all military power throughout the world, and would administer that military power under the guidance and limitations imposed by law, law to be made by the world federation, subject to the control of the member nations.

**UNITED STATES SHOULD VOTE FOR HOLDING OF CHARTER REVIEW
CONFERENCE**

Now, the recommendations which I would like to offer the subcommittee are, first, that the United States should vote for the holding of a general revision conference pursuant to article 109 of the charter.

DELEGATES TO A CHARTER REVIEW CONFERENCE

Second, that we should send to that conference the best men we have, the most eminent bipartisan delegation available.

Third, that we should refrain from giving those delegates any binding instructions as to particular alterations of the charter.

U. N. SHOULD BE REVISED INTO A WORLD FEDERATION

Fourth, that we should authorize and direct our delegates to seek agreement with the delegates from other nations on a proposal for a general revision of the charter which would convert the United Nations into a world federation, giving the United Nations governmental power which would be adequate to keep the peace, subject to safeguards that would protect us and the people of other nations from injustice at the hands of the strengthened U. N.

RATIFICATION OF CONFERENCE PROPOSALS

Next, I think we should examine carefully any proposal which comes out of this conference, and we should ratify it if, but only if, we think it is in our national interest to ratify it.

UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT WITHDRAW FROM U. N.

Sixth, I think that we should recognize that the U. N. in its present form is an invaluable aid to the prevention of war, and that we should on no account threaten to withdraw from the U. N. because some charter revision proposal that you or I or the United States feel is desirable, fails of ratification, because the Russians or somebody else will not ratify it.

IF PROPOSED CONFERENCE FAILS, SHOULD CALL ANOTHER LATER

And, finally, we recommend that if this general conference should not produce any proposal for submission to the member nations or if it should produce a proposal and the member nations should fail to ratify it, that we should have another general conference in another 10 years, say, at least not too far off.

Now, without reading the statement which has been submitted to the subcommittee—

COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

The CHAIRMAN. We will be glad to put in the record that part which carries on the discussion of these points, which is what we want. These points summarize your ideas on the subject!

Mr. LUSKY. That is correct, sir. A lawyer always tends to say "Your Honor" and that is what I almost said.

The CHAIRMAN. There are a few of them here who are entitled to that. Your statement runs into time, and we have three witnesses after you, sir, that we would like to finish by noon.

Mr. LUSKY. For that reason, Senator Wiley, I would not propose to read the statement. I would like to refer to one or two of the points that are in it without reading it, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. I know something about the faults of lawyers, being one myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUSKY. Well, Senator, may I give you the full authority to interrupt me at any time that I am overstepping---

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead, sir.

INABILITY OF U. N. TO ABOLISH WAR

Mr. LUSKY. In the first place, I would like to say that I think it is demonstrable from the experience of 9 years under the United Nations that while it has so far been able to prevent war, and I think that the United Nations gets the major credit for our not being in a shooting war, at the present time it is not able to abolish war in the sense that it can relieve us of the tremendous burden of national armaments or can even guarantee us that its ability to prevent war will actually prevent it for any long period of time.

I think it is also clear that there is a type of organization which could make war impossible, and that is an organization which had all the military power in the world. I think that was known to the framers of the U. N. Charter at San Francisco, and I think their failure to make the U. N. into that kind of an organization was not due to any accident or oversight or evil design. I think it was due to the fact that they saw in such an organization a danger greater than the danger of war.

DANGER OF MISGOVERNMENT IN WORLD GOVERNMENT

Now, it may surprise you, sir, because I know you have heard representatives of the United World Federalists speak in other cities—it may surprise you to have me acknowledge that there is a danger in world government, but I think that danger should be recognized. It is a danger not of war but a danger of misgovernment. It is the same danger that Mrs. Harter referred to; it is the danger that Mrs. Hughes referred to so graphically; it is the danger that led Patrick Henry to oppose the ratification of our own Constitution, the fear that if you set up a federated organization with power to make laws for individuals inside the States, that that organization would exercise its power tyrannically, and it is the same thing that led the States to insist that our Bill of Rights be adopted as a protection against this federated organization that we call the United States Government, before they would ratify the charter.

Therefore, it seems clear that the desirability of world federation at a particular time must be judged in terms of the danger of war, weighed against the danger of misgovernment at any particular time.

Now, the importance of the revision conference is this: the danger of misgovernment is not wholly beyond our control. Written constitutions are designed for the purpose of protecting the member nations and the member states from oppression at the hands of a central

government. Our own Philadelphia Convention in 1787 did exactly that.

It was able, although no one thought beforehand that it would be possible to do or no one would have been willing to guarantee it, no one would have bet any sizable sum of money on it, and it still proved to be possible for a group of able and farseeing men, working in conference and having the advantage of the mutual give-and-take that exists in a conference, that exists in the United States Senate, for example, it is possible for such a group of men to come up with a proposal which no one of them, no matter how enlightened, would have been able to develop by himself beforehand.

Now, what I suggest to the subcommittee is this: it is not possible to know beforehand, before an actual attempt is made to develop a concrete proposal, whether we can at this stage in history develop a constitutional system which will both remove the threat of war and afford to the member nations, the United States and other nations, real protection against tyranny at the hands of a strengthened United Nations. The only way we can find that out is to try.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Lusk follows:)

STATEMENT OF LOUIS LUSKY OF THE LOUISVILLE CHAPTER OF UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, INC., ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is respectfully submitted that the United States should—

(a) Vote for the holding of a general conference of the members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present charter.

(b) Send to such a conference, if it is held, the most eminent bipartisan delegation available.

(c) Refrain from giving our delegates binding instructions on particular alterations of the charter.

(d) Authorize and direct our delegates to seek agreement with delegates from other nations on a proposal for general revision of the charter whereby the U. N. would be given governmental power adequate to keep the peace, subject to safeguards affording to the people of all nations, including our own, reasonable protection from unjust or discriminatory treatment at the hands of the strengthened U. N.

(e) Scrutinize carefully any revision proposed by the conference, and ratify it if, but only if, it is found to be in our national interest.

(f) Recognize that the U. N. in its present form is an invaluable conciliation and collective security agency, and that we should on no account threaten withdrawal from the U. N. because other nations refuse to ratify a charter revision proposal of which we approve.

(g) Propose the holding of another general conference not more than 10 years hence, if the first conference fails to muster the two-thirds vote necessary for proposal of a charter revision, or if a revision is proposed but fails of ratification.

DISCUSSION

The thinking which underlies these conclusions can be summarized as follows:

1. The main purpose of the U. N. is to prevent a third great war. If it succeeds in this, it will have justified its existence. If it fails in this, it will perish.

2. The present structural form of the U. N. is not sacred. The framers of the charter themselves recognized that a more effective instrument for the keeping of the peace might be devised. That is why they included in article 109 a virtual invitation to take a fresh look at the charter after it had been in operation for 10 years.

3. There are two types of international organizations which may be effective in preventing armed conflict between nations:

(a) An organization like the present U. N., which provides machinery for the conciliation of international disputes, and facilitates the mobilization of collective-security measures to resist aggression if conciliation fails, but which lacks the power to make and enforce laws forbidding the preparation or execution of military measures by the governing officials of the several nations.

(b) A federated organization having direct and exclusive control of all military power throughout the world and possessing governmental authority to prevent aggression, compose international differences and control armaments by means of laws—laws prescribing enforceable rules of conduct for individual men and women, based on the consent of the governed and therefore always subject to peaceful amendment or repeal.

4. The choice between these types of international organizations cannot be made on a doctrinaire basis. Dangers reside in each alternative, and the choice must be based on an appraisal of the respective dangers in the light of conditions as they exist at the moment of decision.

5. So long as the U. N. retains its present form, the danger of war will remain. The U. N. can conciliate international disputes, but there is never a guaranty that conciliation will succeed. The U. N. can serve as a medium for collective-security measures, but collective security will deter aggression only so long as the collective alliance is kept strong enough to awe the potential aggressor. What the U. N. cannot do is to render war impossible by monopolizing military power throughout the world, just as the United States Government now makes war between the States of the Union impossible by monopolizing military power throughout the Nation. Until this step is taken, and universal disarmament is achieved, international peace cannot be made secure. It is important to recognize, however, that the inability of the present U. N. to dispel the danger of war results not from any failure on its part, but from limitations inherent in its structure. It is also important to recognize that these structural limitations were not introduced by accident or oversight or evil design, but were accepted and indeed insisted upon in 1945 by the United States and other member nations, because at that time world federation was thought to involve a danger even greater than the danger of war.

6. The danger in world federation is a danger of misgovernment. If we are to consent to the abolition of all national armaments in favor of an international military establishment, we have a right to require assurance not only that this military power will be controlled by law, but also that the law will be made and enforced without injustice to us. The fact that the world federation would in a sense be our own government, in which we would presumably have voting power commensurate with our population and strength, would not in itself preclude the possibility of unjust and discriminatory laws. It can never be assumed that a legislative majority will act for the best interests of the community as a whole, if the community is divided by deep cleavages along lines of nationality, race, or religion. Groups which are disliked or distrusted by members of the society at large can rightly fear unfairness at the hands of the legislative majority. Even where such groups have minority representation in the legislature, they may be held at arm's length and their interests disregarded by a monolithic majority. This phenomenon is not unfamiliar to Americans. It lay at the root of the sectional conflict which culminated in the Civil War. It has manifested itself in the many cases of discrimination against domestic minorities. It will appear whenever there are deep psychological cleavages which cause particular segments of the population to be held separate—their interests appraised coldly through the medium of group stereotypes rather than with the brotherly sympathy accorded the needs and desires of fellow human beings as individuals. The existing cleavages between the peoples of the world are in some cases very deep indeed, and there is a correspondingly great danger that a world federation would deal unjustly with particular national groups.

7. The union of existing nations under a federal system must be evaluated in terms of the new dangers (of misgovernment) it creates, as well as the old dangers (of war) it dissipates. There is a natural tendency to say that the evils of war have become so stupendous as to be wholly incommensurable with any other type of disaster, however great. This is what most people think they think. On this premise war must be abolished at all costs and the only problem is to decide what it takes to do it. In fact, however, the danger of injustice at the hands of one's own government frightens a man as deeply as the prospect of foreign attack. And the danger of such injustice is always increased by the formation of larger governmental units.

8. The desirability of world federation at any given time thus depends on two variables: the danger of war resulting from the absence of such a federation, and the danger of misgovernment which might result from its creation. If and when the former danger is thought to outweigh the latter, the time for world federation has arrived.

9. But the danger of injustice at the hands of a world federation is not wholly uncontrollable. To an important extent, it can be mitigated by safeguards built into its constitutional structure. When the two variables (danger of war and danger of misgovernment) approach equilibrium, the preparation of a constitutional plan offering a measurable degree of protection against official tyranny may be sufficient to make federation acceptable. That is what was done in the Philadelphia convention of 1787.

10. The U. N. has two functions, both of which are of fundamental importance: (a) By whatever temporary expedients are available, to forestall a major, civilization-destroying war until the time for world federation arrives; and (b) to serve as the vehicle for world federation when the time is right. Article 100, which provides for review of the charter by a General Conference, establishes the procedure whereby this latter function can be performed.

11. It will not become possible to make a judgment as to whether the time for world federation has arrived, until a concrete proposal for revision can be developed by a General Conference and presented to the member nations for ratification. Not until then can we envisage the actual operation of the proposed federation so that the danger of injustices at the hands of the new government can be realistically evaluated in the light of the constitutional safeguards which will be a part of the proposal. Therefore we should not prejudice the results of the revision conference. No one can say beforehand whether an acceptable federation plan can be developed at the present time. The fact that international hostility is now very great is not in itself conclusive, because the destructive potentialities of war are also very great—in fact, are at an all-time high. As our own Federal convention showed, a group of able and far-seeing men working in conference may be able to evolve a viable plan based on mutual give and take, which even the most enlightened of them could not have developed alone. The urgency of the need to eliminate the danger of war forbids us to assume in advance that universal national disarmament under a plan of federation is not yet possible and that a revision effort would necessarily end in failure.

12. For the same reason, we should not hamper our delegates to the revision conference by giving them binding instructions on matters of detail which would limit their ability to join with other delegates in working out a mutually acceptable plan. No one has the wisdom to say dogmatically that the proposal must necessarily embody any particular features. The important thing is that, taken as an integrated whole, it must eliminate the possibility of war and offer us sufficient protection against misgovernment. We should send our ablest statesmen to the conference and give them full freedom of action, bearing in mind that our own President and Senate will have an absolute veto on any proposal which is ultimately offered for ratification.

13. At the same time, we should recognize that men and nations can reasonably differ as to whether world federation has yet become possible, and as to whether any particular revision proposal is acceptable. Safeguards which seem sufficient to us might seem inadequate to other nations. The decision to relinquish national armaments in favor of an international military establishment is a grave one. Therefore the refusal of other nations to ratify a revision proposal which we may have approved should not be interpreted as willful stubbornness justifying our withdrawal from the U. N. To do so would be to sacrifice the precious service which the U. N. is now rendering, and disable it to serve as the vehicle for world federation at a future time.

14. Even if charter revision proves to be impossible now, the way should be kept open for a renewal of the attempt at a date not too far in the future. There is great value in periodic reexamination of the problem, so that federation and universal disarmament can be accomplished as soon as world conditions permit. Even if a particular proposal is rejected, it may stimulate debate which will point the way to eventual success. Therefore, for the same reason that the framers of the charter invited a revision conference after the first 10 years of operation, we should do our best to make sure that this conference, if unsuccessful, will be followed by repeated efforts until the great objective is finally attained.

15. The General Conference should concentrate its efforts on the problem of major structural change in the U. N. because, as a constitutional convention, it will be uniquely equipped to deal with that problem. Its attention should not be diverted to relatively minor amendments which, though perhaps desirable in themselves, could be effected as easily through the regular amendment procedure provided by article 108. Since the present discussion is limited to recommendations for action by the General Conference, there is no occasion to discuss detailed amendments of that kind.

16. The fear has been expressed that revision proposals should be avoided at this time because the public debate on such proposals will highlight the shortcomings of the U. N. and give aid and comfort to isolationists and others who contend that the U. N. is not worth preserving in its present form. There is always a danger that public debate on a difficult policy question will be perverted by demagogic distortion of issues. We cannot allow this danger to frighten us away from action which the public interest demands. Instead, we must insist that our political leaders avoid partisan considerations and keep the debate in true perspective. The charter revision problem calls for sober and responsible statesmanship in the highest degree. Upon our response to this challenge may depend the life of our Nation and of our very civilization.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir. [Applause.]
Mrs. William M. Culter.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM M. CULTER, BOARD OF THE COUNCIL OF CHURCHWOMEN OF LOUISVILLE

Mrs. CULTER. I am Mrs. William Culter, speaking in behalf of the board of the Council of Churchwomen of Louisville.

The board of the Council of Churchwomen of Louisville wishes to express deep appreciation and thanks to the honorable members of the Senate who, today, come to us, their constituents, to consult and advise about a matter important to us all—the review of the United Nations Charter.

This statement has been prepared by the board of the Louisville Council of Churchwomen. It represents the thinking of elected leaders who can reflect the sentiment of churchwomen through their work, rather than vote or poll of public opinion.

It should be noted here that in October 1953 the subject of review of the U. N. Charter was recommended for study by the Cleveland Conference on World Order. Churchwomen of many denominations participated in this conference. One major religious group is placing this subject as one of four topics for study in a crusade for world order. At a later time, positive conclusions on charter review could be given by the council.

Nevertheless, we do feel prepared to make certain definite statements which would be generally acceptable to most churchwomen.

GAINS IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION UNDER U. N.

First of all, the churchwomen of Louisville are deeply concerned to conserve all the gains in international cooperation that has been achieved in many areas under the present charter. The U. N. goals proposing to bind peoples of the world together through improving living conditions closely parallels the mission program of the Christian church and our own attempts to attain worldwide cooperation within the church. We wish to support and strengthen this work.

MEANING OF "REVIEW"

This group noted that much explanatory material on this subject uses the word "revision of the charter" and "change." We are disturbed. The charter itself uses the term "review of the charter." "Review" could mean the evaluation and support. What will be in the minds of our representatives and representatives of other countries? We do not know.

The council of churchwomen would not want to go on record as advising any move that would result in throwing the valuable achievements of the U. N. into confusion and question. World opinion so important for agreements among nations is not as unified as when the charter was drawn in 1945. Those who think in terms of revision and change, even with good intention, might focus world attention on divisive political differences rather than the less dramatic but constructive substantial work of the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies. So at this time in good conscience we cannot advise holding a conference of U. N. charter revision that would increase world tensions and result in loss of cooperation among nations.

Meanwhile, we must bear in mind that a body of precedent and procedure is being built by particular and immediate cases that come before the General Assembly and commissions of the U. N. Patience, experience, and time will give us structure in this new field of international relations. In fact, there is more room for wider action within the present charter than there is support within the climate of world opinion.

UNITED STATES APPROACH IF CONFERENCE IS CALLED

However, we know that presently this review of the U. N. Charter is automatically on the agenda of the 10th Annual Meeting of the General Assembly. That body, with or without the United States, may vote for review of the charter. In that event, we ask that our representatives approach such a conference without prior commitments and with a positive attitude of exploring ways to use more fully the potential of that organization. We ask that such a conference shall be used to interpret the U. N. and to render interest and support. The United Council of Churchwomen has on many occasions recommended these attitudes in U. N. relationships.

U. N. SHOULD NOT BE USED SOLELY AS INSTRUMENT OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Our final point is of enough agreement among churchwomen to be stressed when we consider a review of the charter—actually, a review of the U. N. The Christian faith binds us to peoples of all races and all nations. We share with them one God whose will is, we believe, that we work out our problems in peace and cooperation. Therefore, we are bound to reject the proposition that the U. N. should be used only as an instrument of United States foreign policy and interests. To us the U. N. is the beginning of a better and fuller life for people everywhere.

In accordance with our faith we welcome this opportunity in our lifetime to pledge ourselves to such a high resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator, any questions?

Senator GILLETTE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask a question by way of clarification.

COUNCIL'S CONCLUSIONS ON CHARTER REVIEW

You state, Mrs. Culter, in your third paragraph that—

One major religious group is placing this subject as 1 of 4 topics for study in a crusade for world order. At a later time, positive conclusions on charter review could be given by the Council.

Do you want to elucidate on that?

Mrs. CULTER. The Methodist Church, for instance, is putting that study on its agenda, and it will be our study in the Churchwomen's Council will not be finished until this year, unfortunately, and that is the reason we state that we cannot speak for the churchwomen; we can only speak as somebody who has worked with them.

Senator GILLETTE. Are you of the opinion that they will have reached their conclusions, completed their study, in time so that it would be available?

Mrs. CULTER. Now, the General Assembly, I believe, meets in January, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. September.

Mrs. CULTER. September. No, I do not think they will, unfortunately.

Senator GILLETTE. You do not think it will be ready?

Mrs. CULTER. It is just one of those things where the timing is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. A year from this September.

Senator GILLETTE. A year from this coming September.

Mrs. CULTER. That will give them time.

Senator GILLETTE. You say:

We ask that our representatives approach a conference without prior commitments.

Do you mean by that no commitments as to what we shall support in the way of review?

Mrs. CULTER. What I feel most of the churchwomen feel is that we might go in without the spirit of negotiation and reconciliation, if we have prior commitments. We must give them a loose feeling, a feeling that they can do what is necessary to do under the situation.

Senator, I had the privilege of sitting in under the formation of the Charter of Human Rights and also the Genocide Convention, and one of the most illuminating things that comes out of that is the meeting of minds of people who are so different. I wish everybody in America could see the man from Egypt, the man from Syria, the woman from Pakistan who knitted all during this, and what a simple thing means to us would mean such a different thing to those people who grew up under different laws and different religions. That is the thing I feel that we should go uncommitted to the point that we can receive other people's opinions.

Senator GILLETTE. The thought that was behind my question was that it did not seem possible that you would take a position that our representatives should go into such a conference—

Mrs. CULTER. I see your point.

Senator GILLETTE (continuing). Without some conclusions to present. They should not be irreconcilable, of course.

Mrs. CULTER. Committed to action, it should have read.

Senator GILLETTE. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Senator?

Senator COOPER. Don't you take into account that the delegates who would be in such a conference would, of course, be representing this Government?

Mrs. CULTER. Yes.

Senator COOPER. They would have to represent the viewpoint of the Government.

Mrs. CULTER. Oh, yes; I do.

Senator COOPER. I would just like to say this, that while I am strongly in favor of a conference, I have always said that I think there is nothing particularly wrong with the structure of the U. N. It is really the question of whether the members will observe its purposes. I think you are right in this regard.

Mrs. CULTER. May I make this statement? I have felt, in observing the United Nations and watching the development of it, it is arriving, as the British Constitution was arrived at, by precedent and by decisions that have been made, and we have seen powers taken from the Security Council and placed in the General Assembly through precedent. It may be that we will not have to fight our way to an improvement.

Senator COOPER. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. CULTER. Thank you very much.

U. N. MECHANISM NOT SUFFICIENT IN ITSELF

The CHAIRMAN. I just want to say that in the various hearings we have held, where we have had people appear who have regarded the United Nations as a fetish, and those who cannot see any virtue in it, I cannot help but think of the United Nations in terms of the analogy that you can have the best automobile in the world but if you put it in the hands of an insane person it will not be a good automobile very long.

We have had the Ten Commandments for some centuries, and we have had violations of the moral code, but we have kept the Ten Commandments, thinking they are pretty good things to follow.

But in pursuing the remedy which, after all, is bringing the human race to the point where people will treat each other with respect and live together in harmony, we must make sure that we do not think that the mechanism can do the job alone; there must be a rebirth in the consciousness of the individual.

Now let us hear from Mrs. Beatrice Pearson, corresponding secretary, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Louisville branch. Carry on.

STATEMENT OF MRS. BEATRICE PEARSON, CORRESPONDING SECRETARY, WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM, LOUISVILLE BRANCH

Mrs. PEARSON. My name is Beatrice Pearson, and I am the corresponding secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and a statistician by profession.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom was founded at an international conference at The Hague in 1915. Miss Jane Addams headed the delegation from the United States.

There are at present 26 sections in 26 countries of the league. Two of our past presidents were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, Miss Jane Addams and Miss Emily Balch.

LEAGUE SUPPORTS UNITED NATIONS

Senator Wiley and members of the subcommittee, the United Nations is the outstanding agency in the world today in which men and governments can join their efforts to achieve their objective of maintaining peace. Of itself the United Nations cannot create peace. It is an important mechanism which men and nations must themselves use in order to create peace in the world.

Through the 38 years of its existence, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom has stood for a strong international organization functioning democratically within the framework of law as essential to lasting peace. We believe that the United Nations represents a stage of such an organization and as such we give it full support (from the principles and policies adopted at the annual meeting of the United States section of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom in June 1953).

It is our belief that everything possible should be done to strengthen the United Nations, and that nothing should be done to weaken it as an agency for the maintenance of peace.

VETO SHOULD BE RETAINED

We members of the Louisville branch of the league believe that there is grave danger in the suggestion that the veto allowed to the five permanent members of the Security Council should be limited or abolished. We are of the opinion that the veto power is the one thing which has kept the United Nations whole in this period of world tensions, and that to remove it would be to turn the United Nations into another impotent League of Nations. It was recognized at the San Francisco Conference which created the charter that peace could not be maintained if it were possible for any four of the major world powers to veto military action against the fifth. It was for just such a situation as now exists in the world that the veto was written into the charter. If there were no tensions, the veto would not be needed. It is also possible that the time may come when the United States finds itself in a minority position. If that time does come, the veto may save us from a most serious situation. We members of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, therefore, strongly urge that nothing be done to weaken the veto power in the charter.

SUGGESTIONS FOR STRENGTHENING U. N.

The members of the league in Louisville believe, moreover, that there are actions which our Government could take which would strengthen the charter as an agency to preserve peace. It is our opinion that anything which seriously weakens the authority of the charter constitutes an essential revision of it, and we, therefore, call to your attention the following suggestions for strengthening the United Nations:

RED CHINA SHOULD BE ON SECURITY COUNCIL

1. The de facto government of China should be given its rightful place on the Security Council. Secretary-General Trygve Lie, in his memo of March 8, 1950, stated that if a new government shows that it exercises effective internal authority and is habitually obeyed by the bulk of the people, it should be accepted as the government of the nation. It is becoming more clear every day that, and Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Mr. William DeWitt state in their book "U. N.: Today and Tomorrow" (p. 20):

The Peking regime gives no external evidence of lacking internal authority.

We believe that the United Nations cannot function as an agency to keep peace in Asia as long as the largest of the Asiatic nations is denied its place on the Security Council, a place that was given it because of the recognition of its importance to the Asiatic world.

U. N. SHOULD RELY MORE ON PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT METHODS

2. "The league believes that the primary responsibility of the United Nations as outlined in the charter is to operate as an instrument of mediation, negotiation, conciliation, and judicial review in resolving world tensions rather than to rely on collective security by military might as a means of stopping aggression or settling international disputes" (Principles and Policies).

We are of the opinion that our Government of the United States has not sufficiently utilized the United Nations to this end. We are firmly convinced that if the same methods had been used at the time of the Korean crisis as were used in the India-Pakistan and the Arab-Israel disputes, that destructive war could have been avoided. At this time our Government, without ever having brought the matter before the Security Council of the United Nations, is considering sending troops to Indochina. To ignore the United Nations in this matter would most certainly weaken its authority.

PURPOSE OF REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

3. Chapter VIII, article 52, paragraph 1 of the charter states that the main purpose of regional agreements should be—

The maintenance of international peace and security.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the proposed South Pacific agreement seem to be treaties for military action rather than for the peaceful settlement of disputes. Paragraph 2 of article 52 states:

The members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements.

The United States Government has not followed these precepts in regard to Guatemala, nor does it seem to be planning to in regard to Indochina. The foreign ministers of the Organization of Central American States are being called together, according to an article in the *Courier-Journal* of May 31, to discuss "collective action," a term which has been used to imply military action. We would call to the attention of our President and the Senate article 53 of chapter VIII of the charter, which says:

No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangement or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

As yet the Security Council has not discussed Guatemala or Indochina.

