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 2

FEBRUARY 12, 1954
AKRON, OHIO

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
42435 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. CAPEHART, 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 126 AND 193, 83D CONGRESS

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

HOMER FERGUSON, Michigan	SPESSARD 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 MARCY, *Consultant*
FRANCIS R. VALEO, *Staff Associate*
(on loan from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)
MORELLA HANSEN, *Research Assistant*
JUNE C. PITTS, *Financial Assistant*

---

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

CONTENTS

Statement of— Page

Birnbaum, Mrs. I. R., president, Akron League of Women Voters 66
Cotton, John V., attorney, Council of Churches of Akron and Summit County 81
Doutt, Howard M., professor of secretarial science, Akron University; advisory council, United World Federalists of Akron 98
Duryee, Mrs. Gerald, representative, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution 74
Erich, Rudolph, president, Croatian-American Citizens Club 124
Fetter, Rev. C. Willard, First Evangelical United Brethren Church, Akron Ministerial Association 102
Glazer, Joseph, educational director, United Rubber Workers 118
Harden, Raymond, State highway department 106, 148
Horn, David L., student, Oberlin College; United World Federalists of Oberlin 140
Ingham, Roy, chairman, international relations committee, Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce 69
Johnstone, Mrs. Max, teacher, Akron public schools 94
Long, Mrs. Harry C., United Church Women of Ohio 115
MacGowan, Thomas G., director of marketing research, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; vice president, United World Federalists of Akron 107
Miller, Joseph G., attorney, president, Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce 125
Piotter, Edward, Goodyear Aircraft Corp 129
Robbins, Miss Stella, Akron Public Library 89
Van Horn, Dr. Harold, professor of political science, Kent State University; member, Americans for Democratic Action 86
Whipple, Robert P., attorney, treasurer, Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce 137
Wise, Chester A., attorney, Summit County Bar Association 77

Insertions:

Letter from Thomas A. Burke, United States Senator from Ohio 65
Letter from William H. Ayres, Member of Congress from Akron, Ohio 66
Statement of L. S. Buckmaster, president, United Rubber Workers of America, CIO 122
Resolution of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce 125

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER,
Akron, Ohio.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2 p. m. in the auditorium of Simon Perkins Junior High School, Akron, Ohio, Senator Alexander Wiley (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Wiley and Mansfield.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. We meet today in this beautiful city of Akron to receive testimony from representatives of various organizations and from individuals who have indicated an interest in the work of this special Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter.

I should like at the outset to express my thanks to Mayor Berg, Mr. Brittain, and the many other citizens of Akron who have assisted the subcommittee in the arrangements for this hearing. Everyone has been most helpful in every respect, and it is a pleasure and honor to be in this great city in the heart of industrial America.

I would like to introduce my colleague, Senator Mansfield of Montana, one of our most able Senators. Other members of the subcommittee, including Senator Gillette, who sponsored the resolution under which we operate, have had other commitments making it impossible for them to attend.

I am told that this is the first time that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has ever met in Ohio. If that is so, I can only say that it has been an unforgivable oversight. There is no State in the Nation in which the committee would be better advised to seek guidance and assistance on matters involving the participation of the United States in world affairs. The very existence of Akron itself is vivid testimony to the importance of international relations to the United States. The great rubber industry of this city depends heavily on raw materials imported from abroad and, to an ever-increasing degree, on finished products that can be sold abroad.

Ohio has also been the home of some of our finest minds who have foreseen the necessity of rational cooperative relations with other nations in the interests of preserving world peace. A great Governor of Ohio, James M. Cox, who was born on a farm in Butler County, was one such mind. And another was a beloved colleague of ours, the late Senator Taft. Bob Taft was a member of this committee and an inspiration not only to us but to the entire Senate. Because of

his many other interests, few people realize how deep was his concern with international affairs and international organization. But before his death, he wrote:

> Our traditional policy of neutrality and noninterference with other nations was based on the principle that this policy was the best way to avoid disputes with other nations and to maintain the liberty of this country without war * * * I have always felt, however, that we should depart from this principle if we could set up an effective international organization, because in the long run the success of such an organization should be the most effective assurance of world peace and therefore of American peace.

And that, in a sense, is why this subcommittee is in Akron today. We have come here to take counsel with the people of this area on what can be done to improve the prospects of peace and neighborly cooperation with other nations through international organization. The subcommittee is directed by the Senate, pursuant to Senate Resolution 126, as amended, to study United States participation in the United Nations and regional bodies such as NATO (the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance) and the Organization of the American States.

A SHRINKING WORLD

Why should we find it necessary to study this problem at all? I'll tell you why. It's because science and technology have moved the nations of the world into the same neighborhood. Via the polar route, Ohio and Wisconsin have become more vulnerable to atomic attack than New York or Washington. A few days ago a plane flew at 1,700 miles an hour. Another crossed the continent in less than 5 hours. Out of the many strategic materials which this country needs to maintain its industrial strength, we are self-sufficient in only nine.

What do these facts mean? They mean that no nation can live unto itself alone. We are all in the same backyard whether we like it or not and we have got to take the steps which will enable us to live peacefully together.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVIEW

Almost 10 years ago we took one such step when we set up the United Nations. It hasn't worked as well as we hoped it would but it has also had a great many successes. It has had to contend from the beginning with deliberate obstruction by the Kremlin and we mustn't forget that in trying to make a piece of machinery work a lot depends on the will of the mechanics.

Our job is to see what, if any, other steps should be taken to improve or alter the machinery we have for living at peace with our neighbors. The time is ripe for such a study because the United Nations may meet in general conference after 1955 to review the charter. Prior to that time the subcommittee must report to the Senate on the results of its study so that, that body will be fully prepared to discharge its constitutional functions in the field of foreign policy.

CONSULTING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Review of the charter of the United Nations is a matter which concerns the security and well-being of the American people. This committee proposes to consult the American people.

You know, Lincoln—and this is Lincoln week—Lincoln said that God must have loved the common people, he made so many of them. And somehow or other, out of the heart of the common people come some of the great ideas, just as sometimes, from those who are not college educated have come some of the great inventions. Edison never had a college education.

Now we are meeting head on the challenge of affairs in the world. That's why we are here, and that is why we will go to other cities throughout this great land of ours.

The time is past when foreign policy issues might be left in the hands of a few in Washington. We need, indeed we must have, the understanding and participation of the people of the entire nation if the decisions we make are to be the right decisions, decisions which will best protect the safety and continued progress of our country.

I remember, on one occasion someone said to me, "Senator, just what is the basis of our foreign policy?" I said, "America has had several great basic principles. One has always been the Christian principles; another one is applying the law and the principle of self-preservation."

With changed facts in the world, we sometimes have to change our policies, and that is why we are here today.

Now I would like to call on my associate, a very distinguished Senator, to see if he has any comment at this time.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is that I am in full accord with the remarks made by you. This is an historic event in the history of our country, because for the first time the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate is coming before the people to ask them for help, advice, and guidance. What we are doing in Akron to day, under the leadership of our great chairman, Senator Wiley, of Wisconsin, we hope to do in other parts of the country as well, so that eventually, out of these deliberations between the elected representatives and the people, we might be able to devise ways by means of which the United Nations organization may become a better vehicle for the benefit not only of ourselves, but, let us hope, of all mankind.

That is all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

The subcommittee invited the two Senators from Ohio and Congressman Ayres, of Akron, to sit with it during these hearings. The replies to these invitations will be inserted in the record at this point. (Letters attached.)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PUBIC WORKS,
February 10, 1954.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very kindly for your letter of February 3, inviting me to attend the hearings which your special subcommittee has scheduled to commence in Akron, Ohio, on February 12, in connection with your consideration of proposals to amend the United Nations Charter.

Because of my deep interest in this subject matter, I have delayed replying to you until now in the hope that I could work out some rearrangements for certain firm commitments which I had made for February 12, prior to the receipt of your invitation. It is with keen regret that I find I will be unable to do this, and will have to forego the pleasure of being with you in Akron.

Your committee's determination to hold hearings on these important measures throughout the country is, in my opinion, a wise one, and I am delighted. It is a splendid method of approach. It affords a sounding board for numerous folks

who otherwise could not be heard, and it gives the committee opportunity to obtain first hand the ideas of the American people in an atmosphere of "home," rather than the "strange one" that generally is prevalent here in Washington.

Mixing and mingling with the people of Akron will, I am certain, be a source of genuine pleasure to you and your committee. You will find them practical, reasonable, and intelligent—their views, I am sure, will be most helpful to the committee in its deliberations.

Your conveyance of this message to them will be gratefully appreciated by me.

Cordially,

THOMAS A. BURKE, *United States Senator.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1954.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee,
United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you so much for your kind letter informing me that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations will be holding hearings in Akron, Ohio, on February 12 on proposals to amend the United Nations Charter.

I am most gratified that the subcommittee will visit Akron. I had arranged some time ago to make a Lincoln Day address at Gettysburg, Pa., and deeply regret that I will be unable to attend the hearing.

If I can be of any assistance to you or to the subcommittee ,please let me know. May I extend my best wishes and welcome you on behalf of the city of Akron.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. AYRES,
Member of Congress.

We will now hear the witnesses. We have suggested that they may wish to put their full statements in the committee record for our study, and that it would be helpful to the conduct of this meeting if they would summarize their statements orally. This will make it possible for the committee to hear a larger number of witnesses than would otherwise be possible.

I hope witnesses will bear with Senator Mansfield and myself, as we may wish from time to time to question them during the course of their remarks.

I have before me a list of the witnesses, and the first one is Mrs. I. R. Birnbaum, president of the League of Women Voters.

Mrs. Birnbaum, if you will come up here, I believe that chair is meant for you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. I. R. BIRNBAUM, PRESIDENT, THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF AKRON

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. Senator Wiley and members of the committee, on behalf of over 300 members of the League of Women Voters of Akron, I wish to thank you for the honor and the opportunity to express to you some of our views on the United Nations, and possible changes to be made in the charter. We feel that hearings such as these will do much to help all of us gain a better understanding of the United Nations, and this better understanding will be of great benefit, even though no changes are made in the charter at this time.

The League of Women Voters of Akron believes today, as it did in 1945 when the charter was before the Senate for approval, that, to quote Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, "The United Nations

Charter represents man's most determined and promising effort to save humanity from the scourge of war and to establish justice between the nations."

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

We know that the history of the United Nations is full of many disappointments, and sometimes failures, but we think that the accomplishments of the United Nations during the past almost 9 years have been conspicuous, and I would like to name a few of them which we think are important:

1. The withdrawal of Soviet forces from Iran.
2. The containment of the Communists in Greece.
3. The armistice between Israel and the Arab States.
4. Establishment of an independent Indonesia.
5. Resistance to aggression in Korea.
6. Contributions of technical know-how in the fields of industry, agriculture, and medicine, to say nothing of accomplishments in the fields of education and culture, through the United Nations specialized agencies.
7. The provision of a world forum.

The League of Women Voters of Akron supports the United Nations and points with pride to its many accomplishments. It wholeheartedly is convinced that the United Nations must be maintained and strengthened as a desirable organization for solving international problems.

PROBLEMS TO BE MET

This does not mean that we think the United Nations is a perfect organization or that the charter is a perfect document. In fact, we look forward to eventual change in the United Nations Charter, with the hope of improving and strengthening it, for our studies here in Akron of the United Nations have made us aware of some of the problems which need to be met and solved. To name a few:

1. Universality of membership.
2. The exercise of security and its relationship to the Security Council and the veto.
3. Provisions for membership and voting in a Security Council.
4. Provisions for membership, responsibilities, and voting in the General Assembly.
5. Armament, disarmament, and new weapons unknown in 1945.

Our view on these questions is somewhat determined by these two principles:

1. Not to lose the good that is in the charter in the search for something better.
2. That the success of the United Nations depends on the willingness of member nations, on their cooperation, and on their spirit.

Our studies have also made us feel that the success of the United Nations largely depends upon the use which is made of the machinery we already have. To quote our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles:

> The United States should approach this problem of charter review with recognition that the charter as it is can be made to serve well the cause of international peace and justice. The defects in the charter can, to a considerable extent, be corrected by practices which are permissible under the charter.

In other words, it is up to the member nations to give the charter a chance to work. Any failure which we have seen is largely failure of humans and not of laws. The United States, in its position of world leadership, has a great responsibility. We feel that our country is going to accept this role of leadership nobly, because we feel that most of our leaders agree with the old philosophy: "If we are not for ourselves, who will be for us? But if we are for ourselves alone, what are we?"

Thank you, gentlemen.

EFFECT OF SOVIET EXPULSION FROM U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. If you have no objection, we will ask you a few questions.

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. Much has been said, as you know, about kicking the Kremlin's representatives out because of their attitudes, using an expression from the street. Expelling them, in other words.

Have you any suggestion as to that?

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. Of course we recognize the fact that Russia has been extremely difficult, but we also feel that world membership is important to the solution of world problems.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the United Nations would be more or less effective if the Soviet bloc were absent?

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. I don't know that I can say that the League is prepared to make an official statement as to whether the Soviet bloc should be kept in the United Nations.