We believe that through application to the International Court of Justice and the Security Council, all differences can be settled without war. We urge our Government to bring its great prestige to bear for the strengthening of these agencies for peace, by resorting to them in cases of serious difficulties with other nations.

GENOCIDE AND HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS SHOULD BE RATIFIED

4. "The league believes genocide is a crime against humanity and deplors the fact that the United States has so far refused to ratify the Genocide Convention" (Principles and Policies).

We believe that ratification of the Genocide Convention and also the Human Rights Convention by the United States Congress would strengthen the United Nations in its efforts to spread democracy throughout the world. As long as the most powerful nation in the United Nations fails to ratify its conventions, the charter loses by so much the authority it carries in the world.

U. N. SHOULD CALL WORLD DISARMAMENT CONFERENCE

"The league holds the goal of the United Nations to be a total world disarmament enforceable under law * * *. The league recommends the calling of a world disarmament conference by the United Nations, including all nations, to consider the necessary steps toward total world disarmament" (Principles and Policies).

The present disarmament conference now in session in London is a hopeful sign. We believe, however, that real disarmament implies that the United Nations must have power to enforce a disarmament agreement. An agreement for complete disarmament must have the binding force of law. This concept is incompatible with the concept of unlimited national sovereignty on which the charter is now based. Complete disarmament, therefore, requires either reinterpretation or change of the charter to allow for limitation of sovereignty in the matter of armaments.

If the charter review conference should be called, it should consider the requirements of complete disarmament and either find a way to provide for the necessary machinery under article 26, chapter V of the charter or to suggest revisions of the charter to this end if that prove necessary.

U. N. CAN BE STRENGTHENED WITHOUT BASIC REVISION

To summarize, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Louisville branch, puts before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the suggestion that the United Nations Charter can be strengthened as an instrument to keep the peace without basic revision, through the following actions: By maintaining the veto power; by admitting the Government of China to the Security Council; by the United States Government working more closely with the Security Council in matters of differences with other nations; by maintaining the conciliation character of regional arrangements as called for in the charter; by ratifying the Genocide and Human Rights Conventions; and by working for full disarmament within the framework of the charter.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Gillette, any questions?

Senator GILLETTE. No, Mr. Chairman, but I want to thank the lady and her organization for a very concrete statement of recommendations. I will not personally reach the same conclusions on some of them that you have reached. Statements of this kind are very helpful in the kind of work the subcommittee is trying to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Senator COOPER. I think the reason that regional agreements have been concluded is because of the failure of the Security Council to act, because of the veto by Russia.

Mrs. PEARSON. Russia cannot fail to act when we do not bring matters to the Security Council's attention.

Senator COOPER. What instruments do nations have just for self-defense?

Mrs. PEARSON. I think we should try the Security Council. Then if we find it fails to act, perhaps we need to take other action. But so far we have never tried the Security Council when we have had difficulties.

Senator COOPER. We tried in Korea.

Mrs. PEARSON. I am sorry, but the United States Armed Forces were sent into Korea before the Security Council had an opportunity to discuss it, and then the Security Council discussed it and backed us up.

Senator COOPER. They are debating Indochina—it is now before the Security Council. I think.

Mrs. PEARSON. No.

Senator COOPER. There is a question of whether we can even get a matter on the agenda. What do you do when the Security Council just will not act?

Mrs. PEARSON. I still feel there are agencies in the United Nations, and if the Security Council finds there is no reason to act, then we would be at fault in acting; that it is up to the Security Council to decide whether or not action is necessary. If any individual nation can go ahead on its own, then the United Nations has no meaning.

Senator COOPER. Do you mean that if there should be aggression and the Security Council fails to act because of the veto of Russia, then we should not act?

Mrs. PEARSON. I think that aggression is a matter of the point of view. What appears to us as aggression may not appear so to other nations. I have read in the paper yesterday, for example, the South American nations have a very different attitude on Guatemala, on what they have done, than the attitude we have. It seems to me that is why we have the Security Council so that these things can be threshed out and the different points of view brought to bear.

Senator COOPER. I do not want to argue the matter, except to test your argument about one of your recommendations when you say we should not rely on these regional agreements.

Do you recommend that in every case where the Security Council will not act because of the veto of Russia, the United States or other nations should not act through regional agreements?

Mrs. PEARSON. I feel that is why the United Nations was set up. Then we might as well withdraw from the United Nations; if we are not going to abide by its decisions, then why have it? We should be bound by the decisions of the U. N. as much as any other nations; otherwise there is no point in having the United Nations. We might as well withdraw. That, I think, would be a great tragedy.

Senator COOPER. You think the use of the veto then is always a considered action by Russia?

Mrs. PEARSON. I think the time may come when we also want the veto.

Senator COOPER. I think so. The United States has been for the veto. I cannot get your reasoning on this one recommendation.

Mrs. PEARSON. That is the basis for it. If we have the U. N. then we should work within the U. N., otherwise we need not have the United Nations.

Senator COOPER. That is all I want to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions? Thank you very much.

Mrs. Walter C. Anderson, president, National Society of the Daughters of Colonial Wars in the State of Kentucky.

Mrs. Anderson, may I remind you that we have a number of witnesses who will have to be heard in the next 15 minutes. You have a lengthy statement here. Can you summarize the suggestions that you have for the improvement or the disposal of the charter?

STATEMENT OF MRS. WALTER C. ANDERSON, STATE PRESIDENT, DAUGHTERS OF COLONIAL WARS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY

Mrs. ANDERSON. Yes; Senator, I do.

Now, the gentleman who called me stressed that point, and I have it; this is my summary.

Senator Wiley, members of the subcommittee, and Mayor Broaddus, thank you for the privilege of appearing before this distinguished body of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee.

May I commend this committee of the Senate for this approach to the revision of the United Nations Charter.

I am Mrs. Walter Carroll Anderson, of Lexington, Ky., State president of the Daughters of Colonial Wars in the State of Kentucky, and a member of the national council of the National Society, Daughters of Colonial Wars.

I am also a member of the Daughters of the American Colonists in Kentucky. I am speaking for both of the State societies.

We are glad of the opportunity to express our position on the revision of the United Nations Charter, and hope that our views will assist you in your work. We hope that the charter will be amended satisfactorily so the United States can participate.

PURPOSE OF U. N. SHOULD BE EMPHASIZED

When the United Nations was formed, its primary purpose was distinctly understood to be a worldwide diplomatic meeting place for discussion and peaceful settlement of world problems by the representatives of its member nations, thus tending toward better world understanding and world peace.

This main objective should be maintained and should be emphasized when revising the charter in 1950.

The United Nations should continue to serve us as an assembly of sovereign nations seeking to improve world relations. It can accomplish much if it undertakes its work through the process of study and arbitration, advice and education, but not by force.

OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

We sincerely hope this committee of distinguished Senators will not approve any amendment to the United Nations Charter which might change it from a voluntary organization of sovereign nations into a world government or partial world government.

It is our understanding that proposals are being made for strengthening the United Nations or putting teeth into it by converting it into a world government or a limited world government. Stalin, before his death, approved this. We are strenuously opposed.

All are for world peace and order, but the ways to secure them are not through a forced union of the world's group. All have different interests and standards of law and justice. This has been proven to us recently.

How could any form of world government be successful with such different government ideas, philosophy, and principles as exist in the world today? Many nations want the United States to pay more than our proportionate share of the U. N., and the associate agencies, yet we are outvoted by these nations.

For example, in recent days the WHO levied a demand for \$350,000 on the United States. Our Senate would be very foolish to pay this.

However, the possibility of any world organization levying a demand on the United States Government demonstrates one of the fallacies of a world government. With such vast regions under Communist rule and us outvoted, the results would be disastrous for our constitutional Republic and our way of life.

This was forcibly demonstrated in the vote on proposals for economic aid and development. We want to keep our Federal Constitution and Bill of Rights which our Founding Fathers fought so hard to secure. We did not want to surrender our constitutional liberties. Why should we lose our birthright for a mess of pottage?

Further, we object strenuously to giving the United Nations the power to pass treaties and rules which might supersede our Constitution or interfere in our domestic affairs. We want our duly elected representatives to keep their constitutional authority to pass our international law—I mean our internal laws.

OPPOSITION TO U. S. AS WORLD LEGISLATOR OR POLICEMAN

We strictly oppose the United Nations becoming a world legislator or a world policeman. When the United States ratified the United Nations Charter they were definitely assured and believed there would be enforcement of article 2, clause 7, which reads:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to interfere in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

This important provision should be kept in any possible revision of the United Nations Charter and should be strictly obeyed.

NOT "PEOPLES" OF THE U. S.

We urge that the third word in the United Nations Charter probable be changed from "peoples" to "nations." We are not peoples of the United Nations.

The American people have never voted for delegates to represent them, either in the forming of this organization or to represent them in this organization since it was formed.

VETO POWER SHOULD BE RETAINED

Only sovereign nations are its members. Individually and collectively we, of the United States of America, pledge our allegiance only to the United States of America. We are convinced that the veto power in the Security Council should be retained. Perhaps in this way alone can we be assured of the preservation of our Constitution and freedoms under our republican Government.

No changes should be allowed to our Constitution, either by treaty or by any other method, which would permit the vote—which does not permit the vote of our own people voicing approval of such a change.

CONTROL OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

We feel the specialized agencies should either be controlled by the United Nations or connections severed. They are causing great resentment among our people.

We owe our primary protection, support, and allegiance to the Nation which our Founding Fathers left us, which has protected, educated, and aided us by giving us and our forebears so many outstanding privileges and blessings.

AGAINST ANY LOSS OF UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY

We oppose and will continue to oppose any revision of the United Nations Charter which might lead toward the loss of any United States of America sovereignty or any of the God-given rights of American citizens.

The United States of America is the hope of the world. Why lose that hope? May God continue to bless the United States of America is our prayer.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Any questions?

Senator CHELTERE. No questions.

Senator COOPER. No questions.

DOMESTIC JURISDICTION MATTERS

The CHAIRMAN. I want to read into the record at this time subsection 7 of article 2 of the United Nations Charter:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Anderson is as follows:)

STATE SOCIETIES STATEMENT, DAUGHTERS OF COLONIAL WARS IN THE STATE OF KENTUCKY AND DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN COLONISTS OF KENTUCKY

Senator Wiley, members of the subcommittee, and Mayor Bronddus, thank you for the privilege of appearing before this distinguished body of the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I am Mrs. Walter Carroll Anderson, of Lexington, Ky., State president, Daughters of Colonial Wars in the State of Kentucky, and a member of the American Colonists of Kentucky. I am speaking for both of our State societies. Our organizations are glad of the opportunity to express our position on the revision of the United Nations Charter and hope our views will aid you in your work.

First, we would like to commend this committee and the Senate for seeking the opinions of the American people on this important issue of the revision of the United Nations Charter. It is truly an American approach, as this is a Republic—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Since our subject is the revision of the United Nations Charter, these are the changes we think should be made.

1. THE U. N. CHARTER PREAMBLE

The third word in this U. N. Charter should be changed from "Peoples" to "Nations." We, as citizens of the United States of America, owe no allegiance to the U. N. save as a member nation of the U. N. We are not peoples of the United Nations. No people in the United States of America ever voted for delegates to represent them at San Francisco Conference, at any U. N. General Assembly or at any U. N. Commission. The U. N. is composed only of member nations. We here in the United States pledge allegiance only to the United States of America.

2. PREAMBLE, FINAL PARAGRAPH—AMENDMENT

We suggest: "Accordingly, the United Nations Organization is hereby continued as a voluntary organization of sovereign states having such functions and powers as are expressly granted to it by the following articles."

This revision would give any Nation, dissatisfied, the right to withdraw from the U. N. As a sovereign nation, they could exercise that right. That sovereignty is asserted in article 2, clause 2. It is universally conceded that a U. N. member has the right to withdraw. That important right, the right of withdrawal, should be expressed in the charter and not left to implication.

3. THE U. N.'S PRIMARY FUNCTION

The Senate and the American people distinctly understood the primary function of the United Nations was to serve as a worldwide diplomatic meeting place for the discussion and peaceful settlement of differences among the member nations. Senator Vandenberg called it the "town-meeting of the world." It was also meant to serve in promoting respect for human rights and improving the economic and social status of individuals through advice and education but not by force. It was hoped by these methods it would bring peace to the world.

We feel if this committee's recommendations should be to lessen rather than to expand the powers of the U. N., it will strengthen the U. N.'s chance for sur-

vival in a troubled world. On the other hand, if the committee should propose amendments to the charter which, under the guise of "strengthening the U. N." or "putting teeth in it, would transform it from an organization of sovereign states into a partial or world government, it would encourage those who want to get the United States out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States. We are strenuously opposed to world government.

At the recent National Council of the National Society of Daughters of Colonial Wars held on April 17 in Washington, D. C., this resolution was passed:

"Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of Colonial Wars reaffirms its opposition to any form of world government, world federation, or to any immediate federation, to any impairment of the national sovereignty of our representative Republic, the United States of America, by convention, covenant, or treaty."

4. ENDOWING THE U. N. WITH POWER TO INTERVENE IN DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF STATES

If this attitude on the part of the U. N. continues, it will be impossible for the American people to support it. Other nations share this view. For example, the human rights declaration recently adopted at Caracas, the 10th Inter-American Conference, contains this provision:

"The inalienable right of each American state to attain economic independence and live its own cultural and social life without intervention on the part of any state or group of states, directly or indirectly, in their internal and external affairs * * *."

It does not help the peace of the world to have the United Nations meddling in the domestic affairs of the nations.

5. AMENDMENT OF THE DOMESTIC JURISDICTION CLAUSE, ARTICLE 2, CLAUSE 7

Quoting: "Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state * * *" (art. 2 (7)).

Without the assurance of that protection the U. N. Charter would never have been ratified by our Senate. When the charter was under consideration article 2, clause 7, was used to allay all fears that the United Nations might assume some control over the purely domestic affairs of the United States and its citizens. We have not received the protection that article 2, clause 7, was intended to provide.

Beginning with the San Francisco Conference, Mr. John Foster Dulles opposed any precise definition of domestic jurisdiction. He pointed out that the powers of the United Nations could be greatly expanded by evolution. The official abstract of his statement contains these startling words:

"The United States had had a long experience in dealing with a parallel problem, i. e., the relationship between the 48 States and the Federal Government. Today, the Federal Government of the United States exercises an authority undreamed of when the Constitution was formed, and the people of the United States were grateful for the simple conceptions contained in their Constitution. In like manner, Mr. Dulles foresaw that if the charter contained simple and broad principles future generations would be thankful to the men at San Francisco who had drafted it" (S. Doc. No. 87, pp. 287-288).

In 1950, the State Department stripped article 2 (7) of all meaning when it announced in an official publication (No. 3972) "there is no longer any difference between foreign and domestic affairs;" later, in State Department Bulletin of October 6, 1952, page 530, declared nations joining U. N. subjected themselves "to what amounts to an international legislative system" that "was to deal with the individual and the rights of the individual." We want no world policeman or world legislator.

See also the January 1948 issue of *Annals of American Academy of Political and Social Science* for statements by Mr. John P. Humphrey, then Director of the Division of Human Rights of the United Nations, as follows:

"What the United Nations is trying to do is revolutionary in character. Human rights are largely a matter of relationships between the state and individuals and, therefore, a matter which has been traditionally regarded as being within the domestic jurisdiction of states. What is now being proposed is, in effect, the creation of some kind of supranational supervision of this relationship between the state and its citizens."

Later, United Nations officials extended that theory in saying that:

"Once a matter has become, in one way and another, the subject of regulation by the United Nations, be it by resolution of the General Assembly or by convention between member states at the instance of the United Nations, that subject ceases to be a matter being 'essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member states'" (Moses Moskowitz, 35 American Bar Association Journal, pp. 281-285).

This Humphrey Moskowitz theory is now the official view of the United Nations. This is endorsed by numerous deans and professors of law schools, who also oppose the Bricker amendment. This is one of the reasons the United States needs the Bricker amendment. We need the Bricker amendment to erect a constitutional and a congressional fence between the ambitions of global bureaucrats and the inalienable rights of the American people. We believe unless this protection is provided, the United States will eventually withdraw from the United Nations. Another protection, article 2, clause 7, should be amended to make it clear the United Nations and the specialized agencies have no authority to draft international agreements dealing with subjects that are only the concern and responsibility of member nations and their political subdivision. The American people are entitled to this protection pending the adoption of an adequate threat amendment.

In the testimony of Mr. Dulles before you on January 18, 1954, he states the things he advocated in his book, *War or Peace*, 1950, can be carried out under the present charter. Hear his words:

"I have never seen any proposal made for collective security with teeth in it, or for world government, or for world federation, which could not be carried out either by the United Nations or under the United Nations Charter."

In replying to Senator Wiley, Secretary Dulles said (January 18, 1954, hearings, p. 11):

"What I meant primarily there, Mr. Chairman, was not that these things could be done by the United Nations, but I said could be done consistent with the United Nations Charter. When I spoke, for instance, of a security organization with teeth in it, you can form that under article 51."

The Senate should take immediate action after this warning from the Secretary of State.

7. AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES 55 AND 56

When U. N. Charter was ratified by the Senate, assurance was given them by administration officials (1945-46) that the human-rights provisions contained in articles 55-56 were merely a statement of high aspiration and purpose and not intended to be any legally enforceable obligation. The American people understood it was just an aspiration and not an enforceable obligation.

Hardly had the charter been ratified before one world organization asserted articles 55 and 56 were non self executing and had the effect of superseding thousands of Federal and State laws. A lower court in California and a lower court in Idaho agreed with that view, as did four Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States of America in their concurring opinion in *Opama v. California* (332 U. S. 633 (1948)). President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights adopted the same view. The Supreme Court of California decided articles 55 and 56 were merely statements of aspiration. If other than just aspiration, it violates the 10th amendment of our Bill of Rights in our Constitution. Such interpretations make an amendment like the Bricker amendment necessary. Another reason for amendment of 55 and 56 is that the U. N. view is that all human-rights questions, local, private, and sacred, have ceased to be purely domestic concern within the meaning of article 2, clause 7, because human rights were internationalized in articles 55 and 56. Therefore, these articles 55 and 56 should be amended to reaffirm the original understanding. In regard to the question of genocide, no American should be hauled off to an international court for offenses committed in this country. To permit this would have the combined effect of United States ratification of this Genocide Convention and the U. N. draft statute for an international criminal court. While we trust President and present membership of the Senate, the majority of Americans rightly feel that no President and no group of Senators should ever have it within their power or authority to take away by treaty secret or executive agreement any right otherwise protected by the Constitution. That is why we need the Bricker amendment. Amendment of articles 55 and 56 should add after U. N. (56) subject to limitations imposed by article 2 (7), etc., as additional protection. Other articles should conform to article 2, clause 7.

8. AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 58 TO BRING UNDER UNITED NATIONS CONTROL OVER THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

We appreciate very much the sketch of the United Nations system as suggested by Senator Sparkman and included in part 1, hearings of January 18. Article 58 provides that the U. N. shall make recommendations for the coordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies. This article 58 should be amended so as to give U. N. control over the budget and the program of all specialized agencies as set out in article 17 (3). Two specialized agencies, UNESCO and the International Labor Organization, are bringing great discredit to the U. N. itself. We see by hearings, January 18, that these are among the 10 independent agencies with their own constitution and budgets, but are still shown in the United Nations system. Also brought into relationship with U. N. under article 61, that provides Economic and Social Council shall define the terms on which the agencies "shall be brought into relationship with the U. N." However, under article 17 (3) the General Assembly considers and approves "any financial and budgetary arrangements with the specialized agencies." This certainly provides a method of control. Congress is to be congratulated for forbidding the disbursements of funds to any international organization that promotes, directly or indirectly, one world government or one world citizenship. (See Public Law 195, 81st Cong., 1st sess., sec. 110.)

UNESCO propaganda has caused such widespread resentment that Congress has taken this step. Even the 1953 Handbook of the Girl Scouts of America (pp. 228-229) tries to support the view that "every citizen of the United States is included in the United Nations" and contains the incredible statement that the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights "is much like our own Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights." The schoolchildren especially have been bombarded with the idea that they are now citizens of the world, U. N. citizens, and beneficiaries of fundamental rights bestowed by U. N.

In the Lexington Leader, June 1, 1954, appears an article on the editorial page telling that WHO, one of the specialized agencies, "voted itself an additional sum of \$500,000, to be levied on the United States." Seems the delegation sent by United States administration to represent this country voted against the resolution, but was outvoted by the other nations. And the editorial comments "Now Congress is told what it must do by an international organization in which this country is overwhelmed by the minority." "One constitution that needs to be amended is that of the United Nations."

A score of U. N. agencies and commissions are engaged in some form of technical assistance. No doubt some of this assistance is desirable, but there is a tremendous amount of duplicity and extravagance in the program. Congress is asked to appropriate funds for this economic and technical aid, but Congress cannot direct how the money shall be spent, nor can it demand any accounting. The least that should be done is for the United Nations Organization to bring some order out of this chaos. Here's an example: The American taxpayer should not be required to pay one third or more of the cost of studying the organization of social services among the Andean Indians. Nor should the long-suffering American taxpayer be forced to pay the bulk of the cost of U. N. research into town and country planning, social-security systems, and other studies represented in approximately 50,000 U. N. documents. We feel these agencies must be controlled or dropped from the U. N.

9. AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 62, CLAUSE 3, TO LIMIT THE POWER OF THE U. N. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL TO PREPARE DRAFT CONVENTIONS

The Economic and Social Council should be prohibited from writing draft conventions that seek to define and control the economic, political, and social relationship between citizens of the same country or between citizens of a country and their own government.

(a) *The Human Rights Commission*

The present administration is to be commended for announcing that it will not sign the human rights covenants now being prepared by the Commission. However, this is only a temporary policy and certainly no substitute for the Bricker amendment.

The draft Covenant on Political and Civil Rights would, if adopted by the United States, destroy many of our most cherished freedoms. These covenants have been so well analyzed by many people that it is unnecessary to discuss them further. In March this year, the U. N. Human Rights Commission by an

overwhelming vote reaffirmed its previous action in refusing to recognize in the treaty the right to own property. We consider this a fundamental right. The consistent refusal of the Human Rights Commission to recognize the right to own property as a basic civil right proves how foolhardy it is to give any serious consideration to a universal bill of rights. We need the Bricker amendment, however, because some future administration may believe, like the last administration, that the American people should live under a bill of rights prepared by the Human Rights Commission.

How can any thoughtful American expect a satisfactory bill of rights to emerge from a commission, the majority of members of which represent countries which fail to accord a decent respect for such fundamental rights as freedom of speech and of the press?

(b) The U. N. Draft Covenant of Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights

The Morley article points out the very close similarity between this proposed treaty and the constitution of the Soviet Union. In addition, the former Chairman of the Human Rights Commission, Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon, noted during the end of his term of office that recent amendments to the covenant were inspired more by Communist teachings than by Western ideals.

(c) United Nations Convention on the international right of correction

This treaty has already been approved by the U. N. General Assembly and is open for signature. Although the United States has not signed this treaty, some future President may sign it and some future Senate may ratify it, with the result that we would be forced to establish in the United States a Ministry of Truth. (See editorial in Wall Street Journal for December 23, 1952, which accurately summarizes this treaty as "a mare's nest of propaganda and falsehood.") The treaty would obligate nations to issue corrections of "false and distorted" news dispatches no matter what its opinion concerning the facts in question. Under this treaty, any unkind reference in the American press about Russia would require the United States to disseminate Russia's propaganda denying the press report.

Even assuming that the United States will never sign this dangerous treaty, the treaty promises to do great harm to freedom of information. It establishes a dangerous precedent and will inevitably restrict freedom of information in the countries that do become parties to it. This is why this Economic and Social Council should be prohibited from writing treaties on such subjects as freedom of information.

(d) The U. N. Draft Convention on freedom of information

This is another dangerous treaty that would give legal sanction to suppression of freedom of information in the countries that become parties to it. Here again, it is humarital that the United States may never ratify this treaty. The United States delegate, Mr. Charles A. Sprague, who attended the U. N. conference working on his treaty, in a speech (Department of State Bulletin, November 17, 1952, p. 730) voiced this conclusion:

"To sum up, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the history of the last 5 years dictates its own conclusions. It has been shown that the writing of treaties on freedom of information is not the way to promote freedom of information, at least at this time. Our disagreements range over too wide a sphere and they are not growing smaller. We have crosscurrents of ideas and tides of opinion, which ebb and flow. We cannot tell where they will take us, except that it appears certain that if we continue our present course, we will skirt perilously close to rocks and shoals dangerous to liberty."

It is foolhardy to risk the loss of freedom any place in the world. That risk is unavoidable so long as the U. N. Economic and Social Council is permitted to prepare draft conventions on freedom of information and on other subjects that are primarily matters of domestic and local concern.

(e) The United Nations Draft Convention on uniform road signs and signals

Why should the American taxpayers defray any part of the cost required to establish global bureaucrats in an expensive hotel in Switzerland, where they can spend months preparing a treaty designed to make highway signs the same in Ethiopia and Saudi Arabia as they are in the United States?

(f) Proposals for economic aid and development

Not yet in treaty form, the Economic and Social Council and its subsidiary bodies are engaged in a vast amount of work which can only be summarized in a way. Its proposals are designed to extract the wealth of the most prosperous

nations (that's us) and siphon it off to nations less fortunate. All these proposals simply add up to a massive redistribution of the wealth on a global scale. Eventually, some of these proposals will find their way into draft conventions. They are, in essence, the international adaptation of the cardinal principle of Marxist philosophy, that is, taking from each nation according to its ability to pay and giving to each nation according to its need.

It is absolutely untrue, as so many internationalists have claimed, that the Soviet Union has always been outvoted in the United Nations. In 1952, the Economic Committee of the U. N. General Assembly passed a resolution endorsing the right of nationalization of property without mentioning the duty of compensation. On this resolution there were 31 yeas, 10 abstentions, and 1 negative vote. The one "No" vote was cast by the United States.

Even a cursory study of the various economic aid proposals kicking around in the U. N. proves that it would be suicidal for the United States to support any charter amendment giving the United Nations any legislative power or the power to tax. Yet, that is exactly what many unthinking humanitarians urge in the name of "strengthening the United Nations."

10. AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 68 TO LIMIT THE POWER OF UNESCO AND THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION

(a) *The International Labor Organization*

The International Labor Organization was in existence prior to the formation of the United Nations. It has semi-independent status. Therefore, it may be difficult for the United Nations to control the work of the ILO but the attempt should be made by amending article 68. If the ILO should refuse to accept any limitations on its authority, its connection should be severed. The International Labor Organization is busily engaged in drafting conventions dealing with such purely domestic matters as labor-management relations, social security, medical care, and maternity protection. See excerpts from statement of Mr. W. L. McGrath in Senator Bricker's speech of March 13, p. 2655 of Congressional Record.

(b) *UNESCO*

No specialized agency has created more adverse criticism for the U. N. than UNESCO. Although UNESCO is attempting to eradicate illiteracy and to facilitate the international flow of education and scientific publications, it has been engaged primarily in propagandizing the United States and beating the drums for an expansion of its power. The words "world government" are seldom used by UNESCO but all its propaganda is directed toward that end. In addition, it has embarked on such treacherous projects as writing an official history for the world, revision of textbooks, and in general telling people what to think about the United Nations and international cooperation. All of UNESCO propaganda has a heavy socialist flavor. Many of the more shocking publications are not issued officially by UNESCO, but spring from conferences and study space groups held under UNESCO auspices. The result is the same. The world is being taught that world government is the only answer to the problems of war or peace and that governments were instituted among men, not to secure the blessings of liberty, but to build apartment houses and public health clinics.

We need not pause to consider whether or not the UNESCO propaganda is good or bad, right or wrong. No government agency, national or international, should undertake to serve as a ministry of enlightenment. The truth in all matters, and particularly in international matters is something for individual determination. It is eminently proper for children in our public schools to be informed about the United Nations and its activities. That instruction should be presented in an objective manner. All the necessary information about the U. N. may be obtained from the U. N.'s Department of Public Information or from one of the many sales agencies in the United States. There is no need for any propaganda organ such as UNESCO.

11. AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 100, DUTIES OF SECRETARY-GENERAL

In view of past happenings, we would like to see this added to section 1 of article 100:

The Secretary General shall discharge:

(a) Any employee of the staff who seeks or receives instructions from any government or other authority external to the organization.

(b) Any employee of the staff who is employed within the state of which he is a citizen but who is ineligible for employment by the national government of that state. No discharge under the authority of this article shall result in any obligation to indemnify that employee, any rules and contractual arrangements to the contrary notwithstanding.

12. WE WISH TO RETAIN THE VETO POWER IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In this way and perhaps alone, can we be assured of the preservation of our constitutional freedoms under our republican form of government.

Miss Susette Baldwin is the next witness.

We are very happy to have you. You are a teacher in Parkland Junior High School. Will you carry on, please.

STATEMENT OF SUSETTE BALDWIN, TEACHER, PARKLAND JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Miss BALDWIN. Senator Wiley and members of the subcommittee, I want to thank you very sincerely for letting me bring six young members of my group down here to have a bit of participation in government. They are terribly interested in world affairs, and they appreciate awfully having had the chance to come.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Give the girls a hand.

Miss BALDWIN. Three girls and three boys; there are three boys there, too, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. The record will show that three boys are here, too.

BELIEF OF PARKLAND JUNIOR HIGH STUDENTS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

Miss BALDWIN. At this time when teen-agers are more or less making the front page with distressing publicity, we thought that perhaps a more optimistic note might be a pleasant one.

During the past 8 months a group of rather young members of this age bracket has been studying and watching with keen interest some of the activities of the United Nations. Naturally their conclusions are not particularly profound ones—unless you believe that sometimes the very young can actually lead us to think more wisely and to view with less prejudice some of the problems we face.

During their discussions, these children have studied and talked of the basic ideas and ideals of the United Nations and they have decided that, though there are humanly weak spots in the actual accomplishments of nations and people participating, that they believe thoroughly in the concept of a world freed from fear and working together so that all people, everywhere, can live in peace and understanding. They, of course, have never known anything except a time when the greatest danger lay in the fact that people might lose faith in one another and that false ideas might undermine democracy.

Studying the concepts of the U. N.'s Charter from a number of angles, these youngsters have a deep conviction that if we cooperate in a very positive way and learn from the time we are very young to be tolerant, to respect the rights and the traditions of all groups and to practice true democracy, peace can be attained.

Going back and comparing our own Bill of Rights—with its innumerable problems and its necessary compromises—for instance, the fear of the small States of the larger States, the financial problems,

the necessity for authority and adequate defense measures, et cetera—to the problems of the U. N. and its Bill of Human Rights, they found there many parallel cases. The children, after a great deal of discussion, unanimously agreed that they felt that the basic ideals of help in the field of healthful living, medical assistance, rehabilitation, control of atomic energy, et cetera, and to them, most important of all, understanding and friendship, would enable the United Nations to achieve its goal if the citizens, young and old, would have sufficient faith in their leaders and if each person would train himself to make democracy work and keep himself informed of the work of the U. N.

Whether or not this is the time to make drastic changes in the plans of the U. N. as they now stand, whether or not to do away with the veto (which can be good or bad), whether or not to exclude any nation, are problems too large for citizens who have attained only the ripe old age of 13 to be very sure about.

However, the consensus of opinion has been that while certain countries like Russia and its satellites were often a detriment to unity, that it was perhaps wiser to have control over their actions by way of the Security Council and the various agencies of the U. N., than to allow them to proceed with their campaigns unchecked, and that while the veto has stood in the way of certain issues it is still possible for the peace-loving big powers to use it to their advantage. The children decided for themselves that the present setup had much in its favor, and that a change might jeopardize the good now being done.

They stand ready to believe in and uphold the efforts of peace-loving nations to build friendship, understanding and world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you. I want to suggest that you are doing a grand job when you get these youngsters who tomorrow will be taking over the government, to become interested early in the problems that they have to face.

As I have said before, it is a pretty small world, and every nation is now literally in every other nation's backyard because of our inventions and ingenuity. Therefore, we have to look at things from the angle of today and the future, and in bringing these young Americans here, you are doing a grand job.

Thank you.

Miss BALDWIN. Thank you. [Applause.]

Senator COOPER. Mr. Chairman, may I move that the names of the six young people here be placed in the record at this point.

Miss BALDWIN. I will be very glad to do that.

Senator COOPER. She can furnish the names.

The CHAIRMAN. You can furnish the names to the reporter over here.

(The names referred to follow:)

Thomas Campbell, Dennis King, Donald DeWitt, Sandra Jett, Shirley Peck, and Jeannette Litsey, pupils of the seventh grade class of Parkland Junior High.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mrs. Lisle Baker, Jr. We understand you are working at the Courier-Journal, is that right?

STATEMENT OF MRS. LISLE BAKER, JR., LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mrs. BAKER. No, sir; my husband works there. I am——

The CHAIRMAN. You are positive about that, now?

Mrs. BAKER. Yes, sir. I am a housewife; I do not do anything at the Courier-Journal.

I should tell you what is not in here, and that I am a former member of the League of Women Voters. You may find my thinking parallels theirs, but I had not previously read Mrs. Vandenbosch's statement.

My name is Mrs. Lisle Baker, Jr.; my address is Longview Lane, Upper River Road, Louisville, Ky. I am a housewife with four children——

The CHAIRMAN. Good for you.

Mrs. BAKER (continuing). And a husband who is vice president of the Courier-Journal & Times Corp., and of WHAS, and who is presently serving as chairman of the Louisville Committee on Foreign Relations.

My husband regrets that he has not a statement prepared today for your committee.

I have a bachelor of arts degree from Wellesley College, where my special field was international relations. Eleven years ago I was chairman of international relations for the Louisville League of Women Voters, and conducted a study group which met every 2 weeks throughout the year. For the past 9 years I have been a member of a study group on international relations. I am now serving as international relations chairman for the Louisville Women's Club, and have been recently elected to the board of the international center.

REPRESENTING STUDY GROUP ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

I have been delegated to appear before this committee to represent the study group of which I have been a member for 9 years. It was organized at the time the United Nations Charter was being written in San Francisco, for the specific purpose of studying the charter; and it has continued meeting once a month throughout the years. Our members have taken turns writing papers on international affairs, studying whatever countries seem most important at the moment, and we have watched with interest the influence of the United Nations on dangerous international situations. We have only 30 members; that is why I took so long to explain what it was. It is not well known.

NOT FOR CHARTER CHANGES AT PRESENT TIME

We think the United Nations Charter is an excellent instrument and should not be changed at the present time. We feel that if it has not worked as well as the signatories hoped it would, it is because some nations have not observed the ideals they pledged themselves to promote; they have not carried out the spirit of the charter.

HOPE FOR EVENTUAL LIMITATION OF VETO

We do want to go on record as favoring a change in the wording of paragraph 3 of article 27, some time in the future. We do not think it is feasible to change it now. But we have noted with regret

the abuse of the veto, and we hope that eventually it will be used only on matters relating to peace and security, and not on "all" other matters except those of procedure. We particular regret that nations qualified for membership under article 4 have been refused admission to membership because the Security Council refused to recommend them.

EXPULSION PROVISION

We also note that according to article 6, a member who has persistently violated the principles contained in the charter cannot be expelled except upon recommendation of the Security Council; but we would not change this article, for we do not think it would be in the best interests of the world to expel one of the major powers.

A POLICE FORCE

There has been some talk of "putting teeth" in the powers of the United Nations to obtain a police force. We think articles 43 and 47 of the charter are entirely adequate. All that is needed is some action to obtain the agreements referred to in paragraph 2 of article 43.

May we therefore urge you to keep the charter in its present form.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank you. Your statement is a very good summary of the problems that will be faced in giving consideration to review of the charter.

That concludes the list for this morning.

Apparently there are no questions.

Senator COOPER. It was a good statement.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to say that you have witnessed today a forum where Americans gather, and they differ as wide as the poles, but that is the American way. There has been no abuse or misunderstanding between the representatives of your Government and the witnesses. There has been only a sense of reaching out trying to obtain the answers that we hope will be forthcoming. I want to compliment you all. You are not only very handsome as I look at you, but you have demonstrated judgment and reason, and we are glad that we are here.

We will be seeing you at 2:30 this afternoon. The meeting stands adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 12:35 p. m., the subcommittee recessed, to resume at 2:30 p. m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN. As most of you know, we held a meeting this morning, and this is the meeting for the afternoon.

At this point there will be inserted in the record statements by Miss Martha J. Brunson, president of the Kentucky division of the American Association of University Women, and Mr. La Rue Spiker.

(The documents referred to follow:)

LOUISVILLE, KY., June 6, 1954.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Care of Dr. K. P. Vinson, Louisville, Ky.

GENTLEMEN: The Americans for Democratic Action has suggested that its members express to you their opinions regarding the possible review and revision of the United Nations Charter. Since it will not be possible for some

of us to attend the open hearing in Louisville on Jun. 7, perhaps you will be willing to note individual expressions of opinion by letter.

An ordinary citizen cannot, of course, give expert opinion on the implications of certain highly technical aspects of the charter. However, all of us are qualified to hold strong opinions on the basic purpose and broad meaning of the charter.

First, working people like me want peace. We are the people who will suffer most if there is another world war. We do not believe that another war will solve the problems facing civilization today, except to eliminate the problems by eliminating civilization itself. Therefore, we want the world's problems solved otherwise than through force of arms.

Second, we regard the United Nations as the best means thus far developed for solving world problems; and we want a guaranty that it will be continued and strengthened, not weakened and turned into a gimmick for furthering power politics. There is grave danger that any attempt to revise the charter within the near future would be used as an attempt to sharpen the antagonisms among the major world powers, rather than to bring them to closer understanding.

Therefore, it appears to me that no conference to consider revision of the charter should be called. At present the major powers have accepted certain provisions of the charter, such as the veto. If a conference were called and the veto provision eliminated, some of the present participants would probably withdraw. If this happened, there would no longer be a United Nations; for the very principle of the charter is to provide one organization where disagreeing nations can come together to work out their differences. From a practical point of view, such coming together is impossible unless it includes all the major powers.

Let us instead put more effort into using the United Nations as it was intended to be used. Let us stop unilateral planning which sets up military power blocs of nations now participating in the United Nations. Military power no longer provides any hope through which mankind can reach its goals. Let us face the fact of Red China and support seating her in the United Nations. Whether we like it or not, she is a major world power and as such must be dealt with in any solution of problems. Individuals may be able to live and function without speaking to each other; nations cannot. Let us deal with the situation in Indochina through the United Nations—not through a continual jockeying for position which is losing us our friends and bringing us closer to holocaust. Let us put more honest and sincere effort into making a reality the human rights provisions of the charter, such as the development of backward areas for the benefit of the people living in those areas, the ratification of the Genocide Convention, the exchange of cultural and scientific accomplishments between nations.

Respectfully yours,

LA RUE SPIKER.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
KENTUCKY DIVISION,
Louisville, Ky.

*To the Members of the Special Foreign Relations Committee,
Senator Alexander Wiley, Chairman:*

Reflecting the association's consistent policy of supporting effective institutions for international cooperation, the Kentucky division of the American Association of University Women reaffirms its faith in the United Nations as the best means of preservation of the free world.

From the minutes of the international relations committee, May 15 and 16, 1954:

"No formal motion was adopted but there was general agreement that ideally any discussion of charter revision would assume that the present United Nations organization should be strengthened rather than a new international organization created, and that any changes which would contribute to the efficiency of operations of the U. N. would be regarded with favor, but we would not so regard a fundamental constitutional reconstruction. In keeping with this approach, the committee deferred any action on specific proposals until such proposals should

be formally introduced by experts in the U. N. headquarters staff, U. N. delegates, and the like."

Respectfully submitted.

MARTHA JANE BRUNSON,

President, Kentucky Division, American Association of University Women.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is anybody else on this list who wants to insert his statement in the record instead of being heard, he may do so.

The first witness this afternoon is Dr. George Brodschi of the International Center, Law Department, International Hall.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE BRODSCHI, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, INTERNATIONAL CENTER, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

Mr. BRODSCHI. I am George Brodschi, executive director of International Center, University of Louisville, and a member of the faculty of the University of Louisville.

This is a statement pertaining to the revision of the United Nations Charter.

The following statement pertaining to the revision of the United Nations Charter is submitted by the International Center, University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky., to a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations convened on June 7, 1954, at Louisville, Ky.

BACKGROUND OF INTERNATIONAL CENTER

The University of Louisville, International Center, is a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization concerned with the promotion of interest in international affairs among the citizens in the Louisville area.

The center represents 75 industries and commercial firms in this area which are engaged in international trade. The center contacts more than 15,000 people a year through various educational and social activities, directed toward better understanding of current international affairs.

In formulating our position on revision of the charter, the center has endeavored to analyze the activities of the U. N. during its 9 years of existence.

U. N. VICTORIES

While the U. N. is far from a perfect organization for safeguarding universal peace, at the present time it is the only organization the human family has, and even if it has not succeeded in stopping all aggressions since 1945, still we should give the organization that substantial measure of credit she deserves for those conflicts which have been resolved by virtue of her existence.

In the cold war between the free nations and the Communists, the free nations have won several major victories through the U. N. organization. Our victories include:

1. Withdrawal of the U. S. S. R. occupation armies from the north of Iran.
2. The Balkan Commission which stopped Communist infiltration from Bulgaria and Albania to Greece.
3. The common police action of free nations in Korea where Communist aggression was stopped.
4. Avoidance of hostilities between India and Pakistan.

Through the U. N. General Assembly, where the United States has only 1 vote and Russia unashamedly has 3, our spiritual leadership in the world is clearly demonstrated. In all issues we have overwhelming support from other member nations. These facts speak strongly in favor of our further participation in the U. N.

QUESTION OF CHARTER CHANGE

On the question of whether or not changes should be made in the charter next year, our members have expressed widely divergent views. Informal surveys which we have conducted have, for the most part, reflected apathetic attitudes and lack of interest. On the other hand, every year we celebrate U. N. Day on October 24 and have a very warm response in the community.

Two years ago we requested 60 civic and patriotic groups to donate American flags to be exchanged with the member countries of the U. N. for flags of the respective countries. The exchange was very successful and our community groups use the collection of U. N. flags on special occasions.

NO MAJOR CHANGES SHOULD BE PROPOSED NOW

We feel there is general recognition that the charter is not perfect and is in some respects very unrealistic. At the same time, we feel that recognition of current East-West friction dictates that no major changes in the organization should be proposed at this time and that a more intensive educational program should be inaugurated and conducted by the United States, to the end that when changes are proposed they will more certainly reflect the thinking of the American people as a whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Any questions, Senator Gillette?

Senator GILLETTE. Just one question, Mr. Chairman.

How do you suggest, Mr. Bronschi, that that last suggestion of yours could be implemented, so that we could inaugurate or develop a greater interest in this matter?

Mr. BRONSCHU. I feel that there is a great gap between our internal affairs and our external affairs because the American people, who are very intelligent and very capable, who made such a great country as the United States is, they run themselves this country, and if they do not run it at this time, run the international affairs, it is only because they do not have the necessary educational background for this.

I proposed last year at a meeting of the Department of State, that the Department of State make regional conferences and will go down to the grassroots of the American people, and explain to them the current issues.

For instance, I proposed that there be an Ohio Valley regional conference of the Department of State, and to invite a few statesmen to explain the current issues and the current programs as to the affairs.

I also suggested that they invite all leaders of the grassroots. I feel that there are many organizations like the Daughters of the American Revolution, like the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and others, and to which the country owes very much to these organizations. America was built by these organizations; and at the same time they

do not have the necessary information. For instance, only a few days ago I received a call from a patriotic organization, and they were very much worried about the flags. I explained to them that our one flag is the American flag, and nothing can substitute for it, but I do not know where they have all this information from or this misleading information; and even this morning, our best organizations have shown that they are not current with current issues, and if we want to have this success in our international affairs we should come back to the grassroots and analyze the problems and ask them for suggestions.

We offered a few days ago the United Nations Charter free to every citizen of Louisville. We had only nine requests—the United Nations Charter free.

I will refer to the statement made by Senator Wiley yesterday in his most splendid address at our commencement, and he compared the United States of America with a cathedral. I am a member of this cathedral, and I know that if all congregations of this cathedral will not work together and worship together, it will be just a building and not a living church.

Unless we inform the people, give them exactly the problems in a real democratic way, and then ask for their solutions, our foreign relations will be as they are now.

Senator GILLETTE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BRODSCHI. I wish to add, I understand fully the anxiety of Senator Gillette, because he feels that the United Nations Charter should be revised, and if we will lose the opportunity next year, it may be the losing of a tragic opportunity. But, on the other hand, I feel that it is not time now to revise the charter, so I think, and I would like that it be put on the record, that the committee for the revision of the charter should meet and should decide a term of postponement, say, for 5 years, and after 5 years meet again, and maybe with the Lord's help, we will have a new situation, and then we can make the United Nations Charter more realistic.

Senator GILLETTE. Thank you.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. No, thank you.

I would like to say that I have been acquainted with the work of Mr. Brodschi and his organization, and I know that he has done effective work.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Mrs. Clark Bailey, State chairman, national defense committee, Kentucky Society, DAR.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CLARK BAILEY, STATE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE, KENTUCKY SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mrs. BAILEY. I am Mrs. Clark Bailey, of Harlan, Ky., and I am just a housewife, but I am an old mountaineer and, as Senator Cooper could tell you, mountaineers are very strong in their convictions, and if mine are a little strong, just remember that I belonged to that organization, the one that the gentleman who spoke before me said helped to build

this country, and for that reason really we do have strong patriotic feelings about it.

The DAR in Kentucky has 60 chapters. We have 4,322 members, and we are dedicated to the task of supporting and protecting and defending our Constitution against all enemies. To us it is the greatest document that was ever written, and we love it.

The DAR of Kentucky, as well as of this Nation, would like to support the United Nations. We believe in the United Nations so long as it does not assume the role of policemen or of a legislative body. We hope that it will continue that way so that we can lend our full support.

Then, as the purpose of it in its organization, in the founding of the U. N., was to have a diplomatic meeting place where East-West differences could be ironed out, we hope that it will continue in that way and that we can throw our full support back of it.

We do want to do everything that we can to protect the security and the safety of this Nation.

CONCERN OVER DOMESTIC JURISDICTION

Now, this morning it was brought out that in article II, paragraph 7, there were dangers involved there, and I think that you said you inserted that into the record.

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

This has given us quite a bit of concern because we have felt that the United Nations should not have any control over our domestic affairs, but then in a Department of State bulletin written in 1950, referring to article II, paragraph 7, it says that:

There is no longer any difference between foreign and domestic affairs.

This statement gives us quite a bit of concern, because it at once does away with article II, paragraph 7, of the Constitution.

This is also why we were so very strongly in favor of the Bricker amendment, and if it was not the answer, for some amendment to keep treaties from superseding the law of our own land.

CONCERN OVER CONTROL OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Another thing that has given personal concern as well as concern to our organization is the control over the specialized agencies.

Now, the United Nations organization can recommend for the coordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies, but we feel that they should have—that is, if we lend our support and our money to these organizations, then there should be some control over the agencies, and the ones that I have listed here, to limit the power of the International Labor Organization—I think that one was discussed this morning, too, and UNESCO. They are two that have great power.

The International Labor Organization was organized back during the League of Nations, and it is a carryover, but it is now a member of the United Nations' specialized agencies.

While it is a semi-independent statute, it might not agree to more control over it, but if it did not want to agree to the controls, then it should be willing to withdraw from the United Nations, and we should be willing to not lend our support to it.

The conventions that are adopted within this organization—there have been more than a hundred of the conventions adopted; however, only six have been ratified by our Senators, and though some of the measures, if they were adopted, it automatically brings socialized medicine; it speaks of social security, that everyone should have the right for social security, but it makes no provision for who will pay for it. Therefore, the United States could automatically be paying social security to the whole world, and we feel that this would bankrupt us.

In the UNESCO, it is a specialized agency, and it is under the charter of the United Nations. It is responsible for the education, scientific, and cultural things, but that is more than meets the eye. It includes more than meets the eye. UNESCO has for its chief purpose being to propagandizing the United Nations, and while in the documents written, the UNESCO documents, they do not express so much the words "world government," they are selling it to the groups that they bring in, to go back and sell it to the people that they come in contact with.

They have, as one of the main provisions, taken the rewriting of American history books as a project, and in the American history books they do not want to emphasize the patriotic people who have founded our country, but they want us to be more world citizens. They want us to deal more in international affairs and to destroy the history of our own Nation.

Now, the World Health Organization—and I cut this clipping from a newspaper—it is very current, because at the meeting this May 1951 the members there voted \$350,000 special assessment to the United States. Our delegates representing us opposed this, but we were told that under the charter which we agreed to, that it was automatically our duty, if it was voted. Therefore, we were voted down, and the members representing our Government at this meeting said they would do their best to slip it through so as not to cause a row in our own Senate, because they felt that our men would oppose it, and that is the reason why we say to you there is danger in a treaty, and we feel that it should come to your attention, and that you should study and see that, after all, it is not just because we are old fogies, but because we are deeply patriotic and love our country, that these things do give us concern; and then, as was brought out, we do have our flag here today. I am really glad to see the American flag because that is the thing that all of us, as American citizens, love. It is our emblem of freedom and security, and in all of the plans that I have heard from church groups and others, I have not heard anyone say that we should rely on the Prince of Peace. If we are going to promote world peace, that it has to be through the calling in and the guidance of the Prince of Peace, which has helped to make us the greatest nation in all the world.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. You think that UNESCO and the ILO have legislative authority?

Mrs. BAILEY. Well, I think that things have been passed in—they may not have legislative authority but if they are ratified by our Senate they automatically become then the law.

The CHAIRMAN. Why, of course; that means two-thirds of the Senate have to approve it.

Mrs. BAILEY. It means two-thirds of the Senate present, and you remember this, that we have had some things passed up there with as few as six Senators present.

The CHAIRMAN. I have heard that argument, but I want to say to you that the argument has in it a great deal of fallaciousness for the simple reason that, in the first place, a treaty, when it comes out of the Foreign Relations Committee, ordinarily has had the unanimous approval of the member of that committee. The Senators all know about the treaty and now we have the rules that there must be a rollcall vote on it.

The only thing I want to make clear before this group is that a treaty has to be approved by the Senate of the United States, and the argument generally is that you cannot trust your Senators. Two-thirds of the Senate ought to be able to protect our national interests.

Now, I want to say to you, that the \$350,000 for the WHO has to be authorized and approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mrs. BAILEY. I know that that is true, but it was voted at their meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Now, we have other treaties that have to come back to the Congress of the United States for operating funds. Even the funds for the U. N. have to be raised by the same method.

You are earnest in your conviction, which you have a right to be, but there is another side to the matters you have raised.

Mrs. BAILEY. I would be glad to get the information, but I believe I have had it from both sides. I would like to get on the mailing list; I really do.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator?

Senator GILLETTE. I have nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. I would just like to say that with Mrs. Bailey being here, that means that there are at least two mountaineers in the room; I am the other one.

I know Mrs. Bailey. I know she feels very sincerely and strongly about this whole subject.

I would like to say also that I have felt that there is too much expansion of the work of some of these independent agencies. I think there is some basis for criticism not, I would say, upon the grounds which I think this witness has spoken of—the legal ground and the legal effect of their work—but I have felt that they have expanded so much that it has taken the emphasis away from the more important aspects of the work of the United Nations.

I would like to say, because there is great misunderstanding and disagreement about the work of these agencies, that many of them are intergovernmental which were established long before the United Nations was created, and that the United Nations, through one of its organizations, the Economic and Social Council has attempted to coordinate their work.

I would say also, as Senator Wiley has said, that even though the specialized agencies make recommendations, they have to be approved by the General Assembly, of which the United States is a member. If a recommendation ever reaches the form of a treaty, it has to go to the Senate of the United States and be approved before it can have

any effect at all. Whatever action the specialized agencies take has no effect upon the United States except perhaps this: If the representatives of the United States in those agencies take certain positions, a great many countries who do not understand our governmental system they take it for granted that the Government of the United States has in advance approved those positions.