Personally, I feel that we have gained quite a bit by watching the Soviet, and probably are in a better position to understand the Soviet by having them spout off in the United Nations than otherwise.

THE VETO

The CHAIRMAN. Another problem that has confronted a good many of our best minds is the matter of a veto.

Have you any idea on that?

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. Speaking for the League, I cannot say that we are prepared to suggest to our representatives that they do away with the veto. We accepted the charter at the time of the San Francisco writing, with the idea that our representatives were probably right in thinking a veto was important.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

CHANGING THE VETO

Senator MANSFIELD. Mrs. Birnbaum, do you think that there is too much power in the hands of the Security Council, and not enough power in the hands of the General Assembly?

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. Well, I believe we sort of got around that situation by making it possible for the General Assembly to take action in the field of security, at any rate, when or if a majority of the members of the Security Council were not able to agree.

Is that not true, under that——

Senator MANSFIELD. What I am getting at is this: In the Security Council you have the power of the veto.

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. Yes.

Senator MANSFIELD. You do not have that in the General Assembly, where a majority vote prevails.

Now, because of the fact that we have the veto—and it must be said in all honesty that the United States was perhaps just as responsible as Russia in putting the veto into the charter, you see countries like Portugal, Ireland, Japan and other nations excluded from the United Nations.

How can we make it an organization comprising most of the world, if we do not in some way try to break down the veto and substitute in its place, say, two-thirds, three-quarters or four-fifths as the number of votes necessary to take care of a situation such as this?

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. Of course, I am not speaking as an individual. I am speaking for our organization, and we have not taken any official stand on the subject of changing the veto.

Senator MANSFIELD. All I wanted to do, Mrs. Birnbaum, was to try to get some ideas. The mere fact that we ask you certain questions does not mean that we are in favor of what we ask, although personally I have felt that something should have been done about the veto all along, because it has its defects as well as its assets.

Mrs. BIRNBAUM. Yes, we recognize that problem, and I believe I mentioned it as one of the problems which we thought should be considered in relation to changing of the charter.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's all.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Birnbaum.

The next witness is Mr. Roy Ingham, central development department of the General Tire & Rubber Co.; chairman, international relations committee of the Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF ROY INGHAM, CENTRAL DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT, GENERAL TIRE & RUBBER CO.; CHAIRMAN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE AKRON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. INGHAM. Senator Wiley, members of the committee, Mayor Berg, it is my firm belief that the efforts put forth by this Senate Subcommittee on Foreign Relations will have tremendous value in the formation of public opinion on problems of an international nature. By showing the people of these United States that their thoughts are sincerely desired in helping the officials of our Government decide what action should be taken on any given problem, more and more interest will be instilled in the average citizen toward devoting constructive thought to these international issues.

VALUE OF REVIEW CONFERENCE

I believe that the forthcoming General Review Conference of the General Assembly will be of tremendous value to the cause of making the United Nations a more effective organization even if no amendments or altering of the charter takes place. Hence, I am heartily in favor of such a conference. My reason for this statement is that at such a conference the prestige of the United Nations will grow immeasurably during the course of the discussions concerning what the

accomplishments of the U. N. have been since 1945, in spite of the many impossible situations which confronted it.

I feel that it is of importance to mention this aspect of the Review Conference in view of the arguments that will probably be advanced in answer to Secretary of State Dulles' comment before your committee. Dulles asserted that the existence of the veto did not mean that the Review Conference would be futile because the was veto not exercised by the nations which drafted the Dumbarton Oaks proposals when changes to these proposals were made at San Francisco. However, these nations still possessed that power of the veto and could bring it into play whenever any of the original proposals or changes thereto were employed to their disadvantage.

Whatever resolutions or amendments are believed to be necessary for the attainment of a more effective world organization should be proposed by our representatives at this conference regardless of whatever the chance may be for their passage and incorporation into the charter of the U. N. For this reason the United States would be demonstrating its sincerity to other nations by the very fact that this country would be willing to subject itself to the ideas contained in the amendment. This would seem to be a much more forceful procedure for illustrating the desire to have a policy or idea put into effect on an international basis as opposed to the normal procedure of making a public statement without assuming any positive obligations such as are imposed by an amendment.

VALUE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The utmost care should be employed not to give the impression that unless the amendments proposed by this country are adopted the U. N. would cease to be of any value. I emphatically believe that the action which the U. N. has taken to date has been of inestimable worth toward promoting a better world for every individual. It has given newfound appreciation of freedom and life to thousands of men and women through the activity of its several humanitarian agencies; and in the present crucial field of preventing armed conflict it has made very heartening gains as evidenced by the creation of the Collective Measures Committee. True, it has not been able to design the necessary machinery for insuring continued peace, but through the implementation of the policy of collective security, the Western World is taking steps within the charter framework (but not through the U. N.) toward building a bulwark against aggressive action.

STRENGTHENING INTERNATIONAL LAW

The term "Let's put some teeth into the U. N." is heard quite often these days. But, of course, teeth do decay, and I say this in spite of the controversy on fluoridation. I use this natural phenomena to illustrate the point that our basic solution for creating an effective United Nations does not necessarily lie in "beefing up" the present charter. Recently, I have read a quotation by the late Senator Taft which reads as follows:

> That in the long run the only way to establish peace is to write a law, agreed to by each of the nations, to govern the relations of such nations with each other and to obtain the covenant of all nations that they will abide by that law and by decisions made thereunder.

I agree with the foregoing quote. However, I feel that there is a severe lack of appreciation today on the one proposition and requisite which is needed for the attainment of peace, and that is "to obtain the covenant of all nations." This has been the immovable object in the path to international harmony from the very beginning of the existence of sovereign nations. And why has this been so?

To take the argument a bit further, we all have witnessed the cynicism with which totalitarian forms of government have regarded international law and treaties. They do not regard any moral obligations toward their professed agreements. Hence, it would appear quite naive to consider that we could hope to obtain the covenant of such nations.

How would a representative type of government be concerned with the proposition of entering into an agreement with the United States that they would abide by a certain law? It is quite conceivable that good faith would be evidenced on the part of this nation, as history has shown this to be the case.

KEEPING FAITH IN COVENANTS

How then can there be a way in which we can establish peace if only a part of the nations will act in good faith and the others will not? As I stated previously, I agree with Senator Taft's statement, but I do not feel that we could achieve in this generation, or the next, or ever a complete change in the political structures of those nations which are today totalitarian to a representative form of government unless we realize that it isn't the words describing the law which are lacking, but a proper moral atmosphere on the part of the millions of individuals who are unwilling to abide by those laws.

I believe that the underlying principle in any amendments which are proposed should evidence a realization of the fact that laws are created from the rational consent of the individual. How else would we differ from the animal world if this were not true? The Council on Human Rights has accomplished a great deal toward elevating the individual to a position where he is becoming more aware of his ability and right to help shape these laws which govern their action.

Any changes in the charter which are directed toward preventing conflict are most certainly desirable, and if possible should be incorporated. This, however, will not satisfy man's ultimate goal of establishing the principle of universal individual identity. This can only be accomplished by a ceaseless effort on the part of those countries in which this principle is established of proving to the other peoples of this bipolar world that an existence imbued with this philosophy is the most desirable in this world of ours.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The quotation of Senator Taft assumes importance. You can have plenty of covenants, but if you don't keep faith, the covenant is no good.

The Kaiser said, "A treaty is but a scrap of paper." Implicit in your suggestion is that there must be responsibility of those who covenant—a moral responsibility and faith in keeping the covenant.

Mr. INGHAM. That's correct. It is going to require a continuation of the efforts that have been made to date, to bring these people in

what are termed the backward nations, such as Africa and India, and the Far East, to a point where they can accept a common moral code as we in the western world have been able to do.

NO WITHDRAWAL FROM THE U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you anything to say on the subject as to whether or not the United States should withdraw from the U. N.?

Mr. INGHAM. Yes, I have. I definitely feel that the United States should not withdraw from the U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to state your reasons?

Mr. INGHAM. I will.

There is this one reason that, as has been stated many times, does provide a place where the various nations may gather and air their difficulties, air their thoughts, and the representatives become more familiar with the thinking and the philosophy of the representatives from other States. I think that is one very fine aspect of the United Nations.

Secondly, you have to start somewhere toward perfecting a world peace. The United Nations, I feel, even as it was created in 1945, without the knowledge of the existence of an atomic bomb, was a very forthright step toward the formation of an organization that would someday be able to implement, through effective machinery, a continued world peace.

GIVING THE U. N. GREATER POWER TO PUT DOWN AGGRESSION

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe the United States, not to mention other nations, is ready to surrender any jurisdiction to the United Nations? Have you any ideas that the United States or any of other of the present nations are ready at this time, in view of world conditions, to surrender to any extended world government jurisdiction?

Mr. INGHAM. Excuse me. As far as I am personally concerned, Senator, I do feel that there is a growing desire to make an effective movement toward relinquishing some of the powers which we now consider sovereign, and that is in the field of preventing aggressive war.

I feel that it would certainly behoove the United States to heartily support a move toward making some sort of machinery available to the United Nations, which would not be able to be blocked by any one nation, toward promoting a cessation of hostilities whenever they may arise. In other words, to give a certain amount of arms to a world organization. I think that that is one way that we can help to secure a more permanent peace.

The CHAIRMAN. You think more in the nature of an organization such as we have got in NATO?

Mr. INGHAM. I do. I do. I think that that is a form of machinery which could possibly me used. As for the details that might be necessary to work out, I wouldn't even care to venture there, but it seems to me, from what I know of NATO, that that is a starting point for some type of collective action.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

AN INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Ingham, if I understand you correctly, what you advocate as one of the revisions to the charter would be an amendment, allowing for the creation of what would be called an international police force, or a United Nations police force?

Mr. INGHAM. That's right. I would be in favor of that, to some extent.

I think it would have to be—this again I want to repeat—the underlying basis on which to create such a force would have to be a realization of, let's say, the humanitarian aspects of the situation, realizing that this machinery is to protect people, and to create a more healthy atmosphere in the world.

Senator MANSFIELD. All right. Do you think that if such an organization had been in existence at the time of Korea there would have been a greater equality in the distribution of effort on the part of the U. N. nations in the Korean conflict?

Mr. INGHAM. I think they would, although let me say this, that I do not know exactly what the proportion of the troops from the smaller countries who participated with the United States in stopping that aggressive movement were. I know they were quite small, and I feel as though they were smaller than the direct proportion between the then existing standard armies or standing armies of the two countries.

EXPECTED AND ACTUAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE U. N.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that's a reasonable argument. To get back to one other statement made by you, either directly or by implication. You stated, if I recall your testimony correctly, that the United Nations was set up to take over, once peace was established; is that correct?

Mr. INGHAM. I don't recall making that statement, but I think I agree with it.

Senator MANSFIELD. Has peace been established since the end of the Second World War?

Mr. INGHAM. Would you——

Senator MANSFIELD. Has the world returned to a peaceful status, generally speaking, since the end of the war?

Mr. INGHAM. No; they have not.

Senator MANSFIELD. So we find the United Nations called upon to do a job which it was not supposed to do, such as stepping in during this emergency and taking over responsibilities which were not inherent at the time the charter was drawn up in San Francisco in 1945.

Mr. INGHAM. That's exactly right.

Senator MANSFIELD. If we follow that argument a little further, then we can see where, in many respects, the United Nations has performed a very great service to the world in putting down disputes, like those in Kashmir, in the Balkans, in Iran, and elsewhere, in carrying out good health programs in various parts of the world, like the eradication of yaws in Haiti. It did all those things in its first formative years.

In other words, we could in effect compare the United Nations to a babe in swaddling clothes. It is still young, it is still growing up, it still has a long way to go, and even though it has both assets and liabilities, nevertheless it has been able to accomplish some good in some parts of the world.

Would you agree with that statement?

Mr. INGHAM. I certainly would. I definitely agree with that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think if you got rid of the United Nations you would have to have something else to take its place?

Mr. INGHAM. Yes, I do, and it would probably be streetcleaners, if we got rid of the United Nations at the present time. I think that ultimate chaos would come about.

The CHAIRMAN. That's all, sir. We thank you.

Mrs. Gerald Duryee, North Canton, Ohio; district chairman of national defense.

STATEMENT OF MRS. GERALD DURYEE, REPRESENTATIVE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION, DAR; DISTRICT CHAIRMAN OF NATIONAL DEFENSE

The CHAIRMAN. We are glad to welcome you. I see you are from the National Association of the DAR?

Mrs. DURYEE. Yes, I am chairman of the district.

The CHAIRMAN. Carry on.

Mrs. DURYEE. I might state first that the object of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution is to cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom, to foster true patriotism and love of country, and to aid in securing for mankind all the blessings of liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you do it?

Mrs. DURYEE. Well, you can keep trying.

The CHAIRMAN. That's right. That is a good slogan, never give up.

Mrs. DURYEE. Approximately 6,000 of our members from every State in the Nation, representing thousands of women, attended the 62d Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, held in Washington, April 1953.