I think that there ought to be a great deal more attention given to the positions our representatives take in those organizations; but I agree with Senator Wiley that I think this danger has been mistaken it for granted that the Government of the United States has, in advance, approved those positions.

The CHAIRMAN. Any treaty can be set aside by joint resolution of the House and Senate. In all the years of our Government only one treaty has been set aside, and that was done after the opening of the 19th century, when we set aside a treaty with France.

The question of our Government entering into foolish treaties has been overemphasized until fear and hysteria have been created throughout the land; that is the only reason I take the time to make that statement.

WORK OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

We are here not in the interests of world government; we are here in the interests of trying to find what your reaction is to the United Nations. If you want to do away with it, say so. If you have suggestions on how to amend it, say so; or if there is anything else you want to say in relation to the United Nations, we want to hear that in order that we can formulate our opinion on the facts, and make recommendations to the executive branch which will have to renegotiate the United Nations Charter, if it has to be renegotiated. Any charter changes will have to be approved by two-thirds of the Senate. (The prepared statement of Mrs. Bailey is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. CLARK BAILEY, STATE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL DEFENSE KENTUCKY SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

I represent 60 chapters, with 4,322 members. The work of the committee is to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States and the security of our constitutional Republic against all enemies.

It is our hope that the United States can continue as a member of the United Nations provided the role of a world policeman or a world legislator is not assumed by the U. N. For more than 2,000 years efforts to establish political peace leagues and alliances have been made. The primary reason for failure has been the attempt to change the political system of each member nation, resulting in a loss of national sovereignty. When the Constitution is no longer the supreme law of the land and we are no longer a group of sovereign States the one-worlders will have reached their objective—the destruction of the United States Government.

The primary function of the United Nations is to serve as a worldwide diplomatic meeting place for the discussion and settlement of East-West differences—a union of sovereign nations working together to promote international peace and security. If the committee's recommendations concerning revision of the U. N. Charter should be to lessen rather than to expand the powers of the United Nations, it will strengthen the U. N.'s chance for survival in the troubled world. On the other hand, if the committee should propose amendments to the charter which, under the guise of "strengthening the U. N.," would transform it from an organization of sovereign states into a limited or full-blown world government, it will encourage complete withdrawal from the United Nations.

Amendment of the domestic jurisdiction clause, article 2, paragraph 7: Article 2, paragraph 7, provides in part:

"Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State * * *"

Without the assurance of that protection, the U. N. Charter would not have been ratified by the Senate. When the charter was under consideration, article 2, paragraph 7, was used to allay all fears that the United Nations might assume some control over the purely domestic affairs of the United States and its citizens. We have not received the protection that article 2, paragraph 7, was intended to provide.

In 1950, the Department of State stripped article 2 (7) of all meaning when it announced in an official publication that "there is no longer any difference between foreign and domestic affairs." In addition, former Secretary of State Acheson in a speech made on September 18, 1952, boldly declared that the nations in joining the U. N. subjected themselves "to what amounts to an international legislative system" that "was to deal with the individual and the rights of the individual" (Department of State Bulletin, Oct. 6, 1952, p. 530).

While the Bricker amendment was under discussion, the U. N.'s treaty-making ambitions were soft pedaled for obvious reasons. However, the schemes to give the United Nations control over almost every phase of human existence have not been abandoned. We need the Bricker amendment to erect a constitutional and a congressional fence between the ambitions of the global bureaucrats and the inalienable rights of the American people. Unless that protection is provided, the United States will eventually withdraw from the United Nations.

Amendment of article 58 to strengthen United Nations control over its specialized agencies: Article 58 merely provides that the United Nations organization shall make recommendations for the coordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies. This article should be amended so as to give the organization control over the budget and the program of all the specialized agencies. Two specialized agencies, UNESCO and the International Labor Organization, are bringing great discredit to the U. N. itself. This is unfortunate because the United Nations organization actually has no power to curb those activities of UNESCO and the ILO which cause so great a resentment among the American people. Congress is asked to appropriate funds for this economic and technical aid, but the Congress cannot direct how the money shall be spent, nor can it demand any accounting. The least that should be done is to enable the United Nations organization to bring some order out of this chaos.

Amendment of article 68 to limit the power of UNESCO and the International Labor Organization:

(a) *The International Labor Organization*

The International Labor Organization originated with the League of Nations, continued in existence after the abandonment of the League, and is now an agency of the United Nations. It is therefore an international body having an official standing with governments the world over, including our own. The ILO has a governing body which constitutes a board of directors. It has a permanent office in Geneva, headed by a Director General and an ample staff, most of whom are sympathetic to socialistic ideas. They develop the documentary material regarding the agenda items presented to delegates at the conference.

ILO has a semi-independent status. Therefore, it may be difficult for the United Nations to control the work of it but the attempt should be made by amending article 68. If the ILO should refuse to accept any limitation on its authority, its connection with the United Nations should be severed. The International Labor Organization is busily engaged in drafting conventions dealing for the most part with essentially domestic matters. Over 100 ILO conventions have been made dealing with such purely domestic matters as labor-management relations, social security, medical care, and maternity protection. (See for example excerpts from the statement of Mr. W. L. McGrath in Senator Bricker's speech of March 13 on p. 2035 of the Congressional Record.)

(b) *UNESCO*

UNESCO is one of the specialized agencies of the U. N., created under the charter. It is responsible for education, science, and culture—but that includes more than meets the eye. UNESCO has been engaged primarily in propagandizing the United Nations and beating the drums for an expansion of its power. Although the words "world government" are seldom used by UNESCO, all of

its propaganda is directed toward that end. Two major goals are: forcing treaty adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and the revision and rewriting of every American textbook now in use—with first emphasis upon American history books.

In the Saturday Review, Norman Cousins stated in an editorial: "If UNESCO is attacked on the grounds that it is helping to prepare the world's peoples for world government, then it is an error to burst forth with apologetic statements and denials. Let us face it: the job of UNESCO is to help create and promote the elements of world citizenship. * * * And as it concerns world government, let us not be so timid that we will back away from the greatest cause and ideal of our time. * * * The important question for us to decide is not whether we want world government, but, rather, what kind of world government do we want? For world government is coming."

The objectives of UNESCO are made very plain in this amazing statement by Norman Cousins (July 19, 1952). It is altogether proper for children in our public schools to be informed about the United Nations and its activities. That instruction should be presented in an objective manner. There is no need for any propaganda organ such as UNESCO.

At a meeting of the World Health Organization in Geneva, May 1954, it was voted to assess the United States Government an additional \$350,000 over and above the amount Congress had authorized for the international agency. The United States delegation voted against this assessment, but we were outvoted by the delegates who were not concerned about United States constitutional questions. The United States ratified the WHO constitution in the proper treaty-making fashion back in 1948, and a careful reading of that approved constitution does, indeed, seem to suggest that the World Health Organization has the power to assess member nations. The World Health Organization has raised a little question favorable to the Bricker amendment.

Article 109 in the U. N. Charter provides for a charter reviewing and amending conference to be called in 1955. That year, 1955, can see the death of America as a free and independent nation, for with a paragraph strengthened here, and a clause added there, the United Nations Charter can become—and was designed to become—world government. We would remind you that citizenship in America is a wonderful possession. To most of us liberty is priceless. We have gloried in our freedom but some of us have forgotten the price with which it was purchased. We are aware of the dangers involved in communism but are sometimes unaware of the menace of internationalism which could lead the American people into world government by the back door.

The CHAIRMAN. The next witness is Mr. Sam Ezelle, secretary-treasurer, Kentucky State Federation of Labor.

(There was no response.)

The CHAIRMAN. He is not here.

All right. Rev. Alfred F. Horrigan, Bellarmine College, is that right, Louisville, Ky. Glad to see you, Father.

STATEMENT OF VERY REV. ALFRED F. HORRIGAN, PRESIDENT, BELLARMINE COLLEGE, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Reverend HERRIGAN. My name is Alfred Frederic Horrigan. I am a Catholic priest and the president of Bellarmine College, a college of arts and sciences conducted by the Catholic archdiocese of Louisville and located at 2000 Norris Place, in Louisville.

I appear here as a representative of the faculty of Bellarmine College. I also have been authorized to represent the faculties of the two Catholic colleges for women located in Louisville. These are Nazareth College, 851 South Fourth Street, and Ursuline College, 3105 Lexington Road.

I wish, in the first place, to express our satisfaction at this splendid application of democratic theory which finds a subcommittee of the United States Senate going out into the communities of the Nation to seek at firsthand the opinion of citizens concerning the proposed revision of the United Nations Charter.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF U. N.

Since the discussion concerned with the revision of this charter will necessarily concentrate upon its defects, one should not neglect to note, at least in passing, the genuine accomplishments of the United Nations and its allied agencies.

As Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said on January 18 of this year:

The United Nations as it is, is better than no United Nations at all.

May I remark, in passing, gentlemen, that since I know the subject will be discussed from many points of view and many backgrounds, and in view of the limitations of time, I have limited my sources rather exclusively to spokesmen for Catholic social thought.

We also wish to note here the statement of His Excellency the Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, that—

the United Nations, in spite of its imperfections . . . is, humanly speaking, the last best hope of international peace.

We record our full agreement with the statement of President Eisenhower on January 7, 1954, that—

the United Nations deserves our continued firm support.

SHOULD RECOGNIZE AS BASIC PRINCIPLE SOME LIMITATION OF SOVEREIGNTY

We propose for serious study this recommendation of the Catholic Association for International Peace:

There should be throughout the charter, underlying the structure and actions of the United Nations, recognition of the basic principle that no state is absolutely or unqualifiedly sovereign, that under the moral law the common good takes precedence over divisive nationalism.

Significantly relevant to this statement are the words of Pope Pius XII contained in his Christmas message of 1948:

The Catholic doctrine on the state and civil society has always been based on the principle that, in keeping with the will of God, the nations form together a community with a common aim and common duties. Even when the proclamation of this principle and its practical consequences gave rise to violent reactions, the church denied her assent to the erroneous concept of an absolutely autonomous sovereignty divested of all social obligations.

CHARTER REFORMS NECESSARY

It seems to us that until this basic principle of some limitation of sovereignty is recognized, it will be difficult to move on to two very specific and necessary reforms of the United Nations Charter. These are:

(1) To strengthen the International Court of Justice with compulsory jurisdictional powers. Ultimately, the willingness to accept compulsory arbitration will have to be introduced as a condition for membership.

(2) To find the means of correcting the basic weakness of the United Nations as constituted at present, that is, its lack of effective executive power to enforce majority decisions.

VETO POWER SHOULD BE MODIFIED

We believe that it is imperative that the Charter be amended to modify the veto power in the Security Council as was recommended by the Vandenberg resolution of 1948. This eliminates the veto on the admission of new members and on the pacific settlement of disputes.

Everyone will recall that the application for membership of some 14 nations up to this time has been successfully vetoed by the Soviet powers.

To the greatest extent possible, the United Nations should have universality of membership. However, we state our full approval of the following statement made by Secretary Dulles on January 18 of this year before, I believe, this very committee, and I quote:

Unfortunately, there are governments or rulers who do not respect the elemental decencies of international conduct, so that they can properly be brought into the organized family of nations. That is illustrated by the regime which now rules the China mainland.

That is the end of the quotation from Secretary Dulles.

SYSTEM OF "PERMANENT" COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

Serious consideration must be given to altering the system of "permanent" Council membership. At present, the permanent members are the major allies of World War II.

The defects in the present organization of the Security Council were clearly pointed out as far back as November 1945, by the Catholic bishops of the United States in their annual statement.

The bishops wrote then that the United Nations Charter—

does not provide for a sound, institutional organization of the international society. The Security Council provisions make it no more than a virtual alliance of the great powers for the maintenance of peace. These nations are given a status above the law.

U. N. SHOULD BE BASED ON RECOGNITION OF GOD AND THE MORAL LAW

Finally, it is our fervent hope that the United States will exercise its influence in every possible way to the end that the United Nations organization will finally be based upon a recognition of God and the moral law. Once more to quote the Catholic bishops of the United States in their 1944 statement:

An international institution, based on the recognition of an objective moral obligation and not on the binding force of covenant alone, is needed for the preservation of a just peace.

The fatal weakness of our present situation is dramatized as we witness the Secretary General, or any other employee of the United Nations, solemnly swearing an oath unrelated to any Creator, law-giver, or judge.

Our sincere prayers and best wishes will constantly accompany the representatives of our Nation as they endeavor to effect the changes in the United Nations Charter, upon which rest our hopes for a just and lasting peace.

That is the end of the statement, gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, father.

COMPULSORY JURISDICTION FOR INTERNATIONAL COURT

You suggest that the International Court be given compulsory jurisdiction? I think that is what you said.

Reverend HERRIGAN. That is correct, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you mean that the court should have jurisdiction over the political issues, too, like Korea, Palestine, and similar disputes, or simply juridical issues?

Reverend HERRIGAN. Primarily juridical issues, Senator, with the implication of the possibility being involved that we might move toward a situation where each nation, upon accepting or continuing membership, would be willing more and more to submit to compulsory international arbitration all conflicts which threaten the peace of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you made a very fine statement. You have given us several new suggestions. That is what we like.

Senator Gillette?

Senator GILLETTE. I have nothing to add, except my compliments for a fine presentation.

Reverend HERRIGAN. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. I do not like to take up much time, but you have introduced two unusual suggestions: First, that the International Court should have compulsory jurisdiction and, second, that the membership of the Security Council should be changed. That is supposed to do away with the provision that five great powers should have the powers that they have.

Reverend HERRIGAN. That is correct, Senator.

PROBLEM OF ENFORCEMENT

Senator COOPER. Well, now, that implies, of course, that you expect enforcement of some opinion that the International Court would render, and that you expect a better enforcement of the decisions of the Security Council.

I would like to ask your opinion of the whole great problem of international organization enforcement. What do you propose about enforcement? Doesn't it come back to the real issue of the willingness of the people, of the members, to follow its recommendations?

Reverend HERRIGAN. Ultimately, I think, Senator, there is no question that the ultimate fate, the ultimate improvement of the United Nations, its charter and method of operation, depend upon the will, the attitude of the people of the nations, the willingness to accept the concept toward which the people have moved for many centuries. The belief that there can be enforcement by mere agreements, international politics or high agreements, I think, is only wishful thinking. Until there is the recognition, first of all, of a genuine juridical basis of international law, of moral obligation, which is something a great deal more than a mere treaty obligation—I say, until we have that as the basis, I agree it certainly would be extremely difficult.

We would find the situation such as we have with the League of Nations, that any nation would immediately withdraw as soon as it was confronted with an unpleasant or disagreeable issue and, therefore, I think our job which, I presume from the obvious and immediate

remarks being made by everybody, that our long-range and serious job is that of education, to create the will, to create the understanding, the atmosphere in our own Nation and other nations which sees the concept of a family of nations, united and working for the common good, which is not within the power of a single nation working along those lines by itself.

The CHAIRMAN. In the long run, then, Father, it is a question of the moral responsibility of the nations.

Now, in this country we have moral responsibility between individuals, but if they do not live up to it, we have courts and police power to enforce it, and you do not contemplate some international police power, as I understand from your statement?

Reverend HERRIGAN. The statement did not make a specific reference to that particular aspect of the problem, Senator. I can see no reason why we should too hastily abandon at least the long-range hope that the prospect of a time would come that at least a limited police power could be placed at the disposal of the United Nations which would be available for use, at least within limited circumstances.

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to get your judgment on the significance of regional agreements such as NATO and the proposed pact for the Pacific in today's world picture. What do you think of having those arrangements, considering the present-day immorality among nations?

Reverend HERRIGAN. I think there is no question at all, Senator, that the United Nations Charter provides very happily for the legitimate operation of such regional security plans within the broader framework of the United Nations.

I think in view of the present situation there is no doubt about the imperative necessity of such arrangements, such as NATO, for example, and I think it may be necessary to continue with that kind of arrangement for many years to come.

I think that we would have to, also, at the same time face the fact that it does not offer any ultimate basis of security, because pushed to its less pleasant, but nevertheless logical conclusion, it means that we are going to have a series of regional security agencies which are not more than the old-line alliances or ententes lined up against one another, as we have had down through the weary pattern of past wars and past centuries, so I think it has the merit of a value, but merely as a standby measure.

I think a heavy and too long-range reliance upon it would be doomed to failure in terms of the things we are discussing here, which is a lasting and just universal world peace.

EFFECT OF HYDROGEN BOMB

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to give us your own opinion as to the effect upon the nations of the world of the creation of the hydrogen bomb? Do you think the existence of the bomb will serve to bring the nations into some organization like the U. N. where they will

agree to, and morally feel the responsibility to follow, compulsory arbitration?

Reverend HERRIGAN. I devoutly hope that would be the case Senator, and I think that it will be on, perhaps, adding one condition, that the people of our own Nation particularly, since we are concerned with a responsibility for them, and of the world at large, shall be given the most complete and accurate information possible on this whole subject of atomic power and of the development of the atomic and the hydrogen bomb.

I think, perhaps, there is some reason to think that security regulations have kept from us, perhaps, a degree more of information than might be absolutely necessary in the cause of national security.

The CHAIRMAN. Any further questions?

MORAL CONCEPTS

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Father one question. I am quoting, Father; you say:

As the American Catholics bishops stated in November 1944, "an international institution, based on the recognition of an objective moral obligation and not on the binding force of covenant alone, is needed for the preservation of a just peace."

It seems to me that while that is a consummation devoutly to be wished, that if we are building a house to protect us from the weather, we have to build it with the materials that we have available. And in building this world coalition for the elimination of war, we must recognize the fact, must we not, that we are dealing with hundreds of millions of people who do not have the Christian moral concept that you and I hold. In forming a coalition, if we wait until we have converted them to our way of thinking and acceptance of our Christian precepts we are not going to get very far. Isn't it true, Father, that we should proceed with the covenant—with the people who have their own view which is not ours?

Reverend HERRIGAN. Yes. I would make this remark, if I might, Senator: That I would again repeat my agreement with and acceptance of the statement of Secretary Dulles that a United Nations such as we have is better than no United Nations at all, and I agree, therefore, that we have to do what can be done under the circumstances, and if this is the best agreement we can get, let us take it and make the most of it.

However, I would say this: That I think the United Nations, and the distinguished gentlemen such as yourselves, who speak before the world for the United States in relation to such problems, I think that we should continue to exercise a moral leadership and an influence in the direction of ultimately seeking these particular goals.

I think, for example, a review of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the San Francisco conference is somewhat discouraging on the fact that it was not more plain—it was not more explicit—in the statement and in the activities of our representatives, that that was the real goal, the real ultimate thing to be desired, toward which we were working.

I think not only among Christian nations but among other nations, especially the East, with their deep religious even though non-Chris-

tian background and traditions, there is a real respect and a real grasp of basic moral principles, which is wider, historically and philosophically speaking, than is Christianity itself.

I think there is a tremendous moral resource that can be mobilized and at least slowly moved on toward the fulfillment, at least partially, of this higher goal toward which we seek to achieve.

I think it is unfortunate, perhaps, that thinking since at this time we cannot have everything we want, we are willing to pass it over with silence, and we do not proceed; and one-third of the people today who are not yet clearly in either the Iron Curtain camp or the free world camp, I think, are going to be influenced very largely by what they see of the resources of moral idealism and moral principles which are there, at least, for the hoped-for future use. So while we cannot do everything, I think we can do something more than merely settling for what can be done in terms of mere legislative agreements.

Senator GILLETTE. Thank you, sir.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Father.

Senator COOPER. May I ask one other question?

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE UNITED STATES

The suggestion is made at times that the United States should withdraw from the United Nations. There are many reasons adduced in favor of that argument.

I would like to ask you this: In the United States we hold ourselves, and truly so, as a nation with high standards of living, and we hold ourselves out as a great Christian nation, which I think we are.

Do you think it is a Christian attitude then that this great Nation, which has more material things than any other nation, and which is a Christian Nation, should say, in effect, to the rest of the world, that "We are not our brother's keeper; we will enjoy these things and we will not be concerned about the rest of the world; we will just stay and hold what we have?"

Reverend HERRIGAN. I think such an attitude, Senator, would be morally indefensible on every possible ground. Politically, I think it would be an irreparable blunder. I think any sound philosophy of life, and especially from a distinctively Christian point of view, the resources and materials and the fruits of this earth belong to the human race as a family.

The human race is divided into nations and races, but ultimately it constitutes one human family, and the riches and resources of the earth were made by the Creator for the benefit and support of the whole people. It is the concept of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God which is, literally, I would say, one single family. Therefore, we, the richest nation on the face of the earth, not only have an opportunity to dispense charity, but I think we have an obligation of the strictest kind of justice to share with the other underprivileged nations of the earth our economic and material resources; that we are violating the most elementary principles of justice, especially looked at in terms of Christian ideals, to contentedly say that so long as our standard of living is going to be maintained that we have no concern about what is happening with the so-called backward nations.

I would say flatly I would think we would be obligated to reduce notably our own standard of living, if that was the only way we could bring the essentials of comfort and decency to the other nations of the world.

Does that answer your question, Senator?

Senator COOPER. That answers my question.

The CHAIRMAN. Any other questions?

Thank you, Father.

Reverend HERRIGAN. Thank you, Senator. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. William Verity, foreign relations commission of the national organization of the American Legion.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM VERITY, FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. VERITY. Mr. Chairman, I am William Verity, assistant to the manager of the Ashland division of the Armco Steel Corp., in Ashland, Ky.

I am here representing the foreign relations committee of the American Legion.

I have presented to you a statement of some length and do not intend to read it today unless it is your desire that I do so.

The reason that I have presented this statement of such length is that I understand from our national office in Washington that another member of our commission appeared before your group recently in Greensboro, N. C., and that it was the feeling that it would be better if the American Legion could present some historical background on how the Legion has felt about charter revision for the past 8 years. So, for that reason, having been a member of the commission for the past 8 years, I have prepared for your committee the feelings of the American Legion over the past 8 years as to charter revision, and I would like to leave that with you, and then tell you what our present feeling is, very briefly.

In the prepared statement on page 4 it mentions a document that the American Legion published in 1948 which is called "Twice Is Too Often." It is at the very top of page 4 that I make that mention of this document in the statement. I only have one copy of "Twice Is Too Often," and I have brought it down to leave with you, sir, and I will present it after I have finished this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be received and filed.

Mr. VERITY. The American Legion Foreign Relations Commission had their last meeting in Washington, D. C., last month. We were very fortunate in having Chairman Wiley as our luncheon speaker, and he gave us an up-to-date résumé, I should say, of world conditions, international affairs.

Therefore, I believe that I should tell you only today what the Legion's thinking was as a result of this meeting in Washington, which thinking was confirmed by the national executive committee of the Legion at Indianapolis several weeks ago.

AMERICAN LEGION'S FAITH IN U. N. AND REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The American Legion basically has faith in the United Nations. We look upon the United Nations as our best hope for preventing further worldwide conflicts.

We believe that collective regional security arrangements, as provided by article 51 of the United Nations Charter are our best hope at this time of stopping the further advance of worldwide communism.

We approve of NATO; we are hopeful that Secretary Dulles can develop a similar Far Eastern pact.

OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

The American Legion is opposed to world federation or world government. The American Legion does believe that the United Nations can be strengthened so that it can become an effective instrument for the prevention of aggression.

ELIMINATION OF VETO IN MATTERS OF AGGRESSION

We believe that consideration should be given to the revision of the charter which would provide for these three things, and keep in mind that we are primarily interested in the United Nations as an instrument for stopping aggression. First, we would like to see elimination of the veto in matters of aggression and preparation for aggression, and in our statement we have defined aggression and preparation for aggression.

The CHAIRMAN. You mean limitation, not elimination.

Mr. VERITY. We would like to do away with the veto in matters—that would be limitation, sir.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF SCIENTIFIC WEAPONS

Secondly, we would like to see international control of scientific weapons such as the atomic and hydrogen bomb, with an enforceable inspection set up. In other words, we have approved all along the Baruch proposal of 1946 in which he asked for international control of scientific weapons, with an enforceable inspection set up.

ESTABLISHMENT OF U. N. POLICE FORCE

And, thirdly, we would like to see all of this enforced through a United Nations police authority.

We have agreed for several years with a congressional resolution which was, I believe, offered in 1950 as Senate Concurrent Resolution 104, and the House Concurrent Resolution 253 to 271, which was offered by Senator Sparkman and sponsored by Hon. Guy Gillette, and Hon. John Bricker, of Ohio, which was a congressional resolution for the establishment of a United Nations police force authority under a U. N. police authority.

Basically, this resolution asked for an international contingent made up of mercenaries, so to speak, from the smaller nations, who would be an active force, and they would be supplanted in time of need by national contingents.

It is our feeling that Korea could, perhaps, have been stopped had there been such an active international police force at that time.

That basically, sir, is the position of the American Legion at this time.

Our standing commission is studying all proposals that we can find concerning charter revision, and it is our hope that at the national convention to be held in Washington in August that the American Legion will have further to say about charter revision at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir. This whole statement will be received and filed.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Verity is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM VERITY OF ASHLAND, KY., MEMBER OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION SINCE 1910, ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The subject of the statement concerns the American Legion's past and present views concerning revision of the Charter of the United Nations.

The American Legion has been a firm supporter of the United Nations organization since its inception in 1945.

The American Legion expected much from the U. N. It was generally felt that from a veteran's point of view, the U. N. was conceived as an organized international group whose main purpose was to prevent another world conflict.

Early in 1946, because of Russia's aggressive attitude, and because of the U. N.'s obvious weaknesses in matters of preventing aggression, it was apparent that the U. N. as presently constituted was not the answer to the prayers of veterans. Another world conflict was possible, and almost probable, and the U. N. was powerless to stop it.

Throughout the Nation American Legion posts became worried, apprehensive and anxious to do everything possible to strengthen the U. N. into the strong organization that most veterans had hoped and expected the U. N. to be.

One post in particular took an active interest in the U. N., its weaknesses, and its possibilities as an international organization capable of preventing aggression. This post, 218 of Middletown, Ohio, studied the alternatives of what could be done to avoid world war III—in time.