Resolutions passed at the annual continental congresses become the policy for the ensuing year. The following resolution was one of those passed in 1953:

Whereas the charter of the United Nations comes up for revision in 1955, and world government proponents are already zealously working to achieve their aim of strengthening the charter to provide for a world government or partial world government: Be it

***Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, maintain its stand that the United Nations should be a deliberative body of sovereign nations working together for the adjustment of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.**

Plans concerning the revision of the United Nations Charter presented to the 63d continental congress which meets in Washington, April 19, 1954, will be voted upon by the chapter representatives and if adopted, will become the policy for the year ahead. Such plans will be presented to the entire Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Since I am not authorized to speak for the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, anything which I might say further would be only as an individual.

I want to thank the members of this subcommittee for giving the time to me to set forth the policy of the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand from the resolution presented here that you believe that the function of the United Nations should be limited to that simply of a deliberative body; is that right?

Mrs. DURYEE. Yes; working together for the adjustment of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that in due season, if it could be worked out, the United Nations ought to have an adequate police force?

Mrs. DURYEE. Now, I am not prepared to say for the Daughters.

The CHAIRMAN. But you are a Daughter.

Mrs. DURYEE. Yes; I am, but I don't speak for them.

The CHAIRMAN. No, no, but for yourself?

Mrs. DURYEE. Well, if it could be worked out. But every time I hear that, I always hear that they are going to enforce the peace. And peace has to come from within; you don't enforce peace—necessarily.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, there has been a general opinion that the DAR opposed the U. N. Now, that isn't true, is it?

Mrs. DURYEE. No; they have never advocated that.

ADVANTAGES OF THE U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the DAR believe the U. N. is helpful and has been helpful on the world stage in certain quarters of the globe?

Mrs. DURYEE. I think that they feel maybe that they have gone far afield of some of the purposes for which it was set up, to keep the peace, and they have gone into different aspects.

The CHAIRMAN. But don't you think they have accomplished a number of things, as enumerated by the first speaker here? Withdrawal of the Soviet forces in Iran, the containment of the Communists in Greece?

Mrs. DURYEE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And they had something to do with the present uncertain armistice between Israel and the Arab States, and establishment of the independence of Indonesia.

Mrs. DURYEE. And then we always come back to Korea.

The CHAIRMAN. Then we come back to Korea.

Mrs. DURYEE. Where we lost 25,000 dead, and the next highest, I think, was 717. Britain lost 710.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, in the meanwhile, Britain and France have been losing lives of their citizens in other parts of the globe.

But my question in the first place was whether it was the position of the DAR that the U. N. has done some helpful things in certain corners of the world. I think you said "Yes" to that?

Mrs. DURYEE. Yes; I did.

The CHAIRMAN. And from your last statement, you would infer that the action that they took in Korea was not helpful; is that right?

Mrs. DURYEE. Well, I don't think America can afford that.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, we won't go into that.

Mrs. DURYEE. I don't mean in money, I mean in lives.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you realize a good many people feel that if we hadn't taken that step, worse things would have happened: it would have been "open sesame" to the Kremlin to start trouble all over the world.

Mrs. DURYEE. Of course, there were lots of things that led up to it, which——

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Senator Mansfield, any questions?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mrs. Duryee, I think you have made a very good, brief statement.

RESERVATIONS ON AN INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

Getting back to this matter of a proposed police force, you are entirely correct when you say that peace must come from within. But sometimes it comes from without, in the form of aggressions, as this country knows to its sorrow, and as you brought out in the course of your testimony.

Wouldn't it be better, in your opinion, to have an international police force, then, to which all countries would make a contribution, without losing any sovereignty, so that if a fire breaks out in one part of the world, one country will not have to take the whole burden, but that burden can be equitably distributed among the member states of the U. N.?

Mrs. DURYEE. Well, Senator Mansfield, I think that when we have American representatives that will stand up for the American way of life, and take their stand and say, "This is it," we are going to be a lot better off.

And if we can lay down conditions whereby our country—it is not sovereignty, it is principle, I think, that we have to live up to. And we have principles in our country, and we should not give up that.

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, Mrs. Duryee. As our chairman said, before he made his opening statement, he is the son of immigrant parents. I am the first-born son of immigrant parents, too, and we believe that this country has great possibilities and sound principles. That's one of the reasons we are trying to go to the country now, to ask the members of the DAR, the League of Women Voters, individual citizens, just what their ideas are on what we can do to help make this organization operate on a sounder basis, so that in the end all of us will benefit, because of the possibilities which this organization in itself entails.

There are many problems, and none of us know all the answers, but maybe by discussing things back and forth, as we are doing today, we may be able to come up with a solution, or at least a better situation than is the case at the present time.

Thank you very much, Mrs. Duryee.

Mrs. DURYEE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. We will now hear from an attorney, Mr. Chester A. Wise, of the law firm of Wise, Roetzel, Maxon, Kelly & Andress, Summit County Bar Association.

STATEMENT OF CHESTER A. WISE, ATTORNEY, SUMMIT COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

Mr. WISE. Senator Wiley, and Senator Mansfield, of the committee, today being the birthday anniversary of Lincoln——

The CHAIRMAN. You should have heard my speech here a little while ago.

Mr. WISE. I did. I was standing back of the curtain. I heard every word of it.

I want to quote from Lincoln, who said, "Without public opinion nothing can succeed, with it nothing can fail." That applies to the United Nations as it affects our country.

Some think that the San Francisco Conference in 1945 committed an error in acceding to Russia's demand as her price for becoming a member of the United Nations, the right to veto any order of the Security Council on membership, aggression, etc., by requiring unanimity of the five permanent members of the Council. This would now be only a moot question were it not for its impact on public opinion as it relates to the U. N. in view of what has occurred since most of our troubles in this organization stem from this concession.

Some of our people now think it might have been better to initiate the U. N. without Russia or abandon the project altogether rather than give to her this weapon of obstruction. I do not agree with that view. If it was an error it was an understandable error. That Conference really had no alternative under world conditions then and the urgent and immediate need for some organization to deal with imminent threats of aggression. At that time Russia's membership appeared necessary and we were assured that the use of the veto would be reasonable. It did not work out that way.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

To date Russia has exercised the veto 56 times and has rather successfully thereby obstructed progress toward realizing the purposes set out in the preamble of the charter. The delegates to the San Francisco Conference doubtless recalled that our own Constitution, drafted after 81 days of debate, was a series of compromises with which none of the delegates was entirely satisfied. Yet this instrument has worked well. However, the Constitutional Convention in 1787 had no Joe Stalin with whom to deal, and the San Francisco Conference of 1945 had among its delegates no James Madison or Alexander Hamilton. The U. N. even under the handicap of the veto, in its operation, while not approximating expectations, did make substantial contributions toward the purposes set forth in the preamble. Probably at its inception we were too optimistic, expected too much. Some were so naive as to believe that agreements on so basic a subject as war could be accomplished in a brief time. Such now are becoming disillusioned. In my opinion, even under these great handicaps, its operation to date has been very worthwhile.

The CHAIRMAN. May I interrupt there?

Mr. WISE. Yes.

FAILURES BLAMED ON SOVIET UNION AND NOT ON CHARTER

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not your opinion that the U. N. hasn't done more is just due to the orneriness of the Kremlin and not due to the charter?

Mr. WISE. I thoroughly agree, only I would use stronger language.

The CHAIRMAN. But I think, sir, that's very important. I have used an example many times, that I would rather go down the street in a mediocre automobile with a very good driver, than go down the street in a Lincoln with a lunatic at the wheel.

Mr. WISE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no reflection on the U. N. I think we should keep that clear before the country, because they constantly blame the U. N.

It is just human nature, represented particularly by representatives of one nation, which has made all the trouble.

And our problem is to find out just how to solve that situation. I suggested several courses today. You can utilize them and see if they work.

Mr. WISE. Your suggestion about the driver is fine. I happen to be invited by the President to a conference on highway safety next week, and I shall suggest that.

The CHAIRMAN. Down in Washington?

Mr. WISE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, come in and have some bean soup with me.

Mr. WISE. Thank you, sir, and I will make a contribution myself.

INCREASING PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE U. N.

This committee has undertaken an important and colossal task. The interest of the average citizen in the U. N. and an appreciation of the effect of its success or failure on each of us appears almost negligible. One writer suggested that many are more concerned in where the next meal is coming from than where the next aggression is coming from. Probably not more than 5 percent of our people have read the charter.

The CHAIRMAN. You are liberal.

Mr. WISE. The U. N. is a complicated setup, understood only by experts. As to it, the public is confused. They form their opinions from news items of sessions of the General Assembly and from reported statements of public men. Among these there is divided counsel. For example, the President said, "I think the U. N. has become a sheer necessity." Ex-President Truman called it "the first and greatest weapon against aggression and an international immorality." A governor of one of our States, whom I can name, said, "As now constituted, the U. N. is a snare and a delusion." A Congressman, whom I can name, said, "We must watch well the U. N. for as now constituted it is enemy No. 1 of free America." A newspaper that calls itself the world's greatest newspaper, said editorially, "Our internal difficulties spring from the fact that our Government meekly assents to the proposition that America takes orders from the U. N." Whom shall the people believe? Hence the importance of a campaign to enlighten the public on this subject.

ADVANTAGES OF SOVIET MEMBERSHIP

Much feeling has been engendered by the obstructionist tactics of Russia. One can hear on every hand such expressions as "Let's put Russia out and proceed without her, with Russia's veto nothing can be accomplished; let's abandon the project, call it a day and come home." There is some possibility that this emotional appeal may grow to dangerous proportions. It is the stuff from which political propaganda is made. We are not used to being pushed around. Obviously we cannot put Russia out even if we chose to do so. She would veto the effort. But do we want her out? While little can be accomplished with these roadblocks, can we not better follow her conduct and motives while a member of the U. N.? As such member the moral condemnation of the other members may have some effect. It is not better to relieve the tension by talking than by fighting? Certainly it is less costly in life and money.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you proved that yourself?

Mr. WISE. No, but my question is one of geometry.

I do not favor the abandoning of this project. Nor do I favor dissolving the U. N. and organizinig a new one without Russia. The record of the U. N. accomplishments is better than her critics indicate. We could enumerate at least a half dozen instances of accomplishments of substantial value.

MATTERS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE REVIEW CONFERENCE

The U. N. has been called obsolete since the advent of atomic power. In the event of a review conference it seems some place of control of this destructive weapon by the U. N. should be high on the agenda. Certainly the control by the Security Council of all the agencies of the member nations having to do with production of atomic power would be safer for the world than to have such devastating power in the control of individual nations. Another subject, to wit, disarmament, should be on the agenda for review. As now constituted this may be impossible of accomplishment. But, as has been said, "Not failure but low aim is crime." Doubtless 9 years of operation has disclosed some defects in the charter relating to procedure, which, in the event of a review, can be improved. The line of demarcation between the legitimate field of operation of the U. N. and the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations should be clarified. Most nations are jealous of their nationality and resent any invasion thereof. As to the United States, our people as yet are not ready to substitute My world 'tis of thee for My country 'tis of thee. I couldn't sing that.

OPPOSITION TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Wise, may I interrupt there? When Mrs. Duryee was testifying relative to the resolution passed by the Continental Congress of the DAR reference was made to "world government proponents."

I take it that you are in accord with what Mrs. Duryee has said. I want the record to show that so far as I know, no member of the Congress, either the House or the Senate, in either party has, to the best of my knowledge, ever advocated world government.

Mr. WISE. No.

Senator MANSFIELD. So I would say, then, we are all in accord with that. It is still My country 'tis of thee.

Mr. WISE. Yes. It would sound funny to say My world 'tis of thee; we couldn't keep the tune.

Our people have such a horror of war that they will support the U. N. so long as any hope of attaining the purpose of the charter preamble remains. To those who call the U. N. a failure, may we remind them that, in addition to the 60 member nations, there are 21 applications for membership pending. This status is not the indicia of failure.

VALUE OF SOVIET PARTICIPATION IN THE U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. Someone said—I forget who it was—that we couldn't put Russia out of the U. N.

If we couldn't put them out, wouldn't it be possible to set up a new organization?

Mr. WISE. And not invite her?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. WISE. Certainly. That's the only method I know that it could be done, under the veto power.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think there is any advantage in that?

Mr. WISE. No. I want her in. We can watch her better. If she gets out, you can't tell where she will ramble. Here we can see where she is going.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you noticed lately that one of the Russian high command in secret service, who was stationed in Japan, skipped them? He was a friend of Beria's.

Mr. WISE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you noticed also that when the Russians are in New York, they have to go en masse, because they are afraid that someone will skip out on them?

Mr. WISE. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that due to the fact that we have got something here that they haven't got in Russia?

Mr. WISE. I think that's most of it.

LUST FOR POWER AS THE CAUSE OF WAR

And on the other hand, Russia is one of those nations that demonstrates that justice isn't uppermost, it is power. And let me suggest this to this committee: They talk about the cause of war and the spread of communism. In my judgment, communism never will spread over the world; history indicates that no nation has accepted it except by force, and no idea thrust on people by force has ever lived.

The cause of war from the beginning of creation up to the present time is the inherent urge for power and the domination over the lives of others. You can trace that down through all the wars, and you are not going to end wars until you revamp the world to make the abnegation of power instead of the urge for power the rule. I don't know when that is coming.