Three alternatives were reached:

1. Destroy Russia and its insidious philosophy of communism and the police state by bombing the focal points of government and industry.

2. Appeasing the Soviets and the Kremlin in the hopes of coming to a negotiated settlement concerning further aggression and infiltration.

3. Strengthening the United Nations into an effective agency capable of preventing aggression, thereby eliminating the probability of world war III.

In May of 1946, this local American Legion post chose alternative 3. In addition, this post adopted certain specific proposals aimed at bringing about a U. N. organization capable of carrying out their objectives. After considerable study, the following resolution was adopted in June of 1946. The resolution recommended revision of the charter to allow for

(a) Limitation of the use of the veto in matters of aggression or preparation for aggression.

(b) Limitation of world arms production through the establishment of arms quotas guaranteed through a system of positive international inspection—and the adoption of the United States proposals for international control of atomic energy.

(c) Establishment of an effective tyranny-proof international police force composed of an independent active force under the direction of the Security Council and a reserve force of national contingents.

The Middletown American Legion Post resolution was adopted in August by the American Legion Department of Ohio.

At the national convention of the American Legion in San Francisco in October of 1946, the Legion went on record as advocating the strengthening of the U. N. for the sole purpose of making it an effective agency to keep the peace and to prevent aggression. The Middletown post plan was passed on to the American Legion Standing Commission on Foreign Relations for further study.

This commission approved the Middletown post plan in November of 1946, and in May of 1947, the plan was officially approved by the national executive committee of the Legion.

This American Legion plan was approved by the American Legion at its national convention in New York City in 1947. In every year since that time the American Legion at its annual national convention has confirmed and reapproved this original plan for strengthening the U. N. through charter revision.

In 1948, the American Legion at its Miami convention said:

"The American Legion was among the earliest to recognize the deliberate purpose of the U. S. S. R. to sabotage the United Nations and thus weaken it as an instrument for world peace and justice. Therefore, far from abandoning it, we promptly advocated that it be strengthened, especially against the misuse of the veto. The value of the United Nations as a medium for the expression of world public opinion has recently been demonstrated by its hearings on the Berlin crisis. To make it fully effective, we urge that it be strengthened by charter amendments in three principal ways:

"First, by the removal of the veto in all matters of aggression or preparation for aggression, and the strengthening of the International Court of Justice by giving it appropriate jurisdiction over individuals and nations in matters pertaining to aggression.

"Second, by the limitation of world arms production and the establishment of arms quotas guaranteed by effective international inspection, also the adoption of the United States formula for control of atomic energy.

"Third, by the creation of an adequate, active, independent world police force under the control of a vitalized Security Council, together with a reserve force of national contingents."

As a result of the stand taken at Miami, the Legion embarked on a program to sell its program for strengthening the U. N. to the American public. Many organizations were approached. Many agreed with the Legion's plan. One of these distinguished groups was the Ohio State Bar Association. This group passed a resolution which was printed in the Ohio Law Reporter of May 31, 1948. This resolution in full follows:

[From Ohio Law Reporter, May 31, 1948]

"UNITED NATIONS REFORM

"A resolution recommended by the committee on international relations and reform of the United Nations, was unanimously approved by the Ohio State Bar Association at its recent meeting in Toledo. The text is as follows:

"Whereas we conceive it to be the duty of all members of the legal profession and of all organizations of lawyers to urge and support the settlement of international disputes by law, instead of by force or war, and to assist in every manner possible of making effective a world organization therefor; and

"Whereas the Ohio State Bar Association endorses the high ideals, principles and purposes of the United Nations as expressed in its charter; and

"Whereas it is the desire of this association that the said charter and the organizations therein created be strengthened to the end that enduring peace and security be brought to all the peoples of the world: It is, therefore,

"Resolved, That the Ohio State Bar Association recommend to the President and the Congress of the United States that they immediately urge that the organs established in the charter of the United Nations Organization be utilized to the utmost; that in particular, the competence of the International Court of Justice, one of the principal organs of the United Nations, be invoked for advisory opinions, pursuant to the statute of the Court; that the Court be asked to define the terms "threats to the peace," "aggression," and "breaches of the peace," all of which terms are used in the charter; that particular states of fact which may appear to the Government of the United States to fall within these terms, or any of them, be submitted to the Court through the General Assembly for advisory opinion as to whether they do, in fact, constitute threats to the peace, aggression or breaches of the peace, or preparation for aggression; that the United States thus demonstrate to the world its devotion to the rule of law, its acceptance of the supremacy of courts of justice, and its willingness to abide by judicial decision; and it is further

"Resolved, That the Ohio State Bar Association recommend to the President and the Congress of the United States that the United Nations Organization be strengthened by initiating the adoption of three amendments to the United Nations Charter, as follows:

"First amendment: Reorganization of the United Nations Security Council and the International Court of Justice, with a more effective representation of the nations, to provide a rule of world law to prevent war, enforceable against nations and peoples. Also, to provide for the abolishment of the veto power in all matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression only, while retaining it elsewhere.

"Second amendment: Delegation to the Security Council of adequate powers to suppress aggression and prevent preparation for aggression.

"This could be accomplished by:

"(a) Establishing an atomic development authority responsible to the reorganized Security Council for the rigid control of atomic energy and weapons with proper safeguards. The same or a similar authority to have like responsibility as to biological, chemical, and other means of mass destruction.

"(b) In the case of other heavy armament, such as warplanes, warships, rockets, and heavy artillery, the Security Council to be empowered and directed to limit the total quantity to be produced in the world annually, and allot to each nation an individual production quota, which it may not exceed. In event of actual invasion, the invaded state may exceed its quota and take all other steps to resist.

"(c) To delegate to the Security Council the power and responsibility of enforcing all the provisions of these amendments. The Security Council to maintain staffs of inspectors and establish branches of the Atomic Development Authority throughout the world. The inspectors shall have full access to all sources of raw material, plants and research centers within the scope of their authority, and to full information as to any substantial concentration or training of armed forces. Refusal by the government of a member state to submit to inspection or to recognize the authority of the Security Council and World Court shall constitute an act of preparation for aggression.

"Third amendment: Establishment of a strong World police force organized and equipped to support impartially and effectively the decisions of the Security Council.

"This could be provided through:

"(a) The world police force to consist of one active international contingent, and five national contingents ready to operate as reserves whenever needed.

"(b) The Security Council to establish and maintain under its direct control the active international contingent, composed of volunteers from the smaller member states only; this to constitute a professional army, highly paid, highly trained and disciplined. They shall owe their allegiance to the Security Council only, and shall be equipped with heavy weapons produced as the Security Council may order.

"(c) The Security Council to cause the international contingent to move against any state found guilty by the World Court of preparation for aggression. In event of actual aggression, the international contingent shall move immediately to resist the aggressor. The international contingent may be used as troops of occupation.

"(d) The national contingents to consist of the national armed forces of the five major powers (United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, and China), and shall be equipped with the heavy weapons allotted to them in their respective quotas."

In this same year the American Legion published their full plan for strengthening the United Nations in a booklet entitled "Twice Is Too Often." Because I only have one copy of this booklet I am offering it to the chairman as an exhibit. However, the American Legion plan as taken from "Twice Is Too Often" is quoted:

"Our study has convinced us that this plan possesses real merit and should constitute a long step forward on the road to international peace if adopted by the United Nations Organization. We cannot forecast how other nations will receive it, nor do we regard it as perfect or a cure-all; but, in our judgment, it is the best plan yet evolved and is so essentially reasonable that other nations would be bound to give it respectful attention and find it difficult, in good faith, to reject it. Nor do we assert that this or any other plan in itself can assure permanent peace. Nothing but eternal vigilance and constant effort on the part of every citizen can do that. As we who have worn the uniform so well know, if agreements are not lived up to, it is only a nation's constant readiness to protect its own boundaries and liberties which can save it from the ravages of war. What your committee does assert is that the American Legion, through furthering this plan, will be pointing the way in a constructive move to preserve that peace for which the men and women of World War II have just sacrificed so much.

"The resolution adopted stated:

"Resolved, That the national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., November 21, 22, and 23, 1946, urgently recommends the immediate strengthening of the United Nations Organization by the adoption of three amendments to the United Nations Charter to provide for:

"1. Reorganization of the United Nations Security Council and the World Court with a more effective representation of the nations, and a final decision by majority vote in all matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression. Also the abolishment of the veto power in all matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression only, while retaining it elsewhere. Suggested details would include:

"(a) To reorganize the Security Council to consist of 10 members, 2 each from the United States, Britain and Russia; 1 each from France and China; and 2 selected collectively by the remaining member states.

"(b) To abolish the present veto right in cases of aggression or preparation for aggression. In all such cases, decisions of the Security Council shall be made by a majority of 6 out of 10. In other matters, the present veto right of the five major powers to be retained.

"(c) To define in the United Nations Charter aggression and preparation for aggression. Aggression, or aggressive war, shall include an attack with weapons of violence by the government of a sovereign state, or by its citizens with its acquiescence, against the territory or citizens of another sovereign state. Preparation for aggression shall include production of weapons beyond previously agreed quotas, or refusal to submit to authorized inspection, or the massing of excessive bodies of troops at another nation's border.

"(d) To reorganize the International Court of Justice or World Court, with power to interpret the revised U. N. Charter and to determine when preparation for aggression exists. Its composition shall be similar to that of the reorganized Security Council, except that its members will serve for life or for a substantial term. Its decisions shall be by majority vote and shall, within the scope of its authority, be binding upon governments, corporations, and individuals.

"2. Delegation to the Security Council of adequate powers to suppress aggression and prevent preparation for aggression. Suggested details would include:

"(a) To establish an Atomic Development Authority responsible to the reorganized Security Council for the rigid control of atomic weapons with proper safeguards. The same or a similar authority to have like responsibility as to biological, chemical, and other means of mass destruction existing or hereafter developed, with like safeguards.

"(b) In the case of other heavy armament, such as warplanes, warships, rockets, and heavy artillery, the Security Council to be empowered and directed to limit the total quantity to be produced in the world annually, and to allot to each of the five major powers an individual production quota, which it may not exceed, and to allot to the remaining member states a collective production quota which shall be produced within their territories solely by a nonprofit Armament Authority to be operated under the Security Council; these production quotas preferably to be specified in the United Nations Charter after they have been arrived at by previous agreement. Such production quotas might be: United States, Britain, and Russia, 20 percent each; France and China, 10 percent each; the smaller member states through the Armament Authority, a collective quota of 20 percent. In event of actual invasion, the invaded state may exceed its quota and take all other steps to resist.

"(c) To delegate to the Security Council the power and responsibility of enforcing all the provisions of these amendments. The Security Council to maintain staffs of inspectors and establish branches of the Atomic Development Authority throughout the world. The inspectors shall have full access to all sources of raw material, plants and research centers within the scope of their authority, and to full information as to any substantial concentration or training of armed forces. Refusal by the government of a member state to submit to inspection or to recognize the authority of the Security Council and World Court shall constitute an act of preparation for aggression.

"(d) Effective provisions which this committee does not attempt to elaborate, shall be considered and made effective as to nonmember states to the end that they may acquire no advantage by nonmembership.

"3. Establishment of a strong world police force organized and equipped to support impartially and effectively the powers of the Security Council. Suggested details would include:

"(a) The world police force to consist of 1 active international contingent, and 5 national contingents ready to operate as reserves whenever needed.

"(b) The Security Council shall establish and maintain under its direct control the active international contingent, composed of volunteers from the smaller member states only, recruited in national units; this to constitute a professional army, highly paid and highly trained and disciplined. They shall owe their

allegiance to the Security Council only, and shall be equipped with the collective heavy weapons produced by the Armament Authority in the smaller member-states, namely, 20 percent of the world's production, or equal to that assigned to the United States, Britain, or Russia, respectively.

"(c) The Security Council shall cause the international contingent to move against any state found guilty by the World Court of preparation for aggression. In event of actual aggression the international contingent shall move immediately to resist the aggressor. The international contingent may be stationed temporarily in Germany or any other occupied enemy territory as troops of occupation.

"(d) The national contingents shall consist of the national armed forces of the five major powers and shall be equipped with the heavy weapons allotted to them in their respective quotas. These shall help and reinforce the international contingent whenever needed, and such need shall be determined by majority vote of the Security Council. In case the national contingents shall not suffice to repel the aggression, further national contingents may be called out but only with the consent of their respective governments.

"Further resolved, That we recommend to the President and the Congress that the United States shall initiate the adoption of the foregoing plan; provided, however, that until such time as the above measures, or similar ones, go into effect, the Armed Forces of the United States and its weapons of every nature, shall be maintained at wholly adequate levels."

In 1949, the American Legion endorsed the principle of NATO: The Legion said at its national convention resolution on foreign relations at Philadelphia in August of 1949:

"Realizing that we must not neglect to properly protect the areas that have received our economic aid, the American Legion in May of this year said, 'Because of the misuse of the veto in the United Nations, the peace-loving countries of the North Atlantic area have been forced to take action to guarantee their mutual self-defense * * * and have joined together in a regional defense pact in accordance with the provisions of article 51 of the U. N. Charter. We wholeheartedly approve the North Atlantic Pact and all of its ramifications.'

"We are convinced that this pact, fully implemented, will help prevent further aggression in Western Europe by the Soviets. A realistic and adequate program of military assistance to pact countries will provide both an assurance of aid, and the means to resist. But, the United States, bound to the principle of self-help and mutual aid, must encourage the development of a defensive plan within the framework of the pact which will make clear to all, that pact participants share, to the utmost ability of each, the responsibility of resisting aggression in the North Atlantic area.

"We urge the pact countries to help in the strengthening of the United Nations Charter so that eventually it will be the United Nations and not the North Atlantic countries that will police world aggressors."

In that same report the American Legion urged a regional pact under article 51 of the charter which called for a mutual defense pact for the Pacific area. The purpose of the pact was identical to the proposition now being carried forward by the Honorable John Foster Dulles, our very effective Secretary of State. The Legion's statement was as follows:

"We particularly urge our Government to lend its aid in forming a regional pact, under article 51 of the United Nations Charter, composed of those freedom loving countries of the Pacific and Far Eastern area who, through self-help and mutual aid, desire to guarantee their mutual defense and to preserve individual liberties."

In May of 1950, the American Legion's position on U. N., as resolved by the national executive committee, was:

"We retain our faith in the United Nations. We believe that it can be made an effective world authority which can prevent aggression if the charter is amended immediately as suggested by the American Legion in November of 1946—to accomplish the following:

"1. Removal of the veto power in the two specific instances of matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression.

"2. The adoption of the United States proposals for the international control of atomic energy and the establishment of arms quotas, both to be guaranteed through a system of positive international inspection.

"3. Establishment of an effective tyranny-proof international police force. This force would consist of two parts, an independent active force to be under the direct control of the Security Council and a reserve force made up of the

national contingents of the major powers capable of backing up the active forces when necessary. The result would be that the United Nations, through an effective police force, could enforce its decisions, prevent aggression and the preparation of aggression, and so maintain the peace.

"We believe that the American Legion plan for strengthening the United Nations provides the essential basic requirements of, and the first steps toward, true worldwide enforcement of law and order, which is the immediate necessity.

"The American Legion is opposed to any form of world federation or world government, at this time.

"In 1948, the American Legion recommended a mutual self-defense pact composed of the nations of the North Atlantic area. Our suggestion was made fully a year before the North Atlantic Pact was approved by Congress.

"As a result of the North Atlantic Pact the nations of Western Europe, Canada, and the United States are militarily stronger than at any time since World War II. Arms and essential materials are now flowing and must continue to flow to out allies in this area so that the North Atlantic Pact countries will have the necessary equipment and trained troops to make a formidable stand against any aggressor.

"We now urge the countries of the North Atlantic Pact to join forces within the United Nations to insist on the amendment of the United Nations Charter to accomplish the objectives of the American Legion plan as stated above. In this way the democratic millions of the West would thereby declare to the world their intention of making the United Nations an effective authority for peace."

In 1951, 1952, and 1953, the American Legion made similar declarations of faith in the United Nations, and in each case, reiterated the Legion's plan for strengthening the United Nations into an organization capable of preventing aggression.

The language has not been the same, but the intent of the language remains the same. The American Legion does not want world war III. Legionnaires are not content to wish the war away this time. Legionnaires want to do their share in preventing world war III.

After considering many alternatives the American Legion still believes that the best vehicle for preserving peace is by preventing aggression through the good offices of the United Nations. If such is to be done, the United Nations Charter must be amended to the extent that an agency of the U. N. is enabled to prevent aggression or preparation for aggression.

The Legion is opposed to world government or world federation. We cherish our sovereign rights as freemen. We cherish the true freedoms of America and the American way of life.

We feel that the United Nations so far has exerted tremendous efforts toward leveling economic and social inequalities of its sixty odd members. Not enough attention has been devoted to preventing aggression and particularly the further spread of the vicious cancer of world communism.

The Legion believes that social and economic problems among nations need continued and continual exploration by and through the member nations of the United Nations. Any real developments must, of necessity, be painfully slow. We are not fearful of continuing progress in this regard under the auspices of the United Nations.

However, the American Legion still looks to the United Nations as the one organization that can keep the peace. Our main interest in the U. N. is in its ability to deter and prevent aggression and thus end the threat of world war III.

The U. N. is presently not too successful in this particular regard. In fact, it is impotent.

We believe that the charter should be amended so that the U. N. is capable of carrying out its real purpose--as visualized by the American Legion.

We believe that this can be done by --

1. Reorganizing the Security Council so that representation is on a larger basis, with fuller recognition of the nations of the so-called free world who are the nations in fact who are willing to work for peace. If such is done, the veto, in matters of aggression and preparation for aggression only, can be safely discarded.

2. International control of scientific weapons. Such control must include inspection by international teams of inspectors of all nations who possess the ability to produce atomic bombs, hydrogen bombs, germ warfare or other scientific weapons.

3. Establishment of a United Nations Police Authority. This police authority would be composed of an international contingent capable of stopping all minor aggressions or preparations for aggression, and national contingents supplied by the major powers.

The international contingent would be composed of soldiers recruited from the minor members of the United Nations.

The American Legion believes that these are essentials in any discussions concerning charter revision. We recognize that our suggestions are incomplete and at times indefinite.

We do not pretend to be architects capable of devising a world organization that would be perfect in organization and capable of stopping any further aggressions under any and all conditions.

But, Legionnaires are sincerely interested in the prevention of World War III. We do not believe the U. N. as presently constituted can do the job. We believe that the U. N. with its charter revised along the lines recommended by the American Legion can and will stop further aggression.

We approve of regional pacts under article 51 of the charter for the collective security of its member nations. We believe that all such regional arrangements should be continued until the U. N. Charter has been revised to provide safeguards equal to the present regional arrangements.

In April of this year, the foreign relations commission of the American Legion met in Washington, D. C. We were honored by an address by the chairman of this most distinguished committee, the Honorable Alexander Wiley.

We had the opportunity of discussing at length international problems with experts from our State Department.

A great part of our deliberations was devoted to the subject of the United Nations, and to possible charter revision at the 1955 convention. These deliberations were condensed into the following which is quoted directly from the resolution on this matter adopted by the national executive committee of the American Legion in session at Indianapolis, Ind., in early May.

"The United Nations, endeavoring to operate its program and exercise the jurisdiction of its charter, remains hampered and retarded in its efforts in the face of mounting world tension.

"It is evident there is no intention on the part of Soviet Russia to join in any collective action for the elimination of world tension and the peaceful settlement of world problems. This fact is substantiated by Russia's indiscriminate use of the veto.

"The fact remains the U. N. has been successful in many negotiations. The value of the U. N. as a world forum, giving opportunities for discussion and statements of policy of its members, is inestimable.

"The U. N., as an association of sovereign nations, by its nature and the implications of its charter, represents the hope of the free world that it will, in due time, be the instrument for the creation and preservation of world peace.

"We urge a continuing support of its efforts.

"A special subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Commission has been making a strenuous and detailed study of what might be involved in possible changes in the U. N. Charter during the charter review provided for by the charter, in 1955.

"To date there has been no available data indicating the interest of foreign governments on any probable changes. Our own Government has just recently begun its studies and hearings on the subject and very little indications appear, as of this date, to signify the Government's intentions. We urge a continuing study of this subject, for the purpose of keeping the American Legion abreast of all proposed changes, by whatever government, so that we may keep our policy on a current basis.

"The fact that no action can take place before 1955, and the further fact that the deliberations by the member nations involved, in a review or attempted revision, will be a procedure of long duration, affords ample time and opportunity to allow for further study. We urge the American Legion to continue its policy of opposition to any type of world government and consequently oppose any proposal that may be directed to this effort.

"Once again we restate the Legion plan to strengthen the U. N. by limitations of the use of the veto in matters of aggression, international control of scientific weapons, and the establishment of an effective U. N. armed force.

"We favor a change in the U. N. Charter that will restrict the U. N. to its basic purpose for which it was founded—to maintain peace throughout the world."

The American Legion is, as you can see, currently interested in charter revision, and currently studying revision matters through a subcommittee of the standing foreign relations commission. Further and more complete proposals concerning charter revision should be forthcoming after this study has been completed, and after the national convention of the American Legion in Washington, D. C., in late August.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Gillette?

Senator GILLETTE. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator COOPER. Do you think an international police force would be of any great value now when Russia and the United States are the two nations which possess the nuclear weapons—perhaps England has some—but they are concentrated in the hands of the two great powers?

Mr. VERITY. No, sir; I do not believe that as presently—in the present world condition, that the international police force would be, as an example, too effective in Indochina.

But it is our feeling that if international control of scientific weapons can ever come about, and we can have an enforceable inspection setup which will, therefore, put the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb in some type of control, then the international police force that we visualize, and we believe that these many Senators and Representatives visualized in 1950, would be of effect.

Senator COOPER. Thank you.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

THE VETO

The CHAIRMAN. I understood that you wanted to eliminate the veto in all matters, but your statement reads:

Limitation of the use of the veto in matters of aggression or preparation for aggression.

Mr. VERITY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, you would do away with the veto in those particular instances?

Mr. VERITY. We would do away with it.

The CHAIRMAN. But you would not otherwise limit it?

Mr. VERITY. No, sir; we are not for further limitation of the veto at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. How about in connection with membership?

Mr. VERITY. We have gone on record as being behind the Vandenberg resolution, sir. However, you will note from what we are talking about in our statements, it is primarily the prevention of aggression; that is the main interest of the American Legion.

We are interested in the social and economic aspects of the United Nations, but primarily we are interested in them being effective enough to stop aggression at the start or even before it starts.

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

The CHAIRMAN. Have you considered the specialized agencies, like ILO?

Mr. VERITY. No, sir. We have dealt very—we have had very few dealings with the International Labor Organization. I am now talking about the Foreign Relations Commission.

We have concentrated our efforts on attempting to have the national American Legion make policy statements concerning what we think is the primary function of the United Nations, and that is the prevention of aggression.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not taken any position on the World Health Organization or UNESCO?

Mr. VERITY. Not to my knowledge, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you made a study of those organizations to see whether or not you believe they are instrumentalities for world good or whether they are liable to impair our own sovereignty as has been suggested?

Mr. VERITY. Yes, sir; we have studied them. I thought you meant had we made a statement on them. We had not made a statement. We had studied them.

In fact, in Washington last month we spent 2 full days in the State Department hearing about the very things they are doing in that regard. But we have made no statements as to whether or not we think they are effective in this primary thing we are interested in, and that is avoiding world war III.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you draw any conclusions as to whether or not they were contributing constructively to international relations, or were in any way impinging upon the rights of American citizens or American sovereignty?

Mr. VERITY. Yes, sir. We had the feeling that, as Senator Cooper brought up here very briefly, we feel sometimes they go too far afield in delving into a great many things that are not necessarily in our public interest.

The CHAIRMAN. You feel there are personnel in those organizations who sometimes go a little astray at times, like they do even in America at times?

Mr. VERITY. Yes, sir; it is our feeling that they are being very generous with our money.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, sir.

Any questions? Thank you.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. William C. Major. Carry on.

(The document entitled "Twice Is Too Often" is on file with the committee.)

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM C. MAJOR, PRESIDENT, LOUISVILLE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mrs. MAJOR. I am Mrs. William C. Major, housewife, and president of the Louisville League of Women Voters. There has been a League of Women Voters in Louisville since 1920, the same year that the National League of Women Voters was established, and we now have 530 members in our local league.

U. N. AS CORNERSTONE OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

While the League of Women Voters has made no decision on specifics of charter revision, we unequivocally support the U. N. as essential to the conduct of United States foreign relations, indeed as the cornerstone of our foreign policy. We have been in the forefront of

those encouraging an extension of international authority through a maximum use of the U. N. A strong U. N. acts as a forum reflecting the frailties as well as the wisdom of people and their institutions in a different era. As a permanent organization the U. N. is a far more effective and efficient means of conferring with other nations than any number of special conferences would be. How better can we learn to know about other nations or they about us than in living, talking, working side by side, where reasons behind our differences become apparent at the same time as the differences themselves.

SUPPORT FOR PRESENT CHARTER PROVISIONS

Our approach to studying the U. N. has not been in terms of redefining or amending its powers and functions but, on the contrary, in giving the fullest support and interpretation to the present provisions of the charter. To this end and to enable the U. N. to fulfill its responsibility for world security, the League of Women Voters supported the "uniting for peace resolution" which permits the General Assembly in the face of a Security Council veto to consider any threat to the peace and to check it even to the point of using armed force.

EXTENSION OF INTERNATIONAL COURT AND USE OF WORLD COURT

Recognizing that in the absence of codified international law, the decisions of the U. N. are very likely to be determined by political expediency, the League of Women Voters has considered as essential the extension of international law and an increase in the authority and use of the World Court. In view of this conclusion, we supported Senate Concurrent Resolution 72 (81st Cong., 2d sess.), objective of which was the development of the powers and procedures of the U. N.

SUPPORT FOR PRINCIPLE OF UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

Concluding that ultimate world peace and security was dependent on the united action of all nations, the League of Women Voters has supported historically the principle of universal membership. However, we are not unaware that the changing political situation of the world may produce its own imperatives; therefore, without question, if specific revisions were proposed with respect to universal membership to the extent presently provided in articles 3 through 5 of the U. N. Charter, the League of Women Voters would want to make a detailed study before reaching any conclusion.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF U. N. AND SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

While there is no denying the fact that the U. N. has been less successful in fulfilling its security obligations, the League of Women Voters feels that the U. N. has an impressive record of accomplishment in the solution of many world political, social, and economic problems. Political failures inspire the sensationalism around which headlines are built. The specialized agencies, however, have been quietly winning battles against diseases which recognize no national boundaries, against starvation, poverty, and ignorance. The U. N.

was set up with a twofold purpose—preventing war and promoting peace. In a large measure its work toward keeping the peace has been in the long-range fields of human welfare.

SUPPORT FOR NOT WEAKENING, BUT STRENGTHENING, U. N.

While the League of Women Voters has not spelled out specific changes in the charter, we would oppose any revision in the charter which would weaken the U. N. and, conversely, we would support those measures, national or international, designed to strengthen the U. N. in the fulfillment of its purposes. Success of the U. N. depends not so much, we believe, on its organization and procedures as on the willingness of member nations to make full and confident use of it. No charter in itself will maintain peace. Conferences on revision of the charter can be of great importance in focusing attention on the work of the U. N. But it should also be recognized that such conferences afford an opportunity for assault on the U. N. by less than constructive critics. In analyzing defective sections of the charter, let us resolve stanchly to keep in mind the successes, the contributions to worldwide progress this charter has implemented.

The CHAIRMAN. You have given us the opinion of the association that you represent. Have you any personal opinions, over and above those?

Mrs. MAJOR. No, sir; I would not like to comment on any personal opinions that I have at this time because I think they might be misconstrued as to views which were mine and which were the league's, and I am authorized to speak for the league today.

I might say that these are things that reflect the opinions of our group, and state just as far as the group could go. You certainly, as Senators, hear from our own members the opinions that they have reached from studies carried out in the league that, perhaps, go further than my statements today.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, gentlemen?

Senator GILLETTE. I have none.

Senator COOPER. I have none.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. MAJOR. Thank you, sir.

(Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN. Robert Bowers, professor of history, Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.

You must have traveled quite a distance to get down here today.

STATEMENT OF R. E. BOWERS, PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, HANOVER COLLEGE, HANOVER, IND.

Mr. BOWERS. We did not come by boat, so we come a little easier.

I might say, besides being a professor of history, I am a Presbyterian and the father of three Cub Scouts, which gives me a special interest in world order.

I speak as an individual and from my heart, although with me today there are 10 students from Hanover College representing a broad cross section, I think, of student opinion there and other colleges, perhaps, throughout the country.

At least four of those people agree with my point of view, and if that is any percentage that seems to be verified by certain Gallup polls, I would say a certain number of people agree, as I do. I agree with many of the previous speakers.

I agree we have to work for the principles of the Prince of Peace. I agree with Father Horrigan there must be organization and there must be moral principles set up, and I agree very heartily with many principles of the American Legion position.

I do believe we are faced with a practical problem and, therefore, I shall confine my remarks to the practical issues and, incidentally, I may say that I am very proud to be present at these hearings conducted by the statesman Senator from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you say that again and again? [Laughter.]

Mr. BOWERS. I will shout it from the housetops if you want me to, Senator; I mean that.

I have met with the Senator before and talked with him, and I know his work in the seaway, and I know his scholarly and statesmanlike conduct in this committee, and I am proud we have him on this committee; that is why I say we have a practical problem.

I am here as a private citizen merely suggesting some things. If you have seen Senate Document 87, which they have compiled as background for this, you will know about the vast amount of research and the vast amount of public hearings they have conducted to arrive at statesmanlike conclusions.

What I really hope is that there will be a conference, and I hope at that conference all the points of view will come out, and then I will trust our statesmen to decide which path to take. Meanwhile I am urging one path. It seems to me there are actually three practical alternatives facing the world today.

THREE PRACTICAL ALTERNATIVES FACING TODAY'S WORLD

Some of you who listened to the TV yesterday may have heard me say this. The three practical alternatives are, one of which has been tried and found wanting, one of which has been tried and found lacking, and one of which is partly untried, but I think will turn the trick.

Unfortunately, all three of these paths are possible within the United Nations as it exists, and so, hence the importance of revising the charter.

The path that has been tried and found wanting, of course, is the path of nationalist self-centeredness, the armaments race, cold-war propaganda, secret alliances and all the rest and, as we know, that is entirely possible within the United Nations. It led to two world wars. Frankly, I will not buy it now because I am sure it would lead to world war III.

The path which has been tried and found lacking, it seems to me, is the path represented by the League and the U. N., magnificent as they have been in their achievements within their limited machinery.

But I will disagree with the lovely lady who preceded me in thinking that good will is sufficient. There have always been men of good will, and there have always been wars.

LIMITED WORLD GOVERNMENT

It seems to me machinery is important, and I think the machinery of the U. N. is inadequate to the task today, and so although I do not speak for the several groups that advocate limited world federal government that, in briefly, is my position, and to those of you who are unfamiliar with it, let me indicate three things, particularly, that are necessary for such a limited federal world government.

INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

First of all, it is clear there has to be a police power adequate to keep peace, and I agree with the American Legion on that heartily, and with the position that Senator Gillette is identified with, of some sort of police force.

It seems to me that the police force has to be so superior to all the other police forces that you cannot have a possibility of war. Now, that police force, unfortunately, in my opinion, and here is where I would think the American Legion would have to modify their position by the sheer force of logic, I do not see how they can be against world federal government and for an international police force.

How can you support, have a world international police force, unless you support it, pay the bills, and how can you pay the bills unless you assure them that money is coming in, and how can you be sure that money is coming in unless it has the power to tax directly without waiting for voluntary contributions?

It seems to me, then, if you have an international police force, you must have the power to tax; and the third thing which is brought out, in one way or another by various speakers is this: that there must be power to act directly on individuals.

In two world wars we have seen a slaughter of the innocents as our men tried to apprehend the two criminals in their fastnesses.

I think we should have the power to approach the criminal directly, as the FBI does, and the police do; in short, there should be a police power. Beyond that I do not think world opinion is ready to go.

LIMITED WORLD GOVERNMENT

I do think, however, not only is this a necessary thing and a feasible thing, but it is practicable from many points of view. There are several resolutions before the Senate today, as the Senators know—it is in the report—advocating some form of limited federal world government. There is the Tobey resolution. At least 40 Senators, according to Senate Document 87, are in favor of some kind of move in that direction.

Gallup polls indicate favorable reaction toward it, too. You know the story—I can see by the expressions on your faces you are well informed.

You know how strongly people feel on this matter. I feel, however, that this form of world government that we have in mind is practicable.

Now, really what we come up to in the final analysis, and I think all the people have skirted the issue so far, is what about Russia?

So, may I take the time, Senator, to go through some of these objections which you have before you. I have listed some of the usual objections which are held as to this kind of organization.

It is, first of all, said that Russia would never join such a limited world federal government. Well, the way I conceive of it, they could not help but join it because they would be in it. In other words, we would get this through the U. N. by the amendment process, which would give three simple specific things: Russia could leave the U. N., but until she did she would be in this world federal government.

It is objected, well, supposing that is true, Russia will nevertheless prevent that by a veto. May I say that the proposals to limit the world government by veto, for instance, are subject themselves to veto, just as this is.

Under article 108, Russia can veto a provision to end the veto, so if she is going to do it anyway, and there is ample ground to think she does, if she is going to do it anyway, why not propose a series of amendments which will make an organization so strong that Russia will know if she draws out she faces really an effective, really strong and united powerful organization that she would not dare oppose.

I want to, in short, Senator Wiley, say if this is not the kind of machinery that you, perhaps, inferred yesterday in the paper when you said that if the veto continued to be used, we may have to look for some other kind of machinery to prevent its use.

DIFFICULTIES IN AMENDING U. N. CHARTER

The CHAIRMAN. I am reminded, sir—I am listening very interestedly—of an old Indian chieftain, who, after a fellow got through talking with him, said, "How." You tell us how. How are you going to get the nations to accomplish what you propose?

As was stated this morning, you have about 2,300 million human beings, and today there are less than 300 million of them who really want the kind of government that we have in our country, where the individual has something to say about government.

Mr. BOWERS. May I ask, Senator, how many people wanted a United States of America in 1787?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I was not there; were you?

[Laughter.]

I have heard statistics.

Mr. BOWERS. The analogy may escape me.

The CHAIRMAN. The point we talk about all the time, is how do we get these nations now to agree that they will surrender their sovereignty to a supergovernment with a super police force, assuming that is the road, when you cannot talk to the Kremlin about practically anything and get anywhere. We have tried talking to the Soviets since the war. How are you going to accomplish a thing like you propose when several nations have the H-bomb—and there will be a few more who will eventually have it—and soon we will have the cobalt bomb? These inventions practically do away with collective security in a sense.

Mr. BOWERS. If I may use a homely illustration, Senator, just yesterday I was confronted by one of my sons who was collecting charms. You know, you put money in machines and get charms. My son was getting letters and little toys that you get in gum machines.

The illustration I was using, if I may use it, is this: That he had these charms, and I offered to get this one and that one from him, and he did not want to give them up, they were his. "They are mine, Daddy," and then I offered him a quarter for the whole business—sold.

Now, I wonder, sir, if we are not going about this thing piecemeal? If I were mayor of a town in the Wild West years ago and a man came up to me and he said, "I want to be your sheriff," and I looked at him, and he had toothpick and a table knife and a fork for weapons, I do not think I would give him the job.

But if he came up with the proper arms and the proper powers and, perhaps, with a deputy or two, I would say, "You are hired."

I do not think we have gone about this properly because we have lacked the bold ideas you asked for in your speech yesterday. I do not think we have been bold enough; we have not asked for enough. I am not saying we can do it, but we all know if we believe we can do it, we are more likely to do it than if we do not, and I am speaking not for this thing to happen tomorrow, but I am speaking for an urgent statement of it in behalf of it next year.

How about this, Senator: It is a well-known fact that the Constitutions of France and Italy, and one other country which escapes my mind for the moment, do have in them provisions that that country may legally and constitutionally join a world government when and if such a proposal is made. Does that not indicate that they are ready when the proposal is made?

The CHAIRMAN. But what is the situation in France and Italy today in relation to communism?

Mr. BOWERS. We come right back to the nub of the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. We come back to the question of the mental grasp and the spiritual understanding of the people in the world—a willingness to really join in spirit and mind and soul in a great enterprise. If those things are present, fine, but we do not find that is the situation.

STUDYING PUBLIC OPINION ABROAD

Mr. BOWERS. Tell me, Senator, would this be possible for you to answer to the great American public here: What continuing measures are being taken by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to study public opinion, government procedure in foreign countries? I know you make these significant trips. I know you have representatives at the Interparliamentary Union, but is there a continuing study?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we have not established a subcommittee for that purpose. We have got almost all the work we can handle dealing with this country's problems, but if you have any suggestions we will be glad to get them because we like men with ideas and men who are on their toes and not satisfied with the status quo and have hope for the future.

* BROADENING INTERNATIONAL STUDENT AND TEACHER EXCHANGE

Mr. BOWERS. Well, perhaps, I should speak, then, in an area in which I am equipped to speak, more than in your area, sir.

One of my students whom I had hoped would be able to speak for me today, but the arrangements were not possible, has an idea. It

comes from his heart; it comes from his experience in the Army; it comes from his contact with his fellow students.

He thinks there should be an ever-increasing exchange of students and teachers between the countries of the world. He believes that that is the only way to get a continuous understanding at the grassroots level of what is going on to inform the people who do, in turn, appear before you.

The CHAIRMAN. We have several programs of that kind. We do not disagree whatsoever with his view.

Mr. BOWERS. Yes, sir; and he believes, sir, in the extension of that. He believes also—and I am speaking for him at this time—that we should immediately set up a committee to choose from the various international languages one language which will be acceptable and can be taught in all schools. Again, that is an old proposal, but a proposal which I would like to advance one more as a valid one, and he, who comes from Cincinnati, where he had to learn both German and English—I come from Milwaukee—knowing the situation, and I know he feels that it is not at all a hard thing to do, and should be done elsewhere.

Finally, Senator, and this may not be necessary either, but I am the kind of a man who likes to see the guy I am fighting, and I would like to suggest that this student exchange program be returned to its original status as it was originally passed in the Senate and Congress, I believe, to include exchanges of students and teachers with Russia itself.

I hope that statement does not seem too out of form, sir, but personally I agree with former president Hutchins, that when the voice of reason stops, the voice of machine begins.

The CHAIRMAN. I would probably not limit the exchange just to students. There are a lot of people here in this country who think Russia has got something. I would be willing to have their fare paid over there so they could get acquainted with what they have not got. [Applause.]

Mr. BOWERS. Very good. I agree with you precisely; I believe that is the only way we can find out precisely what they have not got.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. BOWERS. Incidentally, I will volunteer to take you up on that, sir; I will volunteer. I have other things here, but do you wish to ask me any questions?

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any questions, Senator Gillette?

Senator GILLETTE. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. No questions.

The CHAIRMAN. If you receive any other suggestions you think significant, communicate with the Foreign Relations Committee. We are looking for new ideas.

Mr. BOWERS. Thank you, sir.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Bowers is as follows:)

STATEMENT ON REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER BY R. E. BOWERS,
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AT HANOVER COLLEGE, HANOVER, IND.

The following statement is an extension of my remarks over WHAS-TV, Louisville, on Lee Jordan's program, Look It Over. The program, in the form of a panel discussion, took place at 2:30 p. m., central daylight saving time, June 6, 1954.

The world continues to be faced with the choice Theodore Roosevelt said confronted us even at the beginning of this century—a choice between utopia or hell. More recently Bernard Baruch has put it this way: We must choose between world peace or world destruction. I can put the gist of what follows in the injunction Benjamin Franklin offered the Colonies just 200 years ago: Unite or die.

There is no question that we are rapidly moving toward a third world war. Can we stay the catastrophe? It seems to me that if our statesmen are sincerely attempting to stay the catastrophe, and I have no reason to believe they are not making the attempt, then they must choose between three practicable courses of action. One has been tried and found wanting. Another has been tried and found lacking. The third has not been tried, but, in my opinion, it is the only realistic course of action to take.

The course of action which has been tried and found wanting is the course which embarks upon an arms race, feverishly builds up opposing alliances, indulges in propaganda war, and exalts nations above humanity. This course was tried between 1890 and 1914 and resulted in World War I. The nations fell back into this same course in the thirties and reaped World War II. There is no reason to think that such a course can result in anything but general war.

The course of action which has been tried and found lacking is the course followed by advocates of the League of Nations and the United Nations. Not that either of these organizations has been less than magnificent in the job. They have done with inadequate powers, but that their powers have been inadequate to perform the task assigned them. The League ceased to be an effective force when Japan, Germany, and Italy defied it in rapid succession. The League proved powerless to gather a force sufficient to deter the aggressors, and the cohesive forces between nations nurtured by the League proved even less effective in the form of the various efforts at collective security before the blow fell on Poland. Today we see a stronger league, the United Nations, stronger chiefly by the presence of the United States of America, discouraging, circumventing, and resisting aggression in much firmer fashion than the League. But we face a much stronger and more resolute aggressor than the League faced, and the world seems as close to general war 9 years after the birth of the U. N. as it did 19 years after the birth of the League.

This fatal progress down the old road to war, indicates that something was lacking in the league and is lacking in the United Nations. So evident is this, that surely no thinking person outside the Communist bloc countries would oppose a conference to review the charter and consider means of making good its deficiencies. Most of us, then, will acknowledge that the second course of action in the form of the United Nations program as it now exists is lacking in the needed strength.

I, therefore, advocate revising the United Nations through the amending process in the direction of true world federal government. By this means the values of the present framework could be retained while working for something stronger and capable of preserving peace. I advocate this for the reasons which follow:

1. Proposals for some kind of world government are already before the Senate of the United States; e. g., the Tobey and the Taylor resolutions. Clearly the Senate must take the initiative in this matter, since experience has proved that the Senate of the United States is the body that makes or breaks proposals for United States participation in international bodies. There may be as many as 19 Senators openly in favor of some kind of world federal government. There are at least 40 Senators, according to Senate Document 87, 83d Congress, 2d session, who seem to favor a stronger U. N. in the direction of world federal government. And I gather from this same Senate document that should public opinion prove favorable, a great many more Senators will possibly be willing to follow the leadership of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in whatever suggestions it may make for strengthening the U. N.

2. World opinion is ready to discuss a move toward world government. The constitutions of some countries, including France and Italy, already provide means of joining a world government should one be formed. Fifty percent or more of the American public at various times, according to Gallup polls, have indicated their willingness to substitute an international police force for separate national armies. And such a force is the material cornerstone of world government. Prominent leaders in all fields of endeavor, too numerous even to catalog, have gone on record in favor of world government. The least we can do is to bring up the matter at a world conference considering revision of the charter. That is the only way to find out the true state of opinion.

3. The form of world federal government contemplated could come about within the United Nations, without disturbing its continuing function, when three powers are added to the United Nations which it does not at present possess. These three powers are the full police power, the power to tax for stated purposes, and the judicial power in specified types of cases over individuals. The great importance of the legislative power requires, in the present state of world opinion, severe limitations on the world scale to be sure domestic matters cannot be interfered with. The present legislative organ of the United Nations would serve in this role.

The police power must be worked out so that only the world police force could wage war, if necessary, on an effective scale. The power to tax within limits is necessary to pay the bills without fear of interruption. The judicial power must operate on individuals which are a threat to the peace. Only so can we get directly at the criminal without requiring another slaughter of the innocents to apprehend warmongers in their lairs.

For these three reasons I think world government is possible, necessary, and practicable. I need not elaborate on them to a subcommittee that has done the thorough research and conducted the exhaustive hearings which this subcommittee has done. I merely go on record as one more citizen supporting a course of action advocated to you, I am sure, by many thousands representing many millions of Americans.

My main position being clear, I should like to devote the remainder of this paper in making replies to objections to world government, and to elaborating on certain features implicit in my main position.

Objection: Russia could never be persuaded to join such an organization.

If such an organization were created simply by adding the police, taxing, and full judicial power to the present United Nations, Russia might conceivably leave the U. N. but she would not have to be persuaded to join it. She would already be in it.

Objection: Russia would veto any amendments making the above proposals.

This remains to be proved. We do know that Russia and her satellites oppose even calling a conference to revise the charter. But under article 109 she cannot prevent calling such a conference. We do know that Russia would oppose an amendment ending the veto power. And if she would leave the U. N. rather than accept such an amendment, we might as well go further and amend the U. N. in such a way that if Russia leaves she will be facing a far mightier organ for peace than the one she left or the one that would exist if only the veto power were removed.

Objection: Russia is our real problem, not the machinery of the U. N. unless we can find means of getting along with her, it doesn't much matter what kind of world organization we have. We will be at war anyway.

This is a counsel of despair. Russians are realistic. They might conceivably launch a new world war in a world divided among the sovereign nations. But it is seriously to be doubted that she would launch a war against two-thirds of the world standing as a solid unit.

Objection: Russia might accept world government in order to seize power within it and thus stand unopposed in Communist expansion.

In order to seize power she would have to control the army. But the variety of literature on the makeup of a world army shows there are many ways of preventing any one nation or group seizing power of the army. And if the army operated, as it does in our country, under strict control of the civil government, and that civil government were conducted along democratic lines, who would contend that the false philosophy of communism could ever win enough converts to control a democratic majority? Where communism exists it exists through forceful rule of a minority.

Objection: Even if the problem of Russia is solved, world government will always pose the threat of outside control of the United States and perhaps fatal changes in our treasured way of life.

This is not true of the kind of world government suggested. The world government proposed would not have power over domestic affairs and institutions, any more than our original Constitution permitted the Federal Government to interfere in the affairs of the States. For 72 years a free society and a slave society coexisted in America. The genius of our statesmen was stretched to permit this to happen, but it happened; and civil war need not have resulted if the counsels of men like Lincoln, on the one hand, or Crittenden, on the other, both Kentuckians, had been followed; nor need slavery have continued. Compensated emancipation would have been immeasurably cheaper in money and lives than the Civil War in bringing freedom to a brother race.

As long as the principle of national control over purely domestic affairs were observed, there need be no problem here. We could leave it to our children to decide what further steps might be taken. In any case, certainly the freedom from war which world government would bring about would release world productive capacities to such an extent that no one would desire to interfere in America, having all they need at home.

Objection: World federal government might end international war but it would not end civil war.

This is a calculated risk we must take. We had one civil war under our Federal Government in the last 165 years. How many wars has Europe had these same 165 years without federal government?

Objection: With only one army, the army leaders could seize power and dictate to the world.

The United States has had only one army for most of its 165 years. Army leaders have not yet seized power. This is a question of the level of civilization. The Pax Romana was enforced in the then known world by a government superior to the military until civilization itself declined and men no longer cared.

Objection: The United States would have to pay the bills of a world federal government for so long a period we would go broke or be seriously weakened.

This is absurd. Relieved of the necessity of an atomic-war budget, we could support the entire cost of world federal government, if necessary, and still have cash enough to spare to add a thousand dollars a year to the income of every American family.

By way of elaboration, I would like to go on record as favoring the Baruch plan for atomic control, modified in some features if necessary to gain universal assent.

Since atomic control is the starting point of my effort to avert world catastrophe, I think this matter should be made part of the general agenda at a conference on revision of the charter.

In further elaboration, I would like to return briefly to the problem of Russia. Fully aware of the danger from other Communist countries, we nevertheless recognize the final source of our difficulties as resting in the Kremlin. If we are not to be at war with Russia, and we must be ready for it while we are exploring other means of removing Russia's threat, we in all honesty must be seeking means of getting along with her. I do not think enough is being done. We have an Ambassador to Russia. Can he not be charged with quiet, behind the scenes, conversations in continual exploration of a modus vivendi? Shouldn't our top level executive officers take it upon themselves to make similar explorations beyond what is now being done? Couldn't even representatives of our Congress be permitted to discuss common world problems with representatives of the Russian Government? These are questions which only men in the Government can answer.

But from my own point of view and position I would like to ask if more cannot be done in the way of student and teacher exchange with Communist countries. Personally I feel immune to Communist brain-washing under ordinary schoolroom circumstances, and I feel much good could result if teachers and students of both ideologies had a chance to exchange ideas in areas not charged with emotion and propaganda. In this hope, I have been studying Russian in my spare time for 2 years. It may be I shall be forced to use this new knowledge in defense of my country, which I would gladly do. I would rather use it in the defense of the human race from war. And I am sure thousands of my colleagues and millions of young people feel the same way, with regard to their own talents available for service.

In conclusion, may I say that I am a Christian, a member of the Presbyterian Church. I believe that promoting the brotherhood of man is the one big job God has given us. There are a variety of ways in which this can be done. But in the present juncture of world affairs I can think of no nobler or more challenging way to do it than to promote a form of world order which will eliminate the curse of war.

SEEKING A COMMON INTEREST AMONG PEOPLES

Senator GILLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that I am going to have to leave in order to catch a plane, but before I go, may I express my appreciation for the help that the people of this community have given to us.

It may appear to some that there is an ineradicable difference of opinion here, but there is not.

It has been mentioned here, and I refer to it again, that democracy itself rests upon the very fundamental cornerstone that out of the clash of opinion there shall be crystallized a judgment that is in the public welfare. We are seeking, and we know that the world can seek, an area in which there is a common interest.

If the emphasis is not on divisive factors, but on finding the area in which we have a common interest, we can build a free world.

Now, here is evidence of democracy in this committee. Here are 2 Republicans, 1 on each side of me.

The CHAIRMAN. Keeping you safe right here. [Laughter.]

THE SUBCOMMITTEE'S GOAL.

Senator GILLETTE. There is a difference of opinion among us politically. I think they are wrong a good share of the time, but there is no question that we, working together, Democrats and Republicans, representing the Foreign Relations Committee, are going out to the people, some of whom we represent, to find their opinion. I repeat what I said at the outset—that anybody who thinks that we are out to sell a program is very, very much mistaken; we are not.

We are not representing a one world group, we are not representing an anti one world group. We are not excluding anything.

We want the people to tell us what we can do to forward the efforts that people of good will everywhere are exerting to create a world free from war.

I happen to be a veteran of three wars myself. I do not want the fourth one. I am a little bit too whitehaired to get into it, but my boy is not.

We know it is possible to create a world free from war. We know that civilized man does not wish to go on with a war every generation.

But we know that in building a world free from war, we need the best judgment and opinion of all American citizens. That is what we are trying to get and, personally, I am very grateful for your help here today.

[Applause.]

Senator GILLETTE. I will leave the Republicans in control; in our endeavor here, there is no minority.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

Thank you, Mr. Bowers.

At this point there will be inserted in the record a statement submitted by students of Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.

(The document referred to follows:)

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT BY STUDENTS FROM HANOVER COLLEGE, HANOVER, IND.

A sampling of student opinion at Hanover College indicates general support of the United Nations in its present form, with the feeling toward proposed revisions that it is all right to discuss such revisions but that it would be better not to adopt them if it would drive out Russia, whose presence, however difficult, is felt necessary to keep alive the hope of world peace and order.

Here is an individual sampling of opinion among the students.

Bruce Bowden would like to see the United Nations strengthened but speaks strongly in behalf of the representative opinion noted above: that it is better to have Russia at least partly restrained by her membership in the United Nations

as it exists, even with the veto, than altogether unrestrained as she would be if revisions in the charter drove her from the U. N.

Larry Dugle believes we should work for the world police force possible under the charter, make better use of the World Bank, and permit the International Court to operate on individuals as well as States. His position is very close to that of limited world, Federal Government advocates.

Monte Forsyth has a great deal of sympathy for the point of view which looks with suspicion on some aspects of the United Nations. He feels that there is great danger of foreign control of the United States through the United Nations. But after further study of the problem, he has come around to think it best to shelve his suspicions for awhile and try to make the U. N. work.