SPIRITUAL IMPROVEMENT NEEDED

The CHAIRMAN. Then you suggest as remedy, to improve the individual spiritually, and if that's done, we wouldn't have to do much to the United Nations?

Mr. WISE. No, that's true, that's the basis of it all. But it is a big task. This committee hasn't got as difficult a task as that, so it is difficult enough.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any suggestion as to what should be done to the United Nations?

Mr. WISE. Keep on trying. That's all I can say about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you going to do that, too?

Mr. WISE. Oh, listen, I have always tried, but I never accomplished much.

The CHAIRMAN. You are too modest, sir.

Mr. WISE. No, modesty is not one of my cardinal points. I wish it were.

The CHAIRMAN. Does your wife agree to that, too?

Mr. WISE. I think she would agree with me on that, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions, Mr. Chairman. I have enjoyed your testimony very much, Mr. Wise.

Mr. WISE. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Attorney John Cotton, Council of Churches.

STATEMENT OF JOHN V. COTTON, ATTORNEY, THE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES OF AKRON AND SUMMIT COUNTY, OHIO

Mr. COTTON. It is indeed a privilege and honor to appear before you this afternoon on behalf of the Council of Churches of Akron and Summit County, Ohio. So far as I know, Mrs. Cotton is not receiving any mink coats in consideration of my efforts here. If I were here before you solely as an individual, I might feel free to make one or two suggestions of a more or less political nature which I do not believe my appearance on behalf of this important group permits. However, I am quite certain that the Council of Churches believes with me individually in government by law rather than by force. We all want and pray for peace. In fact, we believe so strongly in peace that we sometimes fight for it.

The United Nations offers us the most practical method of securing peace, established up to this time. So long as the nations sit down together around a common table, there is hope of better understanding and cooperation between them. The United Nations look at the problem realistically. The sovereignty of the individual state is recognized and protected. The necessity of all, or practically all, large nations joining to secure peace is given attention. The attitude of giving and taking among the more powerful nations has helped to evolve the present charter. The United States is one of the great powers of the world today, perhaps the greatest. The United Nations cannot hope to function successfully without the United States. The United States cannot hope to have peace without the United Nations or some similar organization. Therefore, the United Nations should have our support and most constructive thinking.

STRONG POINTS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Let us examine very briefly a few of the strong points appearing as the United Nations operates under its present charter. The social agencies with their child welfare and their United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund are performining a service which should lead to world betterment and help develop peace.

The equality of sexes which the United Nations recognizes is established with us. The international respect for the self-determination of peoples is the extending of a good United States tradition. The Educational and Cultural Agency deserves support in its effort to give mass education to the more underdeveloped countries. The United Nations' efforts to control the narcotic drug trade ought to help us all. These and many other branches of the United Nations program show strength and aggressiveness in the right direction. Being created and operated by human beings, the United Nations is no more perfect than the modern husband.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to amplify that a little? [Laughter.]

Mr. COTTON. It might be dangerous.

The CHAIRMAN. Carry on, if your conscience troubles you.

WEAKNESSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. COTTON. Let us glance at some of the weaknesses in this organization. The most outstanding one at this time is the veto power existing in the Security Council. To us in the backwoods, it appears that, while the General Assembly chooses the members of the other groups in the United Nations and control their respective purse strings, the Security Council acts. That makes the veto power even more serious. In fact, all through the United Nations power dominates. We, as Christians, wish this weakness did not exist, but we do not know how to avoid it within a reasonable time. Through the slow processes of education and religion, this particular weakness should disappear. The very lack of any reference to a power greater than human power in the charter of the United Nations, which has probably been caused by the varying religious beliefs of the peoples involved, constitutes another weakness.

UNITED STATES BENEFITS TO AND FROM THE UNITED NATIONS

These weaknesses are not insurmountable, nor are they a justification for the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations. The United States, in spite of its being one of the younger members of the family of nations, has, in our humble opinion, developed the best system of government yet uncovered. This blessing has not been granted to us for the purpose of obscuring it, of losing it, or of sacrificing it upon the altar of prejudice. To whom much has been given, much is expected. Without boasting, we must realize that we have grown strong because of the system of government which we have inherited from our forebears. It now becomes our duty to keep ourselves strong and then, being strong, to use our strength to help those less blessed to also gain strength. Therefore, we should continue as a leading member of the United Nations to do all in our power to make it a more vital force for good in the world. How can we best use this privilege for the good of the world?

REVISION OF THE CHARTER

First of all, we believe that the charter of the United Nations can and should be improved by revision. Before long the United Nations will have been in operation for 10 years. The drafters of its charter have already provided for a possible amending of it at the 10th annual session of its General Assembly. That opportunity should be taken advantage of. By amendment some method should be devised of eliminating, or at least lessening, the calamitous results of the veto power now existing in the Security Council. The casting out from the United Nations of any great nation solely because it abuses this power does not seem to be the logical method. Conversion of a wayward nation seems to be more desirable than ostracism. However, during the lengthy process of conversion the erring one must not be permitted to endanger the welfare of the world. Being merely sidewalk amateurs, we are unable to place our finger directly upon the method which you professionals should use.

The CHAIRMAN. You can certainly handle it.

Mr. COTTON. You mean the professional part? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. We like it, anyway.

Mr. COTTON. Nevertheless, we feel confident that you experts to whom this task has fallen can, with God's help, devise a proper method.

MAINTAINING UNITED STATES STRENGTH

In the second place, we believe that the Government of the United States should be kept strong. A weak nation can never do much to help the world overcome its ills. We have grown strong by reason of our system of government. Let us be sure that we keep that strength. If we permit our strength to be sapped and dissipated among other nations of the world, we thereby lower ourselves to their level rather than raising them to our level. We then join the ranks of weak nations and the world has lost a powerful leader without becoming strong. We should rather use our strength to help other nations become stronger and thus increase our strength. Physically, mentally, and spiritually, we should continue to raise our own standards and by so doing, raise the world's standards. The United Nations is already working in this direction in its narcotic drug traffic control efforts and in its educational and child-welfare programs. Our strength should be thrown into these advances. We should reach out as far as possible and as often as necessary to save a drowning neighbor, but we should also keep a firm foothold upon our inherited basic governmental principles in order that we may be able to pull that neighbor to safety.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before your honorable body on behalf of the Council of Churches of Akron and Summit County, Ohio. May God add His blessing to your efforts and show you the right course.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much for this very stimulating statement.

RESPONSIBILITY OF THE PEOPLE

I have got to say, in reply, several things that come to my mind. One is, you can't pass the buck to Washington. One hundred and sixty million people have a responsibility themselves. We mustn't

get into the habit that the European countries have of simply electing officials and thinking the job is done. The official himself knows that it "the eyes of Texas are upon him," he will keep straight.

I mean that in all sincerity, about the U. N. That's the reason why we are going out into the hinterland, the byways and highways, asking for your guidance and direction. I think the job is one that more or less rests in the lap of the Divine. Many times man's wisdom is foolishness, you know, and then along comes a little light from some place that shows us the way.

ATTITUDE TOWARD ELIMINATION OF THE VETO

Would you want American troops used in Korea or elsewhere by the U. N. without the consent of the United States?

Mr. COTTON. No, sir; I would not.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you be willing for the United Nations to impose a trade embargo in which we would participate without our consent?

Mr. COTTON. Not without our consent; no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Isn't the veto a protection to us?

Mr. COTTON. Yes, sir; I presume it is. It has been abused, but that doesn't say it has no place at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the only one who has abused it is the Kremlin.

Mr. COTTON. That's right, so fas as I can know.

The CHAIRMAN. And we want to differentiate the leaders from the people of Russia.

Mr. COTTON. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. The poor people over there, some 170 or 180 million of them, are to be pitied.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

Now, at present Japan, Germany, Italy, and Ireland, and many other peace-loving states are outside the U. N.; that's correct, isn't it?

Mr. COTTON. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you any idea of what we can do to sneak them in under the tent?

Mr. COTTON. Not unless you can change your veto power.

The CHAIRMAN. Or the Kremlin.

Mr. COTTON. Or the Kremlin, which would be a slow process, probably.

The CHAIRMAN. What's your idea? Do you think it is necessary to have the Soviet Union in the U. N. to make it successful, or more successful?

Mr. COTTON. I think they are much less dangerous in than out.

After all, if they are in, you have a chance of world peace, perhaps, if you can change them a little bit. But if they are out, on the other side of the fence, how are you going to have peace?

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke about improvement by revision. Have you anything specific, outside of what you have said?

Mr. COTTON. Improvement by revision of the charter?

The CHAIRMAN. You used that language, "improvement by revision."

Mr. COTTON. No, sir; I think the matters are set forth there in sufficient detail.

U. N. HELP IN KOREA

The CHAIRMAN. In Korea we had the help of 16 states. Small as it was from some of them, we had that help against aggression, did we not?

Mr. COTTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to ask you your opinion, because I think it is important that we get the opinion of folks on this.

Do you think it was necessary to stop aggression in order to stem the Communist tide in Asia?

Mr. COTTON. I probably haven't got enough information for an opinion on that, but what I have, I would say personally that I believe it was probably necessary. That does not say that I approve the methods.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, you admit, do you not, that it was better to have the help that we got from the 16 nations than none at all?

Mr. COTTON. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Particularly the help of South Korea, with her great troops.

Mr. COTTON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Than for us to have done it alone.

Mr. COTTON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Doesn't that stand out as a beacon light? It was the first time in history that 16 nations did get together to try to stop aggression.

Mr. COTTON. I think that's certainly a beacon light; yes, sir.

VETO AND ADMISSION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Cotton, the question of the veto is a very perplexing one indeed. I wish there was some way we could get rid of it. You do, too.

When you get right down to it, suppose that Communist China wanted to seek admission to the United Nations, as she does, and suppose the question came before the Security Council, and there was no veto? What then would prevent Communist China from becoming a member of the United Nations?

Mr. COTTON. I would be afraid that it might become a member.

Senator MANSFIELD. That's right. So the veto has its uses, and it is a tough question to figure out just what should be done. No one likes to have the responsibility of a final say in the hands of any one power.

Mr. COTTON. That's right again.

Senator MANSFIELD. We believe in majority rule, not in the rule of one.

I only wanted to show that there are two sides to this veto question. I don't know, in my own mind, just what the answer is, as yet.

Mr. COTTON. I wish I could tell you.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. Cotton.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Our next witness is Prof. Harold Van Dorn, professor of political science, Kent State University, and a member of Americans for Democratic Action.

Carry on.

STATEMENT OF PROF. HAROLD VAN DORN, POLITICAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT, KENT STATE UNIVERSITY, MEMBER OF AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION

Dr. VAN DORN. Senator Wiley, members of the committee, the organization in whose behalf I speak welcomes this opportunity, which you have so generously afforded us, to lay before you the views of our group. The ADA members of our chapter, as of other chapters throughout the country, are a nonpartisan group of liberals who are earnestly desirous of preserving the basic American concepts which have made America strong and respected. At the same time we are desirous of promoting those changes and improvements which we believe will give us an ever-broadening democracy and an ever-advancing standard of living.

SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

In pursuit of these aims we believe it essential that our Government give the utmost support to the United Nations. We believe that, in spite of its brief 8-year existence, the United Nations has made remarkable progress in many fields of endeavor. It has brought better understanding among many people of the world and has encouraged the great majority of nations to work together peacefully and harmoniously. That it has not achieved this harmonious relationship among all of its members is regrettable and a matter of deep concern. It is no reason, however, for weakening our support of the United Nations, or slackening our efforts to go forward in pursuit of further goals. We should be unceasing in our efforts to strengthen the United Nations.

VETO PROVISIONS TO BE MODIFIED

The reappraisal of the Charter of the United Nations in 1955 presents an opportunity to profit by the experience of the past 8 years and to strengthen the basic framework in those areas which have shown weakness. The area which has been most criticized and perhaps most unsatisfactory has been the use of the veto resulting from the charter requirement of unanimity of the permanent members in decisions of the Security Council.

We would like to see these provisions of the charter modified. We do not advocate the abolition of the veto. We believe that would be impractical and not in the best interests of the United States. However, we believe that the charter should be so modified that a member of the Security Council may halt action approved by seven members of the Council only when the contemplated action involves national affairs in contrast to international affairs. The veto would thus remain as an added protection against interference with matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

This we think a sound principle even though we recognize that disputes may arise as to what matters are essentially within domestic

jurisdiction. Such disputes might be referred to the International Court of Justice for an advisory opinion.

STRENGTHENING THE HANDS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The second change we would like to submit for your consideration is a modification in the terms of the charter which would strengthen the hands of the Assembly in those cases in which the peace of the world is threatened by a deadlock in the Council. We would like to see a clarifying provision inserted in the charter making crystal clear the right of the Assembly—now in dispute—to deal with situations threatening the peace of the world in the event that the Security Council fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace.

We believe that the two foregoing suggestions are both sound in principle and politically practical, and that they would immeasurably strengthen the United Nations in the promotion of world peace.

I thank you.