Gene Hinds suggests that there might be a small assembly instead of a Security Council to see to security, and thus escape the veto. He feels the General Assembly should meet four times a year. He feels also that the U. N. should be given more power over international trade in order to provide an economic basis for peace. He also feels the International Court could be strengthened in the direction of compulsory jurisdiction.

William Kiser believes more attention should be paid to the nonpolitical organs of the U. N. and more publicity given them in order to build up the social and cultural bases of peace.

Jerry Love stands firmly on the proposals of the Citizens' Committee for United Nations Reform, whose distinctive proposals include: abolition of the veto, the world court to determine aggression, and a quota system for the U. N. Police force which would be set up about as follows: 10 percent to be made up of volunteers from the small nations of the world; 20 percent each to come from the United States, Great Britain, and Russia; China and France, 10 percent each. Mr. Love believes the eventual goal should be world federal government, but that it must be approached in easy stages.

Ted Palmer agrees with Bruce Bowden that change is to be desired but that it is better to keep the United Nations the way it is if that is the only way to keep the United Nations united.

Ferd Avril is making an oral statement before the committee advocating federal world government of a limited type.

THE CHAIRMAN. Now we will have Carl Geider, student of Hanover College, Hanover, Ind.

STATEMENT OF CARL R. GEIDER, STUDENT, HANOVER COLLEGE, HANOVER, IND.

Mr. GEIDER. Senator Wiley and other members of this committee, in this month of June 1954, this Nation and the other nations of the world are faced with a grave crisis, the threat of a new world war, which can be seen on the near horizon, seems to be gradually coming closer, like the dark threatening clouds of an approaching storm.

World war III will be vastly different than any other war. The weapons of perverted science have been perfected to the point that in the event of another all-out war, total destruction will reign supreme.

Man will be so crippled, both morally and physically, it is doubtful that he will ever recover completely from his war wounds. It is, therefore, imperative that something should be done now to eradicate war before it is too late.

DANGER OF MILITARY PREPAREDNESS ALONE

Several different courses of action remain open to us. Among these is military preparedness. If war should come we need to defend ourselves and, at the same time, bring the war quickly and effectively to a close.

However, in military preparedness alone there is a danger. The danger arises from a type of war psychosis. Examples of this illness are many and varied throughout history.

Preceding World War I, every nation in Europe participated in an armaments race, which was one of the decisive factors that led to the World War.

If we are to prevent war, we must find other means than simply the manufacturing of bullets, guns, and atomic bombs.

U. N. CAN BRING ABOUT WORLD UNDERSTANDING

It is my opinion that this can be accomplished through world understanding. The United Nations is a kind of organization in which understanding can be realized.

In the past 9 years this has been proved conclusively. The Russian Government removed its armed forces from Iran after pressure was brought to bear through undivided and nearly unanimous opinion in the General Assembly of the U. N.

War in Indonesia was averted following the action of the same world body of nations. Had it not been for the cooperative efforts of the U. N., the United States would have been forced to go it alone in Korea.

In this Nation there are those who maintain, and they have maintained it today, however, that the U. N. has failed. They point to the fact that the Soviet Union and other Communist-dominated countries still pose a threat to world peace.

It certainly must be admitted that the United Nations is not a near perfect organization. But, at the same time, its accomplishments have been such that it would seem a tragic error to scrap it completely and begin anew after 9 years of fruitful experimentation.

Such an action would serve as splendid propaganda for the Communists who would maintain that the United States had been defeated by world opinion.

U. N. SHOULD BE IMPROVED AND VETO ELIMINATED

Rather, I believe that the best course of action that remains open to us at this time is to make every attempt to improve the U. N.

The first step which must be taken in this direction is the elimination of the veto from the U. N. Charter. The League of Nations died because it was a too conservative organization.

When the Japanese entered Manchuria, and the Italians marched into Abyssinia—

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me; may I interrupt you there?

Mr. GEIDER. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Many people have made that statement. I heard a very distinguished Democrat once say that the League of Nations died because the people of the world were not ready for the idea. I think that a very serious matter for us to consider now is whether or not the people of the world are ready for the ideas that we have been talking about today. But you carry on.

Mr. GEIDER. All right.

Had it done so, World War II might have been averted, if the League of Nations had taken a stronger attitude.

In 1945, at the Yalta Conference, when the veto was agreed upon by the United States and the U. S. S. R., it was passed chiefly on the insistence of statesmen who held reservation about favorable world opinion in regard to the acceptance of their particular national foreign policies.

Insofar as the United States is concerned that has not vindicated in the past 9 years the statements. World public opinion has backed up the United States in questions put before the Security Council.

Russia in the past 9 years has used over 50 vetoes, a number many times greater than those used by the United States. It, therefore, seems evident that the world has respect for American justice and freedom, and looks to this Nation for guidance.

If we are to maintain world peace, the day must come when the nations of this world join together in a closer basis of world brotherhood and understanding.

MUST LAY FOUNDATION FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT

Although a federalistic world organization may never come in our own day, we must lay the foundation for it now if there is to be world order instead of world war.

That is the end of my prepared statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

You are a student?

Mr. GEIDER. Yes, sir; I am, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What course are you taking?

Mr. GEIDER. What course we should follow? Well, I think that, first of all—

The CHAIRMAN. I mean, what are you studying in college?

Mr. GEIDER. Oh, I am a history major under the tutelage of Dr. Bowers who spoke previously, but I do not mean to maintain here that I at all agree with his views as he so presented them. [Laughter.]

I think that a federalistic world order is inevitable, it must come about at some time, but I disagree that it has to come about now, and I do not think the world is prepared for it, as you so ably put it in the middle of my speech, which is what it was. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to say something more?

Mr. GEIDER. Not unless you have some questions that you would like to put.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. Are you graduating this year?

Mr. GEIDER. Yes, sir; I am, sir.

CONCERN OF YOUNG MEN GRADUATES ABOUT POSSIBILITY OF WAR

Senator COOPER. Do you find much concern by the young men graduates about the possibility of war?

Mr. GEIDER. I have found a great deal of concern, particularly with reference to serving in the Armed Forces, and going to Indochina.

Senator COOPER. You have pointed out that world federalism is a thing of the future, if at all.

What do you and young men of your age who are thinking about the possibilities of war think can be done to avert war? I would like

just a minute to say something which is not exactly in line with what we have been talking about.

I have been in the armed services, too, and I know that it is the ones who have to go, who must go, who have the greatest right to speak, and I would like to know what all of you think can be done now from a practical standpoint, in this matter we are discussing, to help avert war?

Mr. GEIDER. Well, I can only speak for myself, Senator Cooper; but I feel that the first action, as I stated previously, that should be taken, certainly should be in regard to having the veto eliminated from the U. N. Charter.

We have got to recognize the fact, I think, that we are faced with a drastic situation today, and I think the best course of action which remains open is through a united effort, and I believe that a united effort should be worked upon through the U. N.

I do not know whether I specifically answered your question or not.

Senator COOPER. That is all I want.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Senator COOPER. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Geider is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF CARL R. GEIDER, HANOVER COLLEGE, ON REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Today, in this month of June 1954, this Nation and the other nations of our world are faced with the gravest problem the human race has been confronted with in all of its long history of achievement and failure. This problem is not localized. It cannot be solved by the promises of a few men in one particular country. Rather it must be solved by the combined promises of all concerned.

The bomb which was exploded over Hiroshima in August 1945, has proved to many that total warfare is as obsolete as the first stone hammer which was sharpened by our primitive ancestors millions of years ago. The very fact that this has not been recognized universally has led many to the pessimistic conclusion that mankind is doomed to extinction just as the reptilian age passed into oblivion when it was met by a challenge of nature that it could not overcome. The position of individuals and groups who hold this viewpoint is indeed a near tragedy of our times. It implies that mankind does not even possess the intelligence of a lower order of species. This is so fallacious that it borders on an absurdity. It is my personal, wholehearted belief that mankind does possess a high intelligence and therefore should be able to shield itself from extinction.

In the past 10 years the inventiveness of man has made a phenomenally rapid achievement in the development and perfection of the tools and weapons of warfare. Unfortunately in the field of social pursuits man's advancement has been slight.

The question, then, which confronts all of us at this grave and serious moment in the hour of decision of man's existence on this globe is simply, What is the best way to control the powerful force that mankind has at its disposal today? The answer, I believe, rests firmly on what can be achieved by a world organization.

In a question so vital as life and death mankind should have the expressed right to choose its own destiny. It is absolutely wrong that any 2 or 3 nations comprising one-fourth of the world's entire population should decide anything so vital to man's well-being. Therefore, on purely democratic and moral grounds a world organization should definitely be applauded and encouraged.

It is certainly correct that no kind of world organization at the present time can offer a panacea for the world's ills; such thinking is purely altruistic. Nevertheless it is an established fact that much fruitful and enlightened understanding can occur through a world-represented assembly.

No one will dispute the truism that "war begins in the minds of men." It has also been established that war feeds on ignorance, poverty, and hunger. When these conditions have been eradicated or at least reduced to a minimum, we will be able to hold some assurance that men will have little or few reasons to foment war. In this connection it is wholly unjustified that one or several wealthy

nations should completely support the entire peoples of the world. All nations should assume their fair share of responsibility. However, without a world organization this becomes impossible. Just as individuals need to cooperate to maintain order, aid in poor relief, and disseminate charity where needed, so nations must cooperate to limit duplication, and at the same time assure that efforts are taken to shelter the afflicted throughout the world. The problem is too immense to rely entirely on the efforts of one single nation.

Consequently through a cooperative, healthy world organization which would act as a world coordinator, the needs of people wherever they might be would be far better improved.

As a direct result of such action it is believed that there would certainly follow a better and securer understanding between people of different races and nationalities. This knowledge and understanding could pave the way for an eventual world unity, which must necessarily come about if man is to be free, everywhere throughout the world, free both economically and politically.

There is in this Nation of ours a verbal minority who would not agree with the hypothesis regarding a world organization which I have briefly sketched.

At the core of their beliefs is the idea that any sort of world organization which could gain effective control over national sovereignty would necessarily drain the privileged nations of this globe of all their wealth and productive power. Disregarding the idea as fallacious that it would be possible to bring about such a strong world organization at the present time or even in the near future, they criticize all attempts to pave the way to such a world order purely because they regard any such attempts as idealistic pipe dreams of irresponsible liberals.

No one can deny that a federated world order of nations is idealistic. It is idealistic because it has never been attempted before. The League of Nations was an ultraconservative organization. Because of its great conservatism it lacked the moral stamina to act quickly and forcibly at a time when World War II might have been prevented. The United States made a tragic mistake when it refused to join the league purely because of the personality clash between Senator Henry Cabot Lodge and President Woodrow Wilson. Had these two men reconciled their petty differences our Nation would be in a far better position to recognize the shortcomings of the league and not attempt to bring about its resurrection today through the body of the United Nations.

It would seem to this observer that to voice opposition to a federated form of world government, is at this present time a pure and simple escapist mechanism to withdraw from reality. Our country is only one nation among many, and although we are powerful, we are not self-sufficient unto ourselves. The force of world opinion must be accepted and reconciled, and in a world which demands unity or death the only way in which we can survive is through collective thinking and action. This, I believe, demands that we make every attempt to cooperate with the other nations of the world. Without such cooperation we will surely be guilty of the sin of omission, and if the world is plunged into another world war which is certainly inevitable without collective organization, we will have only ourselves to blame. However, if we choose to go forward as we have in the past, cooperating with other nations, and presenting our views before the world forum of nations, it is more than probable that we will not only be heard, but maintain leadership in establishing justice, equality, and freedom for all, even on the same basis as it is enjoyed in this country.

During the past several months at Hanover College, there has been much "soul searching," gathering of facts and data, and discussion revolving around the question whether the U. N. is equipped to do the work it was established to perform. Recognizing the deep cleavage which exists between East and West, and the ineffectiveness so far of the U. N. to resolve these differences, many have maintained that the nations of the world are not ready for a universal organization, and that therefore we should disregard the U. N. entirely and make all preparations necessary to effectively wage world war III when it eventually comes. Others have agreed with the first premise, that the U. N. is grossly ineffective, that it should be scrapped, but that a new organization should be established in its place which would immediately set to work to establish world unity on a Federal basis similar to that of the United States. It is the opinion of this writer that both of these plans would end in failure if acted upon. It cannot be denied that the U. N. has made many mistakes. However, this does not imply that it would be wise at this time to start from "scratch," after 10 years of effective experimentation. There are indeed many reasons why

the U. N. should be continued. In the first place it is highly doubtful that a completely new effective organization could be formed even if the U. N. could be abolished. World opinion regarding such an organization would undoubtedly be too diverse. In this country, as well as throughout the world there would be groups demanding complete sovereignty, and at the opposite end, groups which would possibly ask for complete subservience to the world organization. If we suppose that the United States could be successful in establishing a new world organization without the U. S. S. R., the obvious result would be a deeper cleavage between East and West, and a situation which might lead us closer to war, since it would mean that Russia would no longer feel in the least obligated by organized world opinion regarding her actions. Furthermore for the United States to propose such a drastic step would be welcomed propaganda for the Communists who would immediately claim that we were following such an action to create a puppet organization as a soundboard for our capitalistic propaganda. Finally if the U. N. organization was scrapped and Russia and its satellites were left out of a new world order to stand in its place it would mean that the United States would lose the only continuous means at its disposal for discussing world issues with the U. S. S. R.

On the positive side it is only fair to acknowledge the many accomplishments that this organization has been able to achieve against tremendous odds. A near world war was averted in Iran, when under U. N. pressure the Russian Government removed its troops from that country. One crisis after another has been averted in the Holy Land. The Indonesian War was settled across a U. N. conference table shortly after its inception, and finally had it not been for U. N. action the United States would have been forced to go it alone in Korea. In the field of social welfare this same world organization has made tremendous strides in directing the world-refugee program, as well as alleviating conditions of starvation in India, and other countries.

The very fact that the United Nations Charter "leaves the door open" so to speak for defensive arrangements such as NATO and EDC is a lasting tribute to the U. N.'s elasticity. Somewhat allied to this is the question of global unification which many feel, including this writer, must take place eventually. Under the U. N. Charter provisions this is possible, thus encouraging those who believe the only way to achieve world peace is the eventual tearing down of national barriers.

Still it must be admitted that the U. N. Charter is not a perfect instrument. Undoubtedly its weakest part is the veto provision. It is certainly within reason that large, powerful, and populous nations should have a stronger voice than smaller and weaker nations in problems that affect their own security, both directly and indirectly. However, this does not mean that they should usurp the right of smaller nations in asserting their policies and voting on matters which likewise affect their interests to the extent that they become insecure. The United States faced a vastly similar situation at the Philadelphia Convention in 1787, when the differences between large and small States was resolved. Just as it would have been absurd to grant to Pennsylvania and New York veto power over the other American States, so it now seems absurd that five nations comprising less than the entire world population should have the power to dictate their opposition in defiance of democratic procedures of government.

In 1945, at the Yalta conference when the veto was agreed upon by the United States and the U. S. S. R., it was passed chiefly on the insistence of American statesmen who held reservations about favorable world opinion in regard to American policies. In the past 9 years this action has not been vindicated. World public opinion has in most instances backed up the United States in questions put before the Security Council. Consequently it would seem justifiable even on the grounds of American foreign policy to wholly support the elimination of the veto from the U. N. Charter. Were this accomplished, and other minor revisions made, it would not guarantee that the United Nations would have smooth sailing on the road to peace and unity, but it would at least certainly indicate that all the nations of the world participating in such a move are willing to take the necessary steps for stronger world government on a more democratic and brotherly basis.

In conclusion then, it is the opinion of this writer that the veto should be dropped from the Security Council when the U. N. Charter is revised next year. However, if this action were to mean the dissolution of the U. N., I do not believe that it should be supported in 1955. Although the eradication of the veto is absolutely necessary for a stronger world organization, nevertheless I person-

ally feel that the U. N. should be supported by this Nation at almost any cost. In the past 10 years this organization has made a lasting contribution in preserving world peace at the conference table, as well as through the supervision of relief measures throughout the world. Because the U. N. serves ably in the capacity as a roundtable for free discussion and the formulation of opinion, it necessarily follows that if it ceased to exist the nations of the world would be placed in a position where they could no longer rely upon world opinion in support of their actions. In the case of the United States our efforts to thwart the imperialistic attempts of the U. S. S. R. would be blinded, and we would be forced to follow a foreign policy of trial and error in consideration of the opinions of the other members of the world family of nations. The gravest problem which is before this Nation and the rest of the world is, however, the devastating effects of atomic tools of war. To insure a world of peace, it is this writer's opinion that we must operate through the U. N., and specifically work for a stronger world unity. In taking real, effective action of this kind the threat of the bomb which hangs over us all will be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN, Mr. Patrick S. Kirwan, chairman, Americans for Democratic Action, Louisville, Ky.

STATEMENT OF PATRICK S. KIRWAN, CHAIRMAN, LOUISVILLE CHAPTER, AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Mr. KIRWAN. Senator Wiley, Senator Cooper, Congressman Robison, my name is Patrick S. Kirwan. I am chairman of the Louisville Chapter of Americans for Democratic Action. Our chapter was established 7 years ago and has a current membership of approximately 125.

I approach the subject of amendments to the Charter of the United Nations with a sense of deep humility and sincere concern. I and the members of the organization for which I speak are average Americans from all walks of life: housewives, businessmen, laboring people, schoolteachers, attorneys, and physicians. I, myself, am in the insurance business. Like most Americans, all of us are busy at our various tasks and certainly none of us would consider himself an authority on this subject.

PURPOSE OF HEARING

For that very reason I believe, gentlemen of the Senate, our concern and opinion about this matter is in accord with the purpose you had in mind when you scheduled this kind of hearing. I am quite sure that there is an abundance of valuable scholarly opinion available to your committee and I am equally confident that you are making valuable use of this material. But as I understand it, in these hearings you are attempting to ascertain what the many millions of average Americans think about the United Nations and, more particularly, about the revision of its charter.

U. N. AN INSTRUMENT FOR ESTABLISHING DESIRABLE WORLD CONDITIONS

I believe that most Americans regard the United Nations as the only possible hope for achieving and maintaining peace, security, and prosperity on a worldwide basis. I do not believe that most Americans are confident that the U. N. can accomplish this task. But I do believe they regard it as the only available instrument for establishing conditions throughout the world which all men of good will regard as most desirable.

In America we have grown accustomed to getting things done in a hurry. We definitely believe in, and our accomplishments give us the right to believe in, the old anecdote that "the difficult we do immediately; the impossible will take a little longer." This attitude of self-confidence has built us, in less than 2 centuries, into the happiest, most envied, and most powerful nation in the world. This attitude is most valuable and we must never lose it. But because we are confident that nothing is impossible in America, we must not allow ourselves to become impatient with the rest of the world. We must not expect the United Nations to resolve all the complex problems of the world in a decade or in even five decades. We would do well to remember that even in amazing America it was not until 1918, more than 14 decades after the Declaration of Independence, that the United States became generally recognized as the strongest Nation in the world.

U. N.'s JOB IS LONG RANGE

The job which the United Nations has to do is not an overnight task. It is definitely a long-range job. We dare not lose patience with the 2 billion people who live in the Eastern Hemisphere, millions of whom have never known what it was like to have enough to eat even for 1 day. America has done and is doing much to relieve the hungry and poverty-stricken peoples in every corner of the globe. We must continue to do so, not much—but more. The United Nations provides us with the instrument through which we, with our industrial and agricultural genius, can assist less fortunate peoples to get themselves on a self-sufficient basis. When we have accomplished this, we will have laid the cornerstone for world peace and prosperity.

CALLING OF REVISION CONFERENCE FAVORED

As to the proposed conference for the revision of the United Nations Charter some time next year, I am in favor of it. I cannot say that I am very hopeful of much constructive change in the present imperfections of the charter, but I firmly believe that the effort should be made. Mr. Malik, speaking for the Soviet Union, has already announced that he is opposed to even discussing revision. He contends, and quite correctly I think, that the real object is to weaken Russia's position within the United Nations. Certainly it has been the consistent bad behavior of the Soviet Union with its exasperating and frustrating use of the veto that has prompted us and the other free nations to seek some means of overcoming the obstacles which Russia constantly puts in the path of progress within the U. N.

VETO POWER SHOULD NOT BE ELIMINATED

I do not think we should attempt to completely do away with the veto power. I do not believe that any of the five nations which enjoy this power would be willing to give it up entirely. Certainly Nationalist China would not hesitate to use the veto if the U. N. voted to recognize Red China, as was suggested in here several times today.

I am more inclined to agree with the Manchester Guardian editorial of September 24, 1953, from which I quote:

The one outstanding action of the United Nations as a guarantor of collective security—the resistance of aggression in Korea—was possible only because the Soviet delegation happened to be boycotting the Security Council in the summer of 1950 * * * so no veto was cast. But the lesson was not lost on the great majority of the United Nations members. At the next General Assembly they hastened to pass, almost without opposition, proposals to permit the veto to be sidestepped. Under the revised system the Security Council remains the first arbiter on threats to peace, but after a veto has been cast a simple majority of the Council may call an immediate General Assembly. The Assembly can then recommend action. The system is far from satisfactory, for it is slow and clumsy, and serious anomalies stand in the division of authority between Council and Assembly. One object of trying to revise the charter would be to improve the system and remove the anomalies. One result, if the revisions are effective, would be to weaken Russia's power of obstruction. To that extent Mr. Malik is right. He has his own Government to blame.

That is the end of the quotation.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I am prepared to say.

I want to thank you and the members of the committee in behalf of my organization for giving us your attention.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you were the former State president of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. KIRWAN. No; president of the American Federation of Teachers.

The CHAIRMAN. Of teachers?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And you think that you have expressed, in substance, their ideas on this subject?

Mr. KIRWAN. Well, I would hesitate to say that, Senator. I have had no direct connection with them now for several years.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, as a rule they are not a changing lot, are they?

Mr. KIRWAN. Well, I have not found them such.

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, I have four children who at one time were all engaged in the teaching business; I speak from experience.

Thank you very much, sir.

Any questions?

Senator COOPER. No; thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Lewis J. Gorin, Jr., Atlantic Union Committee, of Louisville.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS J. GORIN, JR., ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. GORIN. Senator Wiley, Senator Cooper, Congressman Robsion, my name is Lewis Gorin, Jr.; I am assistant to the general sales manager of the building products division of the Reynolds Metals Co.

I live here in Louisville, and I am speaking today on behalf of the Louisville Chapter of the Atlantic Union Committee.

We have prepared a statement which, in the interest of time, I shall read to you, then I shall welcome any questions.

SIGNIFICANT REVISION OF CHARTER UNWISE

It would be unwise to attempt any significant revision or amendment of the United Nations Charter. Such an attempt, if seriously pursued, would destroy the useful function of the United Nations as

a point of contact, a forum of open debate, for all the governments of the world, both the representative and tyrannical. It presently serves that purpose. Its universal character should not be destroyed.

PROVIDING UN WITH POWER TO ENFORCE PEACE UNWISE

It would be both unrealistic and unwise to provide the United Nations with power to enforce peace, as some have proposed. Firstly, agreement could not be reached by its present members as to implementation of such power and any attempt to effect it could only lead to disagreement and destruction of the organization—although destruction of the United Nations is the fond wish of some, that organization does serve a purpose for the cause of freedom as presently organized by allowing us continuous contact on the plane of debate with the entrenched enemies of freedom. Secondly, assuming that the United Nations could be given the power to enforce peace, this would be undesirable if freedom is our purpose. Such power would necessarily be of a dictatorial character, since only 15 percent of the people of the world are self-governing, and the United Nations could not, therefore, be constituted with a representative character.

It is assumed that those who advocate revision or amendment of the United Nations Charter do so in the hope that a way may be found to effect the purpose of the United Nations as set forth in its charter, to wit: Peace and freedom.

UNION OF FREE NATIONS SUGGESTED

Since it has been demonstrated over the past 8 years that the United Nations cannot accomplish these purposes and since the United Nations cannot be made into an organization of functioning representative government without destroying its universal character, it is suggested that other means should be pursued to effect the purposes of freedom and peace. It is further suggested that a convention be brought about of officially designated representatives of a few or more of the free nations to formulate and recommend for adoption or rejection by popular vote a plan for governmental union of free nations. In this way, strength such as union alone can create could be provided on the side of freedom to enforce peace and guard individual liberty. Strength provided by this means would be the servant of representative government, instead of a Frankenstein force responsible only to the United Nations, an unrepresentative organization.

A union of free nations is the best means so far suggested for enforcing both peace and freedom, the stated but presently unattainable purposes of the United Nations.

The foregoing statement speaks only for the undersigned, but we believe the statement would be approved in substance by others with whom we are associated in the Atlantic Union Committee in Louisville, Lexington, Danville, Owensboro, and Paducah, Ky., and elsewhere.

This is signed by Dr. H. S. Warwick, professor of history at the University of Louisville; Miss Dorothy P. Walton, of Louisville; Mr. L. B. McIntire, C. P. A., of Louisville; Norman E. Isaacs, managing editor of the Louisville Times; Margaret G. McIntire, housewife;

Albert E. Loeffler, Jr., a businessman of Louisville; Dr. Caldwell, the president of the Presbyterian Seminary; Dr. Duke K. McCall, the president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Any questions, Senator Cooper?

Senator COOPER. I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Dr. R. A. Warner, professor of government and international affairs, University of Louisville.

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. WARNER, PROFESSOR AND CHAIRMAN,
DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE, LOUISVILLE, KY.**

Mr. WARNER. My name is Robert Warner, and I am a professor at the University of Louisville, and actually the views expressed are mine and of myself.

As a teacher of international relations and a student of history and international diplomacy and organization, I approach the subject of proposals for amendment of existing international peace and security organizations with modesty and trepidation but with high concern.

I am aware of the many views, minority but substantial, which diverge from the policies for peace and security represented by the U. N. and its affiliated agencies, and I am aware of the frustrating experience of the years of their attempted use. I am, however, in agreement with the purposes, the principles, and the wisdom of these policies and these organizations in the situation of the nations and peoples of the world.

My approach has been limited, practical, and realistic, and to that end I have listed a number of facts and issues which are on the paper before you. I could read those complete, if you wish, or I could skip over to the conclusions which I draw from those facts and issues.