POLICE FORCE FOR THE U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. The U. N. Charter provides, as you know, for armed forces to be made available to the Security Council by the member states to put down aggression.

Dr. VAN DORN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. This hasn't been done very well, except by us in Korea, you might say.

Do you think the United Nations can ever be really effective without having a police force for handling situations requiring a police force?

Dr. VAN DORN. I think we must work toward the establishment of an international police force.

The original Charter, as you know, stated that agreements should be drawn up as to complements of such troops that would be made available by each nation and those agreements have never been drawn up, of course.

VETO RELATING TO ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

The CHAIRMAN. Should the United States be allowed to veto the admission of Red China and representatives of China on the Security Council?

Dr. VAN DORN. Well, if the suggestion which I made, that the veto be limited to matters of domestic jurisdiction were followed, that matter would be outside that field. I do not think it is a foregone conclusion that Communist China would thereby be admitted into the United Nations under present conditions.

The Charter now provides that 7 members of the Council must approve such admission, and if 7 members did approve it, then under the provision we advocate, we would not be able to stop it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think the U. S. S. R., then, would be allowed to veto the admission of states like Ireland or Italy or Japan?

Dr. VAN DORN. Well, if the provision we suggest were agreed to, that would not be a domestic matter, and no nation would have the right to veto that proposal.

MAJORITY VOTE ON RESISTING AGGRESSION

The CHAIRMAN. Should the General Assembly, under your proposal, be given the power by a majority vote to put down aggression?

Dr. VAN DORN. I suggested not anything as specific as that, but that this General Assembly, that it be made crystal clear that the General Assembly may take up and deal with a problem which has become deadlocked, a problem dealing with the peace of the world which has become deadlocked in the Council.

The method of dealing with it, I don't think I wish to blueprint at this time.

We have substantially that at the present time, but the power of the Assembly to deal with the matter, as it has done in Korea, is in dispute. Juridically, there is some question about it.

I would like to make it clear that it should have that power.

LIMITING VETO TO MATTERS OF DOMESTIC JURISDICTION

The CHAIRMAN. You want the veto to apply only in those cases where you say it would have a domestic impact?

Dr. VAN DORN. Domestic jurisdiction.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have any other suggestion in mind, that you think should have consideration by the reviewing powers?

TIME LIMIT ON NEGOTIATION OF INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE AGREEMENTS

Dr. VAN DORN. I think consideration might be given, although I am not prepared on behalf of our organization to make any recommendation—might be given to provide some time limit on the negotiation of these agreements for providing for international police force.

The Charter provides that such agreements are to be drawn up. Ten years have gone by, and no agreements have been drawn up. Possibly it might be desirable to place a time limit on the Council's leadership in that matter, and if, in the next 5 years or 10 years, it is not done, it might be placed in the hands of the Assembly.

POSSIBILITY OF SOVIET ACCEPTANCE OF AMENDMENTS

The CHAIRMAN. Of course you realize that the Soviet Union would not be able to veto the calling of this conference but would be able to veto any proposed amendment.

Dr. VAN DORN. Yes; thats true.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you consider it likely that any amendment would be proposed, that the Soviet Union would not veto?

Dr. VAN DORN. Well, I think the very great practical difficulty there is as to whether any provision, any change that may be suggested in the charter next year, which in any way restrains the Soviet Union, will be accepted by them.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, judging by past experience, you don't think there is anything to indicate that they would agree to some of the suggestions that you have made?

Dr. VAN DORN. I think, since the suggestions are limited, and do not take away the veto power entirely, there is at least a possibility.

Since they could still protect all their domestic program by the veto power, as we suggested, I believe that's worth trying. Although I cannot say I am optimistic as to its success.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Van Dorn, I want to compliment you on the statement which you have read, and I think that the two suggestions you have made relative to amending the U. N. Charter, as it affects the veto, and as it affects the possible, or probable peace powers of the General Assembly, are certainly worth every consideration by this committee.

I want you to know that I am very delighted with what you have to say, and to assure you that the committee will give your suggestions every possible consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

Miss Stella M. Robbins, Akron Public Library.

Carry on, please.

STATEMENT OF MISS STELLA M. ROBBINS, AKRON PUBLIC LIBRARY

Miss ROBBINS. I should like especially to thank the committee for letting me, an individual, appear as an individual. I represent no group whatsoever, and I think this is truly American democracy in action, when we can have individuals appear before a committee of this type to express their own private opinions as citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you for your nice remarks. I hope you like us; we like you.

Miss ROBBINS. Many people before have said the United Nations has done a lot of good, and I would agree with all of that. And any criticisms that I may make of the United Nations Charter are not criticisms of the people who made it. For everything of this nature must devolve slowly, and we are now at the process where we want to look seriously and see what are the next steps to be taken.

CHARTER LACKS ADEQUATE PROVISIONS FOR ENFORCING PEACE

My proposal is to revise two sections of the charter to enable the U. N. to carry out the paramount purpose as stated in article I, paragraph 1. Here the first stated purpose is "To maintain international peace and security." Although the security of our world hangs in the balance today, we should not criticize the U. N. for this fact without checking to see that the charter provides adequately for carrying out that purpose.

This same paragraph suggests several methods of carrying out that purpose. First mentioned is "to take collective measures for prevention and removal of threats to peace." I submit to you that the remainder of the charter fails to provide adequately instructions for removing threats to peace. The second method suggested, "suppression of acts of aggression," is more fully provided for in articles 41, 42, and 51, and the Korean war is proof that the U. N. can and did act to suppress aggression.

But the unpopularity of the Korean war appears to me to be proof that the people of this country are looking to the U. N. not merely to suppress aggression, but to prevent and remove threats to peace.

How could the Korean war have been prevented? Surely had the U. N. been empowered to prevent the arming of the North Koreans, the war could not have happened.

DANGER OF ARMED NATIONS

Under article 26 the Security Council is made "responsible for formulating * * * plans to be submitted to the members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for regulation of armaments."

The CHAIRMAN. If you don't mind the interruption, I think that your statement might be seriously questioned as to whether or not there could have been an antidote to war. Let me say why.

I think it is generally understood now that back of the war in Korea was the strong arm of the Kremlin. It armed the North Koreans, and when MacArthur repelled them, it had armed the Communist Chinese, and sicked a million of them in there. A million dead tells the story.

The Communists provided airplanes and munitions. So back of it all was the feeling-out process of the Kremlin. They intended to find out whether or not this was a weak spot on the perimeter of earth. It may have been just the beginning of a lot of local operation; we don't know.

But in view of the fact that they were set back on their haunches in this very dangerous procedure, I think it has caused the Kremlin to stop, look, and listen.

I think the judgment of the military men is that they had this pretty well planned, that they made a deal with Mao, of the Communist Chinese, and that Mao was a little bit disgusted because it cost him so much, and he got only half of what he started out for.

Miss ROBBINS. Well, I would certainly agree that while men are armed, while nations are armed, we are going to have war when someone like Russia wants to have war. We will have it as long as nations are armed. But I also think that Senator Mansfield pointed out a very good point on the United Nations Charter when he said that it was set up primarily to operate in peacetime.

That is true, but in the purposes of the U. N., as stated, the U. N. Charter is so flexible that it permits changes to be made in the charter which enable us to operate to prevent peace from being broken. In other words, that is the thing that I am coming to, the suggestion I want to make now.

INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE FOR INSPECTION

There is at present within the U. N. a Commission charged with study of such plans. But suppose some plan were suddenly found to be acceptable to both the East and the West? The U. N. Charter fails to provide the authority and machinery for a practical system of inspection and control of armaments, once a plan is agreed upon.

Naturally, no country will want armed troops within its borders to carry on this inspection. We would not trust Russian troops to inspect in the United States, and they would object to us in the U. S. S. R. Such inspection should be carried out by an international police force, very carefully selected to avoid bias, and acting under strict supervision of the General Assembly or the International Court.

Now, I am using the word "police" in its essential and narrow meaning, the dictionary meaning, which is a body of men to act only against individuals, and not to take the place of an army.

I mean, I am not using this international police force as a group that could take the place of national armies at all, not even an international armed force. It would be different from this international police force.

This is merely an inspection police, to inspect for contraband arms, after a plan of regulation of armaments has been agreed on.

At present the charter gives no authority for internal inspection within countries. Suppose we did decide upon such a plan, the charter at present does not provide for the right for such inspection police to operate within countries.

Senator MANSFIELD. Miss Robbins——

Miss ROBBINS. Is that true?

Senator MANSFIELD. Proposals have been advanced by this country and her allies for a disarmament conference to consider the doing away with, in large degree, of conventional weapons, and to a certain degree of atomic weapons.

This country and the West has always insisted in the United Nations that this should be carried out on a regulation and inspection basis, but every time the Soviet Union has come back and has refused to accede to such a request.

I say that because I happened to be an American delegate to the Sixth General Assembly session of the United Nations at Paris in 1951. Our chairman was a delegate the year before last. At both those meetings this proposal was offered by the American delegation, received the solid support of the Western nations, but because of Soviet intransigence, it was not able to get anywhere. I wanted to have the record show that as far as we in the West were concerned, we have been trying to work along the lines of your recommendation, which I think is very meritorious.

Miss ROBBINS. I know that the committee is still working on that in the U. N., and the last report I read was that there are some differences between us and the Soviet Union which had been ironed out, but by no means all of them at all. And we are just hoping.

SPELLING OUT NATURE OF INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE IN CHARTER

I believe, however, if the charter could be revised to show that this international inspection police was so carefully selected as to be unbiased, and so on, that it would be a practically unarmed police, and the type of inspection that they would do, under authority of the International Court or the General Assembly, that could be worked out, then I believe that it is possible that Russia's objections to international inspection might begin to break down, at least let's just hope so. It certainly might be worth a try.

Because that is one of your objections now, this internal inspection. She doesn't make clear what she means by it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the Kremlin doesn't agree.

Miss ROBBINS. They all say she doesn't say what she means by it, she says "Yes," she wants internal inspection, and the next breath she says she doesn't, so we will have to find out what she does mean. We don't know what she means.

And it would certainly be to her advantage as well as ours, but we can't see that yet. The best we need to do, though, I think we need to clarify our plans as clearly as possible, so that Russia can't come back to us and say, "Now, you intend to send an army into our country to inspect," or something of that sort, and we certainly wouldn't stand for that in our country.

If that were true, I think that some amendment would have to be made, either to article 26, or to some addenda covering armament regulations, perhaps a whole addenda covering armament regulations would be necessary if such a plan were worked out, and certainly any disarmament plan accepted would have to be put into international law, so that the International Court could see that it were enforced, using these inspection police for finding it.

GIVING INTERNATIONAL COURT RIGHT TO TRY INDIVIDUALS FOR VIOLATIONS

Furthermore, at present, such a police force has not been given the right to confiscate any contraband weapons found. Such instructions for confiscation could only come from an International Court. But at present the court has no right to try any individuals who may be found manufacturing or holding illegal weapons.

In the Statute of the International Court of Justice which follows the charter, and which is stated to be an integral part of the U. N. Charter, article 34, paragraph 1 says: "Only states may be parties in cases before the court." And if courts were to operate over guilty individuals—because it is always individuals who begin to break the international laws first; is that not true? We held individuals responsible at the Nurnberg trials, but that was after the war. Now we want a system whereby we can hold these individuals responsible before war starts, before the situation becomes so serious that nations go to war. Nip war in the bud, in other words.

Hold your Nurnberg trials before the war, and that's what I am proposing here, that the International Court be authorized to try any individuals whom these inspection police find disobeying any disarmament regulations we may decide upon.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

There are many other changes that are probably necessary; for example, we certainly need universal membership. In order to get that, we would have to do away with the veto, not on all things at all, but certainly we could do away with the veto on admission to membership, because I believe that Communist China does not come under admission of new members. It would be a question of bringing it up as to who is to represent China, and I believe that's a different problem, and I think if we were to amend the charter so as to allow members—you will have to define "peace loving"—all peace-loving members to enter, Russia has vetoed some, but we have also vetoed some, and I believe that all those who are waiting to enter, we would still be ahead as far as it comes to counting noses.

It might be that Russia would give in, we don't know. But if we could just do away with the veto on admission of new members, that would help.

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

And also, let's see, one other thing, on Pacific settlements of disputes, peaceful settlement of disputes sometimes are hindered by the veto. But, of course, when we do away with the veto, that weakens the Security Council again, and you have almost taken it out of the hands of the Security Council. Then we will have to weigh the Assembly.

If the Assembly does the work of the Security Council, we will have to have weighted voting there. And there are a number of other problems that come in there.

EFFECT OF IRON CURTAIN ON CHARTER CHANGES

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your opinion, that we can have a workable plan for the control of atomic energy as long as we have an Iron Curtain?

Miss ROBBINS. I believe that we are going to have to break down that Iron Curtain, and I believe that some day the time will come, because I believe that even nations—at no time can nations fight without willing armies—and I believe the people of Russia are not going to be willing too much longer. I think we need to be prepared for the time when it comes by having plans worked out.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, there is an old saying about rascals—we hope they get religion.

Well, we hope the Kremlin and its stooges get religion. If they do that, they will find that America and the West are ready to sit down. We certainly are not looking for any war.

But we are recognizing the fact that we are dealing with a breed that has in mind world domination. Now, do you think for one moment that there is anything to indicate that the Kremlin would permit, say, a neutral group from Switzerland or Sweden, or some country that might be designated as the inspector, to go through their vast country and inspect their war development and their atomic development?

Miss ROBBINS. I have no way of making sure, but I am sure that we can find a plan if we work on it hard enough, because I believe if the plans are offered and publicity is given that the people of the country, when a practical plan is presented, I believe, the people will then insist that their leaders accept it. I believe the time will come. I don't know how soon, but I think it will come.

The CHAIRMAN. I know the Good Book says that faith will move mountains, but there are lots of high mountains, like Mount Everest, over there to move. Until we do that we will keep our powder dry, won't we, and see that we don't develop any pre-Pearl Harbor mental condition?

Miss ROBBINS. I have assumed that all of this disarmament regulations is a progressive matter, a gradual matter. Is that right? I believe that's the principle that they are now working on, is a gradual matter, and not a settlement.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. And, Miss Robbins, I want to compliment you on your study of the U. N. Charter.

PRESIDENT'S ATOMIC PROPOSALS

I would like to ask this question: We have been talking about disarmament and, I think, placing pretty much the emphasis upon it as it affects conventional weapons. What do you think of the speech concerning atomic energy President Eisenhower made some 2 months ago from the U. N. forum in New York City?

Miss ROBBINS. I think it was excellent, and I wrote and told him so.

Senator MANSFIELD. I think if it is implemented it may go down in history as one of the greatest speeches of our generation. I sincerely hope that the good faith in which this proposal was made by the President of the United States, in behalf of all of us, is carried forward to the extent that the Russians will not only sit down, as they say they are willing to, and as they supposedly are at the present time, but will sit down in good faith, too, and try to work out a solution. If a solution isn't worked out, eventually we may see the day when there will be no need for a U. N., because there will be nothing left in the way of civilization.

That's all, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Miss Robbins.

Mrs. Max Johnstone, substitute teacher in Akron public schools.

Carry on.

STATEMENT OF MRS. MAX JOHNSTONE, SUBSTITUTE TEACHER IN AKRON PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mrs. JOHNSTONE. Senators Wiley and Mansfield, and members of the committee, I am very proud and pleased and honored to be able to express my own personal views this afternoon, and also to read some statements from prominent Akron women whose views are well respected in Akron.

I think it important to remember that the affirmative side of this discussion is asking for charter review, nothing radical—just a conference to study revision. After 10 years of existence it is time to stop and take stock of the United Nations, to check into its good points and into its imperfections, if any.

Those who wrote the U. N. Charter felt that when it became 10 years of age it ought to be reviewed, so they wrote into the charter that the subject of "review conference" should appear on the agenda for 1955 to be voted upon.

WEAKNESSES—VETO AND INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

We who feel that the vote should favor charter review believe that there are weaknesses within the framework of the United Nations that should be corrected or changed.

Probably the outstanding question in our minds is the blocking of decisions by the use of the veto. After nations have studied and debated a question for weeks, or even for a whole session, and then put it to a vote and are defeated by one negative vote—what a waste of time and money. How frustrating for the nations who agree, to be hamstrung by one negative vote.

Another important need, I think, is to have an effective international police force.

The story of the world's past is the story of leagues and treaties and more wars, which tells us that leagues and treaties have never been effective to preserve the peace.

Because I respect life and hope, not fear, and respect the dignity of man, I want to see the United Nations strengthened into the sort of organization it should be. It can be, if we review the United Nations Charter with the idea of realizing that we must make it an instrument for helping to maintain the peace.

OPINIONS OF OTHER AKRON WOMEN

The statements of several women I have mentioned are brief, and I would like to read some of them. Their affiliations and some of their work are given as a means of identification only; they are speaking personally and not as representatives of any organization.

Mrs. Sara Caldwell, immediate past president of the National Education Association, said:

I am 100 percent for the United Nations. I think it is the one machinery we have for getting together to talk out our problems around the world. The door must be kept open. I see no reason why the review conference should not be called. Don't we take stock of our own activities? Good business always does take stock.

Mrs. James Faunce, 1953 member of the city advisory board smoke control, for 3 years a member of the board of the YWCA:

Why should the conference not be called? That is my question. It is on the agenda, and we don't know what we can do unless we try. The publicity given the United Nations, making people think about it, would alone justify calling the conference.

Dr. Mabel Reidinger, vice president of the board of education, a professor of Akron University, says:

Enlightened self-interest on the part of the United States of America demands that the United Nations must function as an instrument of international cooperation. The great scientific, economic, and political changes in the world since the charter was formed would seem to require that the document be reconsidered.

Mrs. E. H. Parsons, volunteer worker with Family Service and church organizations, says:

I favor calling the Charter Review Conference. Every consideration should be given to strengthening the charter.

Mrs. Anne T. Case, president of the Akron Board of Education, along with Mrs. Charlotte Cramp, volunteer worker in OCD and other civic agencies, also favors calling the review conference.

Mrs. L. O. Weiss, who was 1952–53 chairman of the peace committee of the Akron Council of Church Women, in those years spoke before 50 organizations on various aspects of the United Nations, says:

Considering the fact that the United Nations under the present charter is a league of sovereign states, and considering the fact that no such league has ever been able to preserve the peace and prevent war, I believe that eventually the U. N. must be developed into a world federation, open to all states, with defined and limited powers. I believe as a nation we are now ready to participate in a conference that would consider the necessary revision. I would like to see, among other things, the veto removed from all questions not involving armaments; universal membership; and the administration by the United Nations of such disputed areas as Trieste. I sincerely hope our Government will support a Charter Review Conference in 1955.

Mrs. Norman Auburn, wife of the president of Akron University, said:

Yes; I favor calling the Charter Review Conference, first, because it would be a good means of public education; second, review action by the United Nations is desirable in the light of changed world conditions; third, the charter in the beginning was probably weaker than many people would wish, because it seemed desirable to make a cautious beginning.

And there are similar quotations from Mrs. Naida Worthen, president of the YWCA board. She is a teacher and a mother of a serviceman. She says:

In December 1953 a nationwide poll indicated that almost three-fourths of the American people support the United Nations and that 35 percent wanted it to be strengthened. We are living in drastically changing times and certainly should, for our own security, review and perhaps revise a charter written almost 10 years ago. This, I believe, would definitely make the United Nations a better means for world peace, which is certainly the hope of every thinking person today.

Mrs. Howard Reeves, a member of the board of the League of Women Voters, makes a similar statement.

Mrs. Lawrence Abbott, a civic worker, a minister's wife, a member of the League of Women Voters and of the United World Federalists, says:

We need the charter revised, and we should study it carefully in all of our city groups to find out what we feel should be changed. I, of course, am calling for the review conference in 1955.

Mrs. Walter Hoyt, a member of the board of directors of Akron University, makes a similar statement.

Mrs. Edward T. Holmquist makes a statement part of which I would like to read. She is president of the Akron Council of Church Women. She says:

I very definitely feel that the United Nations next to our churches is our greatest hope for peace, that as a country we should do all we can to enable the United Nations to bring about peace in the world. I see no reason why the review conference should not be called, for certainly after 10 years we would profit by some changes. We should take a new, appraising look at the charter.

Mrs. Howard M. Doutt, past president of the United World Federalists and a member of the League of Women Voters of Akron, says:

Feeling that a great many people in the United States want a stronger United Nations Organization than that which resulted from the San Francisco conference, I have asked of varied audiences before whom I have discussed the United Nations this question, "Would you have supported a stronger U. N.?" In every case by a show of hands the vote has been preponderantly "Yes."

Mrs. Robert G. Sparks, visual education chairman of the Council of Church Women and visual publicity chairman for the U. N. in the public schools, also makes a similar statement.

Other names I should like to read are Mrs. Paul L. Raish, who is active in PTA work, at the art institute, and in the little theater; Mrs. George Stauffer, president of the Akron Federation of Women's Clubs. She says:

I thoroughly believe the United Nations is our only hope for world peace and therefore approve calling the Charter Review Conference in 1955.

Mrs. E. S. Babcox, an organizer of the Council of Church Women, and of the First Congregational Church study group, and past president of the YWCA board, also definitely feels that we should call this conference in 1955.

These women whom I have quoted and whose names I have just read believe, as I do, that the United Nations can be strengthened by calling a review conference to look into some of its weaknesses and some of its strong points. We think it can become the instrument that it ought to be for maintaining the peace if the United States uses its talent, its great talent for leadership, instead of burying it.

I thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Any questions, Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mrs. Johnstone, all I want to do is to express my appreciation for the time and trouble taken by you and the other witnesses to come before us this afternoon and to give us the benefit of your views.

I have learned a great deal this afternoon just by listening to you folks as individual Americans and as representatives of various organizations.

I am heartened by this fact, and I think that our investigation, as a result, is getting off to a good start, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Wilcox informs me that the committee will resume its hearings here in this auditorium at 8 o'clock this evening. There will be eight witnesses. I want to join with my associates in thanking you, Mrs. Johnstone, and all the witnesses who have taken the time to come and give us the benefit of their ideas.

It was Knute Rockne, the great football coach of Notre Dame, who built his series of teams on the basis that "The idea is the thing, the idea of winning." The idea here is for us to get the wisdom that is found all over this land. We want to get folks thinking about this very seriously, as you people have. It is a matter in which, as indicated by practically all the testimony, you personally are concerned. You realize that this instrumentality can be made a vital factor in the lives of the Nation and other nations. At this time the meeting stands adjourned until 8 o'clock tonight.

(Whereupon, at 4 p. m., the hearing was adjourned until 8 p. m. of the same day.)

EVENING SESSION

The subcommittee resumed, pursuant to adjournment, at 8 p. m. in the auditorium of Simon Perkins Junior High School, Akron, Ohio, Senator Alexander Wiley (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Wiley (chairman), presiding, and Mansfield.

Senator WILEY. The meeting will come to order.

This is the second meeting of the Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter. Akron is the first city in this United States where we have met for the purpose of getting the reaction of the public as to the charter and any possible amendments, and so forth.

I am delighted that this evening we can continue this hearing in the auditorium of the Simon Perkins Junior High School in Akron, Ohio, to receive the views of the people of Akron about the place the United Nations should occupy in the foreign policy of the United States.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN

As I pointed out this afternoon, last summer the Senate instructed this Special Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter to make a full and complete study of proposals to modify or change existing international organizations such as the North Atlantic Treaty and

the United Nations Charter. Since it is likely that a conference to review the United Nations Charter will be called in 1955, it is essential if the Senate is to discharge its constitutional functions in the field of foreign policy, that it prepare its recommendations by early next year.

To do a good job, members of this subcommittee believe that we should meet with a cross section of Americans to ask them what they think the attitude of the United States should be with respect to the United Nations.

Foreign policy must be designed to keep this Nation at peace, with honor. Our participation in international organizations in general, and in the United Nations in particular, must promote this and other national interests of the United States.

In Lincoln's time, Americans could be found at this hour sitting around a potbellied stove in the country store or meeting in the country schoolhouse to talk about the problems of the Nation. And this is Lincoln's Birthday. This fine junior high school auditorium is a far cry from the country schoolhouse, but Americans are gathered here tonight because we know that it is free discussion and the give-and-take of ideas that have made America great. We are here because we know that in a democracy what the people think and say ought to be known to their Government. We must determine our action as a Nation on this sound basis.

I earnestly hope that the ideas this subcommittee gets here in Akron, and the suggestions we will get from all over this great country will help us to formulate recommendations that will promote the vital interests of this country.

My colleague, Senator Mansfield, of Montana, has worked long and hard on foreign-policy problems. We have both served on American delegations to the United Nations. We look forward to hearing your testimony on the United Nations.

Again, I want to thank you people of Akron for helping us meet here.

Everybody has been so courteous and friendly.

We have 10 witnesses tonight; we have asked each witness therefore to confine his oral remarks to about 5 minutes. If his statement is longer, he can file his statement.

I will be very happy at this time to ask Senator Mansfield for any remarks that he may have, before we inquire of the witnesses.

Senator MANSFIELD. I have none, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILEY. The first witness we have is Mr. Howard M. Doutt, professor of secretarial science, Akron University; Advisory Council of United World Federalists of Akron.

I am glad to see your smiling countenance again, sir.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD M. DOUTT, PROFESSOR OF SECRETARIAL SCIENCE, AKRON UNIVERSITY; ADVISORY COUNCIL OF UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS OF AKRON

Mr. DOUTT. It is a privilege to appear before your committee. Senator, we are certainly very glad that you selected Akron as the first city outside of Washington in which to conduct your hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. We have no regrets, sir.

Mr. DOUTT. I have a short statement which I would like to use as a basis for my few remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Carry on.

Mr. DOUTT. As a combat veteran of World War I; as the father of a combat veteran of World War II; as one of the many, both veterans and nonveterans, who do not want to live through, or die in, world war III; and as a member of the faculty of the University of Akron who has spoken on foreign policy and on the United Nations before various civic, religious, and other groups; I wish to support the calling of the Review Conference provided for in article 109–3 of the U. N. Charter.