The CHAIRMAN. We will insert as much of your statement as you want in the record, and if you will go to the conclusions, we will appreciate it. Time is flying.

SUBSTANTIAL REVISION NOW APT TO WEAKEN OR DESTROY U. N.

Mr. WARNER. All right, sir.

In my opinion, the conclusion is inescapable that any revision retaining the basic principles of the U. N. approach to world peace and security are unobtainable at this time. To make any comment on political issues and matters affecting this situation would take me beyond the subject of this hearing.

I believe we should approach the 10th Assembly and any forthcoming conference for review of the charter with the realization firmly in mind that any substantial revision at the present time is likely to weaken or destroy the U. N. system as originally conceived.

On the other hand, both at the Assembly and at such a conference a sincere support of these principles by members, including the United States, is likely to have a beneficial effect upon world understanding of the true friends and enemies of peace, security, and the freedom and welfare of all peoples.

VIEWS ON U. N. AND RELEVANT POLICIES

I am, however, in agreement:

1. That for the atomic and air age, the present international organization and policies being followed by the nations of the world are wholly inadequate for peace and security;

2. That the present organization of the U. N. and the specialized agencies are basic and should be expected eventually to be modified and revised into an adequate organization;

3. That continual serious consideration and study should be devoted to our purposes and obligations as a member and to the policies to be adopted within and supplementary to our membership;

4. That the approaching General Assembly in 1955 is an appropriate time for a more comprehensive review of the developments and our policies in relation to our commitments in regard to international peace and security;

5. That the American people, as all other peoples of the world, should become increasingly informed and aware of the purposes and responsibilities of world organization and the policies essential for world peace and security; and

6. That the open hearings conducted by this subcommittee are highly commendable to that end.

CRITICISMS OF U. N. DUE TO LACK OF INFORMATION AND EXPERIENCE

I further believe that the American people are morally and permanently resolved in faith and hope to the purposes and principles of the U. N. and that the criticisms are due to the lack of information and experience in world politics and with the machinery for its operation provided by the U. N., the specialized agencies, and international diplomacy. Primarily the criticisms are engendered by prejudices and fears due to the critical state of affairs in the world, a situation we must expect for a long time to continue.

RESULTS OF COLLEGE POLL

A college poll, undertaken with a view to this hearing by a class in our college of arts and sciences showed a strong majority believing in the U. N. as a success, most "as a forum for discussing world problems," next "in relieving the ravages of World War II," next "in assisting world concentration," next "in preventing the cold war becoming world war III," next "in suppressing successful aggression in Korea," and least, but still a majority, "in providing for our security."

Faced by the general question "Do you think the U. N. has become a success, failure, neither?" the largest number chose "neither," but nearly double the number believed it a success rather than a failure. Furthermore 40 times as many answered "No" as answered "Yes" to the question "Should the United States withdraw from the U. N.?" The vote was 3 to 2 against the abolition of the veto and nearly 5 times as many said they would be "alarmed" as said they would be "relieved" "if Russia should withdraw." Four times as many thought "a conference to review the charter should be held at this time." I believe this a typical evidence of support of the U. N. and interest in its study and improvement by the oncoming generation.

I include in the papers submitted a tabulation of the poll which is appended, and I have also appended as an individual testimony of the national faith of our young people in the U. N. approach. I append an unedited answer just received to an examination question "Is the U. N. more important as a practical plan or as an idea?"

I think you will find it a moving declaration of faith in the U. N. and a realization of the problems and of the length of time necessary to achieve a successful and a viable plan in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Any questions?

RESULTS FROM A GENERAL REVIEW CONFERENCE

Senator COOPER. I would just like to say that I think the doctor here has submitted a very comprehensive analysis of the history of the U. N., pointing to the issues which have developed out of its history and the basic agreement upon many of those issues. I think it is a very worthwhile document.

I would like to ask him 1 or 2 questions. Doctor, today it has been said several times that if a conference should be called, there is not much hope that any action would be taken, but that, to the contrary, it would provide a forum in which the aims of the United States might be attacked, and that it might be dangerous to the U. N.

That seems to imply that there is not hope or much value in the statements of the United States and other free nations.

Do you take the position that the U. N. serves just as a good vehicle for Soviet propaganda, and that we are entirely helpless in that field?

Mr. WARNER. No, I do not. I think there have been occasions in which, harassed by the complications, aroused, as all men must be, by the critical issues, that the halls of the U. N. have been used for that sort of word battle.

On the whole, and by and large, however, I believe that the interests and policies and purposes of the United States in the U. N. will reveal themselves through our representatives to such a conference, and that the advantage would redound to our side, and I do not view it with alarm or fear.

Senator COOPER. You subscribe to the idea that a world judgment expressed in these meetings, even though it may not be accepted, has value?

Mr. WARNER. If this world judgment flew in the face of a minority determination which would veto any action, I am not sure that its effect would be beneficial. It would depend on what policies were thereafter followed.

I think that the risk of war at the present time is, of course, due to the basic alinement of the world into 2 camps, 2 armed camps, and that that is of the most crucial character at the present time, and that if the world support for the perfectly valid American position resulted in inadvisable acts, that split might be made irrevocable, and the U. N. in its original plan, as a universal and practical world organization, might be destroyed.

Senator COOPER. I do not think I was specific enough. My point is this: Suppose a conference is held, and no agreement is reached on any change. Of course, Russia could veto any decision made. But if in

that conference the United States and other nations of like purposes should make it clear what their purposes were, that they were for peace, always with justice, not just peace, and there was that kind of a judgment taken by a majority of the members, which did not become effective because of a Russian veto, do you think that that kind of an expression of world judgment would be valuable?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, I certainly do.

Senator COOPER. For the position to which we adhere?

Mr. WARNER. Yes, it would be very valuable.

Senator COOPER. That is all I want to ask.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Doctor.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Warner follows:)

STATEMENT OF ROBERT A. WARNER, PROFESSOR AND CHAIRMAN OF THE DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF LOUISVILLE

As a teacher of international relations and a student of history and international diplomacy and organization, I approach the subject of proposals for amendment of existing international peace and security organizations with modesty and trepidation but with high concern. I am aware of the many views, minority but substantial, which diverge from the policies for peace and security represented by the U. N. and its affiliated agencies and I am aware of the frustrating experience of the years of their attempted use. I am, however, in agreement with the purposes, the principles and the wisdom of these policies and these organizations in the situation of the nations and peoples of the world.

In formulating my opinion of present proposals to amend or revise these policies and organizations, I have considered principally the following facts and issues:

FACTS

1. The U. N. was the product of the wartime alliance against aggression, imperialism, and fascism and promoted throughout by the United States.

2. The U. N. is the establishment of a general and, so far as possible, universal security system based upon the principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and upon recognition of the predominant responsibility of the great powers in matters relating to peace and security.

3. The intransigence, at the least, and the apparently imperialistic policies of the Communist states has strained the U. N. and resulted in—

(a) The blocking of action in the Security Council by the unanimity rule and the use of the Assembly instead.

(b) The exclusion (by deadlock) of a score of nations seeking membership. (The protest abstention from the Council by the U. S. S. R. against the Nationalist government instead of the Communist government representing China resulted in prompt action by the Council in Korea, and then the hurried return of the U. S. S. R. to the Council.)

(c) The use of the floor and councils of the U. N. for recrimination, castigation and maneuver in a propaganda war.

(d) Increased reliance upon political and military alliance for our security.

4. Any alteration of the present charter recommended by a conference would take effect only when ratified by two-thirds of the U. N. members including all the permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, Great Britain, United States of America, U. S. S. R.).

ISSUES

1. Is a better charter possible in the state of world politics, especially the political situation in the United States and the U. S. S. R.?

2. Could a conference at this time seriously and cooperatively review and improve the wording of the charter?

3. Would a clearer and explicit definition of aggression by the charter be possible?

4. If a conference produced a better charter despite the Communists, and Russia vetoed its adoption, should we leave the U. N. and set up the new organization?

5. Is an effort to revise the charter at this time wise? (I. e., would we, by a showdown with Russia, try to obtain a better charter with or without Communist participation?)

6. What would be the effect on American public opinion of a conference and the public airing of the needs and weakness of the charter?

7. Would a conference for revision redound to the advantage of the free world? A "propaganda" advantage?

8. What would be the effect on our allies of an American policy of pushing for a revision? For what revisions?

9. What would be the effect on the neutrals and upon the satellite nations?

10. Would it be advisable to loosen and weaken the charter, if strengthening it is impossible?

In my opinion the conclusion is inescapable that any revisions retaining the basic principles of the U. N. approach to world peace and security are unobtainable at this time. To make any comment on political issues and matters affecting this situation would take me beyond the subject of this hearing. I believe we should approach the 10th Assembly and any forthcoming conference for review of the charter with the realization firmly in mind that any substantial revision at the present time is likely to weaken or destroy the U. N. system as originally conceived. On the other hand, both at the Assembly and at such a conference a sincere support of those principles by members, including the United States, is likely to have a beneficial effect upon world understanding of the true friends and enemies of peace, security, and the freedom and welfare of all peoples.

I am, however, in agreement that—

1. For the atomic and air age, the present international organization and policies being followed by the nations of the world are wholly inadequate for peace and security;

2. The present organization of the U. N. and the specialized agencies are basic and should be expected eventually to be modified and revised into an adequate organization;

3. Continual serious consideration and study should be devoted to our purposes and obligations as a member and to the policies to be adopted within and supplementary to our membership;

4. The approaching General Assembly in 1955 is an appropriate time for a more comprehensive review of the developments and our policies in relation to our commitments in regard to international peace and security;

5. The American people, as all other peoples of the world, should become increasingly informed and aware of the purposes and responsibilities of world organization and the policies essential for world peace and security; and

6. The open hearings conducted by this subcommittee are highly commendable to that end.

I further believe that the American people are morally and permanently resolved in faith and hope to the purposes and principles of the U. N. and that the criticisms are due to the lack of information and experience in world politics and with the machinery for its operation provided by the U. N., the specialized agencies, and international diplomacy. Primarily the criticisms are engendered by prejudices and fears due to the critical state of affairs in the world, a situation we must expect for a long time to continue.

A college poll, undertaken with a view to this hearing by a class in our college of arts and sciences showed a strong majority believing in the U. N. as a success; most "as a forum for discussing world problems"; next "in relieving the ravages of World War II"; next "in assisting world cooperation"; next in "preventing the cold war becoming world war III"; next "in suppressing successful aggression in Korea, and least, but still a majority in providing for our security."

Faced by the general question "Do you think the U. N. has been a success, failure, neither?" the largest number chose "neither," but nearly double the number believed it a success rather than a failure. Furthermore 40 times as many answered "No" as answered "Yes" to the question "Should the United States withdraw from the U. N.?" The vote was 3 to 2 against the abolition of the veto and nearly 5 times as many said they would be "alarmed" as said they would be "relieved" "if Russia should withdraw." Four times as many thought "a conference to review the charter should be held at this time." I believe this a typical evidence of support of the U. N. and interest in its study and improvement by the oncoming generation. (A tabulation of the poll is appended.)

As an individual testimony of the rational faith of our young people in the U. N. approach I append an unedited answer just received to an examination question "Is the U. N. more important as a practical plan or as an idea?"

"It must be apparent to the thoughtful observer that the ideal of the U. N. is not only more important but is in fact the ultimate reality and practicability.

"For centuries the practical plans to form a world community or secure peace, etc., have failed completely. They aren't practical but illusory. The ideology of the U. N. is simply that people in the world today are very different one from another. They don't like the same things, don't know about the same things, don't want the same things. They all want one thing, however: peace and security.

"The best way to seek a way to maintain peace: The ideology of the United States doesn't require that everyone think and act alike, only that they be charitable and understanding about how others do. This is the main difference between the ideology of the U. N. and that of world communism. The Communist says that there is only one type of government, and that it is good for everybody. It believes its security threatened unless everyone thinks alike and if they don't they must be removed. The Communist says, 'I have a plan to bring about the millenium but everybody must conform to achieve it.' The nationalist says, 'I don't have a plan and I don't care if anyone outside my own country has one or not. Whatever was done, is being done, or will be done by my country in the pursuit of its self-interest is always right.' The U. N. approach is more of a combination of these, with voluntary overtones. It says, 'We have a plan, a very basic plan. It doesn't require conformity except to the extent of wanting peace and being willing to work for it.' The emphasis here is not on conformity but modification. The colonial power must or should modify its attitude to its non-self-governing people. The nationalistic power must curb its appetite for territory and glory and conquest. The theocratic state must modify its attempts to save the world. The Communist state must modify its aims to destroy an alien economic method and the republican form of government.

"There are two types of nationalism. One, supernationalism, is incompatible with a world outlook. In the first place, it has neither respect for nor confidence in any other country. It is selfish and hardened to the plight of people as individuals and thinks of them as nationals. It can't cooperate because it uses cooperation as a base upon which to augment self-interest. World communism as a pure ideal would be harmful but Soviet nationalistic communism is even worse because it includes the worst factors of each of these two ideologies.

"Most Americans, I believe, embrace the second type of nationalism. Its concepts are based on pride in the history and tradition of a nation, trust in its present leaders, confidence in its form of government as being the best for that people at that time in their political development. It doesn't preclude an appreciation of other nations.

"The American point of view is that all people want to live at peace with their neighbors, and that the ideals expressed in the charter are feasible, but before they can be completely achieved disparities between nations and peoples must be equalized. This means that the underdeveloped country must be aided by the developed and this not for exploitation but real help. That the uneducated must have learning, the ragged clothed, the hungry fed, the sick made well. This is no idle dream; it is within the realm of possibility. All it takes is money and men. The U. N. now can supply the administrative force, the underdeveloped nations the manpower, and the wealthy nations the money. To the anguished cry of the wealthy nation the U. N. would reply that this function is complementary to the incoming of lasting peace and that a reduction in defense spending would leave enough money available for the most grandiose schemes, not to speak of practical humanitarian ideas.

"But this machine is slow to put into operation. All the parts must function, and to get them to do so requires that they learn to give and take, to risk, to compromise, and trust each other. The ideal of the American is that this functioning will become progressively easier over a period of time, if the machine doesn't break down first. If the U. N. is the machine, then the American thinks of NATO and other regional arrangements coupled with the atomic bomb as the baling wire that is holding it together temporarily.

"The ideal of the U. N. looks to a diminution of this 'baling wire' because it is the practical plan of the U. N. and that part of it which is most susceptible to failure.

"As yet we tend to think of the nonpolitical aspects of the U. N., such as the ECOSOC, UNICEF, and the specialized agencies as the practical features and the political aspects as the ideal. We depend less and less on the General

Assembly and Security Council to secure peace for us and more and more on military power and concerted defense effort with nations like ourselves."

Results of polls

Questions	Yes		No	
	College	High school ¹	College	High school ¹
1. Do you think a conference to review the charter should be held at this time:.....	236	99	19	6
2. Do you think the U. N. has been a—				
Success?.....	112	57		
Failure?.....	62	0		
Neither?.....	133	114		
3. In which of the following has the U. N. been a success or failure:				
In providing for our security:				
Success.....	141	94		
Failure.....	116	15		
In preventing the cold war becoming world war III:				
Success.....	159	94		
Failure.....	104	14		
In suppressing successful aggression in Korea:				
Success.....	180	74		
Failure.....	127	20		
In assisting world cooperation:				
Success.....	196	67		
Failure.....	81	9		
In relieving the ravages of World War II:				
Success.....	232	71		
Failure.....	61	3		
In providing a forum for discussing world problems:				
Success.....	265	93		
Failure.....	81	7		
4. Should the veto be abolished?.....	109	24	159	84
5. Do you think the United States should withdraw from the U. N.?.....	7	10	280	73
6. If Russia should withdraw, would you be—				
Relieved?.....	52	7		
Alarmed?.....	249	57		

¹ A poll of 8 high-school classes, about 130 students, showed these results.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Glenn A. McLain, Richmond, Ky., director of eastern Kentucky center of international relations.

STATEMENT OF GLENN A. McLAIN, DIRECTOR, EASTERN KENTUCKY CENTER OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, RICHMOND, KY.

Mr. McLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I speak today for myself and also for the center of international relations at Eastern Kentucky State College, at Richmond, Ky. I have a very brief statement here. I know time is almost up, so I shall read it.

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

When the United Nations Charter became effective on October 24, 1945, various specialized agencies were provided for to handle international problems in the economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields. The charter specifically provided for the creation of these agencies which have been brought into relationship with the United Nations in accordance with article 68. Eleven agencies are at present operating autonomously under the technical aegis of the United Nations.

The general opinion held by most Americans in regard to these agencies is that the Secretariat exercises control in matters of policy.

Under articles 17, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 66, 70, 91, and 96 there is a definite but limited relationship between the agencies and the Secretariat.

Occasional publicity emanating from the specialized agencies has resulted in unfavorable public opinion in America. In the view of American Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., the independence of the specialized agencies, and the lack of jurisdiction exercised by the Secretariat results in ill-advised publicity and inefficiency in operations of the United Nations administration. A particular case in example is the work of the United Nations Educational, Social, and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO

UNESCO has perhaps aroused more critical comment in America than any of the other 11 specialized agencies. The high principles and even altruism present in the Constitution of UNESCO demands a certain type of understanding on the part of people everywhere. This type of idealism can best be understood by reviewing just a few of the principles which underlie the Constitution of UNESCO.

1. The raising of educational standards.
2. Improving the literacy of people in backward areas.
3. Developing closer relations among peoples through films, radio, press, books, and the exchange of persons.
4. Educational reconstruction in countries devastated by war.
5. A study in tensions and prejudices that separate people.

It is rather obvious that any organization having as its field of operations the wide range of activity prescribed by the UNESCO charter will find determined opposition on general principles by numbers of people in the world. Any agency which attempts to advise in every type of informal media has a public relations job to do concerning its activities. UNESCO has not always been able to get its message across to the peoples of the world. Consequently, many people in the United States and throughout the world have misunderstood the activities of UNESCO and other specialized agencies engaged in similar educative efforts in other fields. If these problems were not difficult enough for the specialized agencies, let us consider the authority of the Ambassadors to the U. N. and their relationship to the agencies. A hypothetical example will illustrate this particular issue.

UNESCO has developed a rather comprehensive system of publications to be distributed to public schools in America and throughout the world. When pamphlets are sent out, various groups have been known to complain about the "one world slant" "atheistic ideas on education" and many other misinformed statements which are often taken from U. N. bulletins or pamphlets. The usual reaction in America to such slanted information concerning UNESCO is for—

1. The local group (Veterans Club, or other) to issue statements to the press which are often fallacious because of the lack of knowledge concerning the objectives of UNESCO.
2. Citizens write to their Senator or Congressman who in turn contact the official representative of the United States, the American Ambassador to the United Nations.

Although the American Ambassador to the United Nations is not responsible to an electorate, he wishes to do his representative best to help develop understanding in America concerning the problems and activities of the United Nations. If he goes to the Secretary General, he is not even allowed to discuss the relationships of the specialized agencies to the United Nations. The Secretary General can only consult with the specialized agency, and his advice does not have any force in any respect. His authority is as limited as the authority of any special Ambassador to the United Nations.

Furthermore, to complicate matters, if more than one specialized agency is involved in any discussion, individual contacts must be made with each of the agencies involved. None of the member nations of the United Nations have the staff to engage in such duplicative administrative procedure. It should therefore be obvious that simplification of administrative procedures should be of benefit to each member nation of the United Nations.

SECRETARY GENERAL SHOULD BE GIVEN CERTAIN CONTROL OVER SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

To further these objectives the following recommendations would seem to help achieve more administrative efficiency, better public relations, and a greater spirit of unity in the functional organization of United Nations' relations.

1. Through appropriate amendments or through existing charter provisions, provide for the exercise of jurisdiction by the Secretary General over the budgets and the general operational procedures of the various specialized agencies.

2. By appropriate delegation of authority, grant the privilege to all United Nations Ambassadors of consulting with the Secretary General concerning the activities of the specialized agencies.

WORK OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES SHOULD BE PUBLICIZED TO WORLD

A further step of great importance is to publicize the multipurpose activities of the specialized agencies to all peoples of the world. The work of these agencies has already contributed many useful and valuable services to the overall operations of the United Nations. If the proper delegation of authority is authorized through charter revision or through implementation of existing provisions, the work of the U. N. will continue to progress. All Americans and all citizens of the world are sincerely interested in these objectives whatever the dissenting opinions regarding methods in achieving results to develop peace and international enlightenment.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Well, friends, the hour has come when we will have to recess this meeting. Before I do so, however, I want to ask Senator Cooper to say a few words, and also your Congressman to say a few words, and I will close with a few words. Senator Cooper?

CLOSING REMARKS OF SENATOR COOPER

Senator COOPER. Mr. Chairman, and all of you who have attended these hearings, first, I would like to say that I am very, very happy that a hearing of this special committee of the Senate Committee on

Foreign Relations has been held here in Louisville to receive recommendations respecting the review of the United Nations Charter.

I have accepted the suggestion made by someone that the charter itself says "review" and not "revision."

I think that from the wide variety of suggestions that have been made today, and from the number of organizations, is shown an indication of the real interest that this community and this State has in this problem. And, as I stated at the very outset, those who have offered their suggestions, either personally or for their organizations, must go away from here today knowing that they are actually participating in the suggestions that will be made by the Senate, by this committee, to the executive branch of the Government.

I think this hearing also has shown so evidently and clearly the deep interest of our people in Kentucky, as, in truth, all of the people in the United States, in finding some better method of averting war, because, as the one witness here today who spoke on behalf of that group of young men who must always go to war, said, it was of great concern in their hearts.

Before I close, I would like to say also that I am deeply grateful to the chairman for coming here, and to our colleague, Senator Gillette. I have served on a committee with the chairman. Because of his character, forthrightness, and broad vision, and, I think, the good humor that all of us have seen here today, I have really learned to respect him greatly and to have a deep affection for him.

He has been one of my idols, and my ideals in the Senate, and I am awfully glad that he could come here. Too, I felt very, very honored that Senator Gillette could come and meet with us, as could my colleague, John Robsion.

[Applause.]

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE ROBSION

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, I think Louisville and Kentucky have been particularly honored that this city was selected as one of the very few in the United States for the great Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in which they felt the citizenry had something to offer to the sum total knowledge of the committee.

We are indebted to Dr. Vinsel and Dr. Davidson and others who have worked to make this program a success. We are very happy to have you, and we appreciate your coming.

COSTS OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN U. N.

I want to make one observation about the costs to the United Nations which have been referred to. The costs of the United States' participation in the United Nations amount to the amount that it costs to clean the streets of New York City 1 year, which is not so much.

It has been estimated that the visitors and the delegates attending the United Nations spend more money with the American storekeepers than we expend to have the United Nations in the United States, so the costs of the United Nations to this country are very little in comparison to other factors, and I do not think it makes too much difference about the cost, because it is more than made up in other ways.

Thank you so much for coming to Louisville.

[Applause.]

CLOSING REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Well, ladies and gentlemen of Louisville and the surrounding territory, we came, and you conquered us with your graciousness and your hospitality.

We came, as we said, not to instruct but to be instructed. We realize that here in America, and, oh, what a wonderful thing it is, we can differ in our religious concepts, in our political concepts, in our economic concepts, and still be friends.

Of course, the question of what the United Nations can perform is one of the great problems of the future. Here in this land Abraham Lincoln was born, he lived in this State, and I must say that his life has influenced mine a great deal. I remember on another occasion when we had a meeting of the United Nations subcommittee in Ohio, I was asked to speak to a high school group; I do not know how many hundred students were there. I could not help but think then of how we say that men's thinking affect their lives.

Now, Lincoln had, as I have said before, three great principles. One was he developed a sense of humor. I know that when his Cabinet meetings were held, the Cabinet members sat around the table like this, and defeat came, defeat from the West and the South. The folks who sat around the table were all men with college degrees, all but Lincoln, and they had fear in their hearts and their muscles were rigid, and he knew that they were no good to him or their country in that condition, so what did he do? He told a story. Where did he learn that wisdom to get men to relax so they could do their best work? Not out of books, but out of life, out of the college of adversity.

Then he had another great principle—he believed in prayer. He said, "When I have no other place to go, I go to my knees." Your President, President Eisenhower, opens every Cabinet meeting with silent prayer.

Today, we hear a lot about the challenging age in which we live. We know that of ourselves we are inadequate, but we know that there is One who is adequate, and if we can tune in like Lincoln did, we will find the answers. You and I had better do a little of that tuning in because America needs you.

Then Lincoln had a third great avenue. Here in the land where you have monuments to the Confederate troops and to the Union troops, as you know, Lincoln had a selfless devotion to a great cause, and that cause was the Republic, so much so that when Horace Greeley of the New York Tribune said, "Let the South go," he said, "No."

Why? We could have been another Europe if we had followed that advice. We could have been 48 nations cutting each other's throats. But on bended knee Lincoln said, "No," and so we are one people again, and today, as we face the future, searching for the answers as he did when the Nation was divided, let us go forward with faith, with a belief that the way will be shown, and it is a critical hour.

So, my friends, I want to take this opportunity to extend my appreciation to you, the people of Louisville. Of course, all of us here do not find ourselves in complete agreement, but we all respect the rights, as I have said, of the other fellow.

In that connection, let me say that some people have said that the members of the subcommittee are going about the country getting views about world government; others say that the committee is too conservative in its approach.

I want to make it perfectly clear that the members of the subcommittee are here mainly seeking your views, as I have said many times. We have no preconceived notions as to what will be our recommendations, what the conclusions will be upon the facts as we get them.

We have nothing to sell; we are after information. We think we got some here today.

I sincerely hope that this meeting has encouraged a greater interest in your Government, in its preservation, in the problem of charter review, and I hope that the people of Kentucky will continue the important task of exploring the issues involved.

I am reminded of the fact that Columbus, after sailing days and weeks, and when the crew was discouraged and even mutinied, said, "Sail on." If Columbus had not done it, you and I might not have been here.

Sail on. So it is a question of sail on, oh, ship of state.

And, friends of Kentucky, let us join together and see that the ship of state sails over the troubled waters.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

(Whereupon, upon at 4:50 p. m., the committee adjourned.)

×