I urge the calling of such a conference and attempting through such means to strengthen the United Nations to the point where it can maintain peace, but without power to interfere in the purely domestic affairs of any nation.

I urge this for the following reasons:

1. The rapid advance of scientific discovery has made war, as a means of settling international disputes, intolerable. No one can win.

2. The United Nations, as now organized, cannot carry out its No. 1 function of assuring peace. If the first atomic bomb had been dropped before the San Francisco Conference instead of after, it is highly probable that a much stronger organization would have been established.

NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL POLICE

From these two statements, with which I believe very few persons would disagree, my own thinking follows what seems to me a logical path which leads inevitably to certain conclusions. The steps on this path are as follows:

1. We cannot have assured peace without disarmament, as President Eisenhower recognized in his proposals toward disarmament (address of April 16, 1953).

2. We cannot have disarmament safely without inspection, as recognized by the President in the same address.

3. We cannot have inspection without an agency to carry out inspection, probably an organ of the United Nations.

4. Inspection will be useles without a means of enforcement; i. e., it is not sufficient to discover that a nation is arming—there must be a means of stopping it.

5. Merely reporting infringement of the present U. N. Assembly or Security Council for discussion and debate would be as fruitless as debating a criminal's actions while leaving him free to continue.

6. It follows that the enforcement process must have teeth—which means an international police.

7. In order that such police may be effective, they must have authority to arrest individuals.

8. In order to protect individuals as well as protect us all, the International Court or an appropriate agency must have authority to try individuals; i. e., we must provide for regular court trials before the damage is done rather than Nuremburg trials after the damage is done.

If these things are done, the United Nations may be able "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war," as stated in the preamble to the charter.

42435—54—pt. 2——6

WEAKNESSES OF THE CHARTER

However, a consideration of these steps from a practical point of view brings to light immediately a number of weaknesses in the structure of the United Nations which must be corrected. Among these are:

1. The fact that decisions by the Security Council may be blocked by the veto of any one of the permanent members.
2. The fact that decisions by the General Assembly may be made by a majority vote which represents a small minority of the world's population or its productive capacity.
3. The fact that when decisions are made, they cannot be enforced but can only be recommended to member nations.
4. The fact that the International Court, representing what should be the highest level of jurisprudence in the world, is so limited that it lacks either civil or criminal jurisdiction over individuals.
5. The fact, closely related to the above, that the United Nations does not have a stable and secure source of income.

I realize that a Review Conference on the charter which attempts to correct these and other weaknesses will face tremendous problems. Working out a formula for the gradual and safe disarmament of the world will in itself be a task of great proportions. Many of the other problems will be difficult also. But it is not in the American tradition to shirk tasks because they are difficult; or even impossible. Our attitude is rather that "the difficult we do today; the impossible we do tomorrow."

It would be presumptuous of me to offer pat solutions to these complex problems. However, we can expect the nations of the world to send their outstanding statesmen to a Review Conference on the United Nations Charter. Surely it is not too much to expect that such a conference can arrive a solutions to which two-thirds of the Assembly will agree.

The matter of ratification may raise one of the most serious problems the Review Conference will face. Should they propose only minor changes? Such as receive almost unanimous endorsement of the delegates and so have a good chance of ratification by the member nations within a reasonable length of time? Or should they propose basic changes in the organization and authority of the United Nations which will be much more difficult of ratification but which will make it possible for the organiaztion to do the job it was intended to do?

Perhaps an answer may be found in words of George Washington, spoken to the Constitutional Convention of 1787:

> Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair; the event is in the hands of God.

That concludes my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, of course, when George Washington said, "The event is in the hands of God," he didn't mean that we, who have been placed on this earth, should do nothing except see if we couldn't follow what God wanted us to do.

Mr. DOUTT. That may have been in his mind. But he was facing a very difficult situation there in the Constitutional Convention, if you will recall.

The CHAIRMAN. I could tell a story illustrative of that fact, but we haven't the time.

What you are driving at, I believe, is that we have got a job to do here.

Mr. DOUTT. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. We cannot simply sit on our hands and say it will be done. In other words, we are the agency of accomplishing good or evil on this earth.

Mr. DOUTT. We cannot sit on our hands, because we say, "Well, there is no use, because it cannot be done."

INTERNATIONAL COURT AND DOMESTIC JURISDICTION

The CHAIRMAN. Some people argue the United Nations is already interfering in the domestic affairs of member nations.

Does your plan contemplate that the International Court would take jurisdiction in some domestic affairs?

Mr. DOUTT. It is difficult to draw an exact line, of course, between domestic affairs and international affairs. I would think that the international agency, whatever it is set up, whether it be Secretary Dulles' suggestion of a disarmament commission, or what, would have to have authority, of course, to enforce inspection.

That would probably mean a police or inspection force in all countries of the world. Now, we might not like that, we probably wouldn't, but we have to pay a price for anything we get.

And my opinion is that those who were in a trench with shells bursting around, the way I was, and sat at home while my son was in Germany, are willing to pay the price for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Your seventh point is: "In order that such police may be effective, they must have authority to arrest individuals."

Mr. DOUTT. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Would that require surrendering any jurisdiction of this Government? Or is the police force simply a supplemental arm of this Government?

Mr. DOUTT. I would think of it as supplemental.

The CHAIRMAN. Jurisdiction would only be given in those cases where Government itself, through adequate treaty, assent of the Senate, and so forth, would think it advisable?

Mr. DOUTT. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Doutt, I want to compliment you on your statement. It indicates a good deal of thought and consideration.

WEIGHTED VOTING IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

I am quoting from your statement that—

decisions by the General Assembly may be made by a majority vote which represents a small minority of the world's population or its productive capacity.

Now, just what did you mean by that particular part of your statement?

As you know, the United Nations is based on the theory of one nation, one vote, regardless of size.

Mr. DOUTT. Right. In the Assembly we have 60 nations represented, each with one vote. Theoretically it would be possible, of course, to have 31 of the small nations cast a majority vote, representing a minority of population and also productive capacity.

I think both have to be considered, and perhaps other factors also.

Senator MANSFIELD. Is it your suggestion that that be changed?

Mr. DOUTT. I would think that a change there would be highly desirable.

FINANCING THE UNITED NATIONS

Senator MANSFIELD. On the next page, Mr. Doutt, you state:

No. 5. The fact, closely related to the above, that the United Nations does not have a stable and secure source of income.

As you know, this country takes care of 33⅓ percent of the income accruing to the United Nations, and I believe it was only because of the efforts by the chairman of this committee, Senator Wiley, that we were able after a good many years to get it down to that level.

What suggestions would you have as to how the United Nations could be financed?

Mr. DOUTT. That would be one of the problems which I mentioned as facing the review conference. I would not trust to speak of anyone, but some stable source of income would need to be provided. That would not mean that we would necessarily be carrying an undue proportion. It is something that would be, I would think, more fairly distributed.

I do not know whether it would be something akin to a tariff as a possibility. There are many possibilities of assuring income. That would be a problem of the review conference.

Senator MANSFIELD. I might say that, in addition to getting the American contribution down to 33⅓ percent, that the chairman of this committee also was successful in raising the Soviet Union's contribution to something like 14 percent.

Do you approve of this Government paying one-third of the cost of the upkeep for the United Nations?

Mr. DOUTT. It might be, with conditions as they are now—let us say with the present situation in the world—that we would be justified in doing that, since it has been impossible to do anything else.

Not that that's necessarily right. It is one reason why I would like to see the whole charter gone over and a more fair basis worked out.

Senator MANSFIELD. A good point. I might say that, insofar as I recall the debates in both the House and the Senate, that the aim of a good many Congressmen who thought the United States was paying too much for the upkeep of the United Nations was to arrive at a figure of 33⅓ percent, which has now been achieved.

That's all, Mr. Doutt.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

The next witness is Rev. C. Willard Fetter, minister, First Evangelical United Brethren Church, Akron Ministerial Association.

STATEMENT OF REV. C. WILLARD FETTER, MINISTER, FIRST EVANGELICAL UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH, AKRON MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION

Reverend FETTER. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, we appreciate very much the opportunity to present a statement adopted by the Akron Ministerial Association, and secondly, a statement adopted by a group of ministers speaking for themselves, and not for the association.

We rejoice that in the providence of God and out of the necessity of human history, the United Nations was born and its present charter created.

While taking due notice of the failure of the United Nations to completely solve the questions of international relationships, we nevertheless note success of the U. N. in many realms, and cite as examples the political settlements in Indonesia and the Balkans, the collective action in Korea against aggression, the widespread hope that has come to the world through the Declaration of Human Rights and the Genocide Convention, the great economic good accomplished through technical assistance, and the effective work of the related, specialized agencies such as UNESCO, UNICEF, WHO, FAO. In the midst of a world of tension, world war III, widely predicted, has been thus far averted largely through the possibility of nations meeting together in the U. N.

We recognize that there are groups, both religious and secular, who are attempting to discredit the United Nations and who urge either American withdrawal from it, or weakening of it.

We believe that it is no longer possible for our Nation to withdraw into a shell of isolation. Our wealth, power, and influence place upon us the responsibility of participating creatively in the common life of the world. This we believe can be best accomplished, at this point in history, through continuing our membership in and support of the U. N.

Therefore, we caution those considering the revision of the charter to beware of efforts which will weaken the effectiveness of the U. N. or destroy it completely. This could conceivably be accomplished either by taking away from the U. N. functions it now has, or by giving to it additional functions which are unrealistic at the present time.

At the same time, there are some revisions which would seem worthy of consideration, and while carrying little risk would make the U. N. a stronger instrument. We urge consideration be given to such revisions.

MINISTERS' VIEWS

This was adopted by the Akron Ministerial Association.

The undersigned group of ministers speaking for themselves and not desiring to involve the Akron Ministerial Association or their respective churches present the following convictions for the consideration of the committee:

BENEFITS OF U. N. MEMBERSHIP

1. We definitely believe that the United States participation in the U. N. has been beneficial to our Nation. World war III has thus far been averted or at least confined to a "cold" war largely because the U. N. has provided a forum of international discussion. Through the U. N., we Americans have been able to overcome to a large degree the provincialism which has characterized us through much of our history. Through the U. N. we have gained insight into the thoughts of other nations. Beyond the benefits which participation has brought to the United States, however, we feel that the leadership which the United States has been able to bring to the rest of the world through the U. N. is worthy of mention. To us as Christian ministers the primary thing is not "Does the U. N. benefit the United States?" but

rather "How can the United States best exercise its responsibility of leadership in the world?" This, we feel, can best be accomplished through the U. N.

VETO MODIFICATION

2. Certainly the power of the veto in the U. N. has been abused, yet we would not advocate eliminating the veto entirely from the rules of the U. N. Perhaps this rule could be restricted so that the veto could not be used to block such matters as:

(*a*) Voting on peaceful settlement of disputes, or

(*b*) The admission of new members to the U. N.

If this meant that it would then be possible for Red China to become a member of the United Nations, we would be willing for this to happen. This, we feel, is simply facing the reality of the world situation—Red China is a major power in the world.

3. It is our conviction that all nations including ours must surrender to the U. N. that degree of sovereignty which will enable the United Nations effectively to maintain peace.

UNITED STATES AND SOVIET MEMBERSHIP IN THE U. N.

4. We feel that those individuals and organizations who advocate American withdrawal from the U. N. are entirely wrong. We should not deprive ourselves of this instrumentality through which to assert our influence upon the rest of the world.

5. There are those who advocate the organization of a new U. N. that would not include Russia or the Soviet bloc. We do not concur in this judgment. Realism forces us to admit that there is a great cleavage between the East and the West but we feel that every avenue must be kept open through which an effective reconciliation of these differences may be made. While it may not be possible at this juncture of world history to reconcile the philosophy of the Soviets and that of the free democracies, we feel that we need to have an inclusive U. N. organization to make even coexistence possible.

REVIEW CONFERENCE

6. We favor a review of the U. N. Charter and possible revision of the same in 1953. However, we caution the committee to remember that the present charter was created out of the sufferings and hopes of a world engulfed in global war, while the major victors were still bound by common urgencies. Developments in the past 10 years have created a less favorable climate today. We must, therefore, beware lest the charter be revised in such a way as to weaken rather than strengthen it.

ENFORCEABLE DISARMAMENT

7. We support the principle expressed in the bipartisan House Concurrent Resolution 132, now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which states that "it continues to be the declared purpose of the United States to obtain, within the United Nations, agreements by all nations for enforceable universal disarmament" under the United Nations inspection and control.

Robert Morey, Firestone Park Presbyterian Church, Akron, Ohio.

Eugene E. Morgan, Jr., Wesley Temple AME Zion Church, Akron, Ohio.

Calvin Klemt, Suffield Evangelical and Reformed Church, Suffield, Ohio.

Franklin Minck, High Street Church of Christ, Akron, Ohio.

A. W. Meckstroth, Grace Evangelical and Reformed Church, Akron, Ohio.

W. C. Snowball, Woodland Methodist Church, Akron, Ohio.

James E. Wilson, East Market Street Church of Christ, Akron, Ohio.

Bradley F. Skinner, Church in Silver Lake, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio.

C. Willard Fetter, First Evangelical United Brethren Church, Akron, Ohio.

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, sir.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP IN THE U. N.

Proposals for United States withdrawal or Soviet expulsion from the United Nations have come from many sources. What is your opinion as to that?

Reverend FETTER. Well, I think it would be a tragedy for the United States to withdraw from the United Nations. It is our only effective instrumentality for bringing our influence to bear upon the rest of the world.

I think it would be equally a tragedy for us to attempt to expel the Soviets because they are part of the world with whom we need to live.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe that there are advantages to having an international organization with universal membership, or would it be more advantageous to have an organization composed only of like-minded nations?

Reverend FETTER. As a Christian minister, I feel that we must seek solutions to our problems in terms of universality, and therefore we must have an organization of inclusive membership, including those whose minds are different than ours.

I believe that one of the things we have been able to learn in the past decade is that we must think in terms of relatives, rather than absolutes; that not all of the good is on the side of those nations who are like-minded, and that certainly not all of the evil is on the other side.

We need to learn to accept that other nations have to give, as well as to give what we have to offer.

VETO AND RED CHINA

The CHAIRMAN. Did I understand that at the present time, as you evaluate the world picture, you, the ministers, feel that we should let Red China in?

Reverend FETTER. No. I think that the statement that I made could easily be misunderstood at that point.

The CHAIRMAN. That's why I asked you.

Reverend FETTER. If the veto were changed so that it could not be exercised in the admission of new members, then conceivably Red

China might be admitted. That is one of the chances we would have to take.

I understand, however, that there are other nations, peace-loving nations, friendly to the United States' point of view, who also are waiting membership in the United Nations, and who may be kept out by this same veto power.

I do not think it is a foregone conclusion that Red China would come in. In fact, I think and I believe most ministers would agree with me, that as long as the indictment against Red China as an aggressor nation stands, she should not be admitted.

A SHRINKING WORLD

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke about our wealth and power and influence putting us in a position of responsible leadership. Part of that responsibility, I take it, is the leadership that we have given in the United Nations; is that not correct?

Reverend FETTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But you recognize also, do you not, that this world of ours has been pretty much foreshortened. As I said this afternoon, every nation is really literally in every other nation's backyard because of the inventions which have taken place. We have planes traveling at the rate of 1,700 miles an hour. Ohio and my State of Wisconsin is nearer to attack than New York City now, because of the circle route.

Reverend FETTER. Yes, I realize that, and I think that makes it all the more imperative that we have an inclusive world organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course when you speak of the difficulties of United Nations, you recognize the trouble isn't so much the instrument as it is ornery human nature.

Reverend FETTER. We theologians have another word for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, once in a while, when we are out of church, we have another word, too; sir. [Laughter.]

We realize that you are leading your flock to a better understanding of the vital facts of life, which include seeking to accomplish these things that we are discussing here.

Reverend FETTER. Thank you very much, sir. We sincerely try to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. Reverend Fetter, as I understand your thesis, you believe in what would be called a part-time veto?

Reverend FETTER. Or a limited veto, perhaps, would be a better word.

Senator MANSFIELD. I want to say I think that you have certainly made, in behalf of yourself and your colleagues, a most vigorous presentation of your beliefs. I am quite certain that you have given this committee a good deal to think about. That's all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, sir.

Reverend FETTER. Thank you very much, Senator.

REQUEST TO BE HEARD

Mr. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt this meeting a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. I have got a list here.

Mr. HARDEN. I think your witnesses are all handpicked, and this is not an impartial hearing. I would like to hear someone speak who is opposed to the United Nations. I haven't heard one yet.

The CHAIRMAN. If you will just be seated, after we have given these people who are listed here a chance, we will also give you a chance, if the hour is not too late. We have to return to Washington.

Everyone who asked to be heard was given a chance to be put down on the list here, the agenda.

I can assure you, sir; that as far as I know, no one here has gone out and influenced anyone who is on this list. I presume that everyone who has testified so far, and those who will testify hereafter, are expressing their God-given American privilege of expressing their own convictions.

Now we will hear from Mr. T. G. MacGowan, market research, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.; vice president, United World Federalists, of Akron.

Mr. MacGowan, you aren't handpicked, are you?

Mr. MACGOWAN. No, Chairman Wiley; I am not. I am, however, favorable to the United Nations. If being favorable to that constitutes being handpicked, why I guess I would have to plead guilty to that.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS G. MacGOWAN, DIRECTOR OF MARKETING RESEARCH, FIRESTONE TIRE & RUBBER CO., VICE PRESIDENT, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS OF AKRON

Mr. MACGOWAN. I am here as a representative of the Akron, Ohio, chapter of the United World Federalists, Inc. United World Federalists is a nonpartisan, nonprofit membership organization for the support and strengthening of the United Nations and for such amendments of its charter as will enable it to achieve universal disarmament enforced under adequate safeguards, thus preventing aggression and making possible a world at peace under law.

It seems to me that your subcommittee is doing a splendid thing in going directly to the people in their home communities to learn about our feelings toward the United Nations, and about our views regarding a charter review conference which will automatically appear on the agenda of the U. N. General Assembly in 1955.

I believe you will discover that the people at the grassroot know more about the need for the United Nations, about its workings and about its strong and weak points than we are sometimes given credit for knowing. In recent years there have been growing efforts in this country not only to discredit the United Nations, but to suggest that the American people are opposed to it and wish our country to withdraw from it. I feel sure that as this subcommittee visits communities throughout the country it will learn that the people everywhere support the United Nations strongly, want it to survive and want it to move forward.

Nevertheless, I think you will find that the American people feel that in some ways the United Nations has fallen short of the high hopes that were held for it. In the beginning they hoped that the organization would insure the peace of the world. They have been disappointed in its performance along that line. But they realize

that the United Nations has been a force for peace, if not a perfect one. And they feel that if peace—lasting peace—is to come, it will have to come through the U. N. By and large there is no lack of confidence in the value of the U. N., or in its capacity to grow up to the job which faces it.

I believe that the people at the grassroots in this country feel, as I do, that the United Nations can reach the point where it will provide a solid assurance of continuing world peace under a system of world law and order.

CHARTER DISCUSSIONS AT SAN FRANCISCO

It was realized when it was launched that the United Nations was by no means perfected. It was a highly experimental venture, the nations were by no means in perfect agreement on the provisions of the charter and many of the smaller nations in particular were disturbed at the great powers given to the five permanent members of the Security Council and to the veto provision which governed voting in that body. Some nations doubted that the great powers which had worked together in World War II under the spur of a common necessity would work together, when the military victory was won, well enough to make the Security Council workable.

Other nations, including Nationalist China, deplored the fact that the charter did not set up a system of limited world law. But the charter was, as all such documents are, a compromise, and in any case it could hardly be expected that a new international organization could from its very inception cope perfectly with the problem of war, whose solution had eluded man from his beginnings. So it was provided—very wisely, we know in the light of later events—that the question of whether a charter review conference should be held would come up automatically in 1955.

FAVORING A CHARTER REVIEW CONFERENCE

Secretary Dulles announced last fall that the United States would vote in favor of holding such a conference. That was an intelligent and courageous decision. There is of course no assurance that a better charter will result from the charter review conference. But the world has here a great challenge and a great opportunity, and I think it is very heartening that your subcommittee is at work on this problem and that widespread discussion of the charter is now taking place all over the country.

In explaining why I feel that a charter review conference should be held, I should like first to answer the question—how well has the charter contributed to aiding the U. N. to discharge its primary function, the prevention of war?

THE U. N. RECORD SO FAR

The U. N. has done a great deal of good. Its specialized agencies have been very effective. Several armed conflicts have been avoided or ended. The U. N. repelled the Korean aggression, which it could not prevent. The organization has provided a forum for discussion by nations with divergent views. It has kept alive the hope of peace,

and it has united and solidified the determination and the opinion of the free world against aggression and aggressors.

On the other hand, the U. N. has fallen far short of complete effectiveness in preventing war, and with atomic weapons in existence the world cannot tolerate anything except a perfect performance in this particular.

One reason why the U. N. has not been fully effective in preventing war is that it has not set up a system of law which makes warmaking and its antecedent acts illegal and punishable as crimes. The charter provided no system of law, nor, had there been such a system, any means of enforcing it. The U. N. Charter did provide that arrangements should be made (arts. 24 and 43) of a military nature to discourage aggression, but these were not possible because of the existence of the veto power in the Council.

The U. N. has failed to bring about disarmament, and has made no progress in the control of atomic energy. It has excluded, through Soviet use of the veto power, some 13 nations from U. N. membership.

THE WEAKNESSES OF THE CHARTER

What, then, are the principal weaknesses of the charter?

They are: (1) absence of provision for a system of world law limited strictly to matters of arms, aggression and the common security; (2) the veto in the Security Council, which tends to paralyze any effective action in security matters; (3) lack of a veto-free way to set up a U. N. police force. These weaknesses, of course, come down to a lack of world law and existence of the veto.

The late Senator Taft recognized the important lack in the U. N. of an underlying structure of law:

> The fundamental difficulty is that it is not based primarily on an underlying law and an administration of justice under that law.

When Secretary Dulles urged charter review last August 26 he pointed out that the charter "reflects serious inadequacies," one of which was the dependence which it places upon men, rather than on law.

These U. N. Charter weaknesses not only make it exceedingly difficult to deter aggressors, but, with other defects of the charter, they combine to make impractical, under the U. N. as now set up, a system of universal enforceable disarmament such as President Eisenhower envisaged in his speech of April 16, 1953. Such a system of disarmament is, of course, as the President pointed out, an absolute essential to a stable peace.

What effect do these charter weaknesses have upon the attitudes of the nations?

EFFECTS OF THE WEAKNESSES

As Secretary Dulles said in September 1953, "Nowhere is there a sense of security." There have been two other effects of the U. N.'s Charter defects and ineffectiveness in security matters which proceeds from them. First, there has been a sense of disillusionment in some quarters. Second, regional pacts and security plans have sprung up.

The U. N. and its charter were "oversold" to the world—the world was led to expect more than could be delivered. The charter was

not set up in such a way as to allow the U. N. to play a more decisive role in security matters than it has. As a result many nations have felt the need to develop collateral organizations for mutual defense—the Brussels Pact, the Rio Pact, the Organization of American States, NATO. The urge toward development of a federation of free nations of Western Europe also results from a feeling that the U. N. cannot be depended on in security matters.

It should be pointed out, however, that extremist opposition to the U. N. in this country does not spring from disappointment or disillusionment with its security results. This is an entirely different phenomenon. Extremist views that the U. N. should be abolished or that the United States should withdraw from it arise primarily from antagonism to the basic idea of international cooperation in the interests of world peace and order. This destructive opposition to the United Nations and to the fundamental idea of cooperative action for peace also confuses the nature of patriotism, which it falsely identifies with extreme nationalism.

DANGERS OF CHARTER REVIEW

Would there be dangers in a charter review conference?

I should like to make it perfectly clear that I would not wish to jeopardize the present charter in any way. If we cannot get a better one—one which grants more powers to the United Nations—then by all means let us stay with the present charter.

But I do not think that a charter review conference will jeopardize the present charter. The United States certainly does not want to leave the United Nations, and I am sure that no other member country does either. If any other country did wish to pull out, it would have done so, because there are no sanctions now provided that would be strong enough to keep a nation in if it did not want to stay.

So I have little sympathy with those who say that we must avoid a charter review conference because it would jeopardize what we already have. I would yield to no one in my desire to preserve what we already have.

Would not the Soviet Union veto any plans for a better and stronger United Nations?

This is an objection which is sometimes made against a charter review conference. Why, say those who offer it, bother with a charter review conference when the Soviet Union through its veto power will be able to reject and block its proposals?

There are three points to be made in answer to that objection: First, the charter proposed at San Francisco contained many improvments over the Dumbarton Oaks agreement; any of those could have been vetoed, but none was. Second, the rules in the Kremlin are not entirely free from pressures from their own people and from captive countries behind the Iron Curtain; these people are reached by the Voice of America and other means of communication. Third, the Russians may well hesitate to risk the world's censure for preventing adoption of a system of lasting peace under law.

PROPOSED CHANGES

What changes should be made in the U. N. charter?

I certainly hope that when the United States enters a U. N. charter review conference it will bring concrete proposals for U. N. Charter revision which are directed toward achievement of a system of foolproof disarmament within the United Nations. This is a goal which has already twice been stated by President Eisenhower. It was also expressed by President Truman before him.

UNIVERSAL ENFORCEABLE DISARMAMENT

The basic key to world peace is, of course, a system of universal enforceable disarmament. But no such system is feasible with the United Nations setup as it now is, and Secretary Dulles has made it clear that charter changes, including the introduction of a system of world law, must precede disarmament. Our Government's proposals for U. N. Charter revision should be drawn from a detailed study of what would be required to make disarmament foolproof under the U. N.

It is important to achieve disarmament partly because the crushing burden of armament costs are pressing very heavily on the American people. Our Federal Government will continue to operate under enormous budgets, which impose heavy tax burdens, as long as we are unable to reduce the amount of money we spend on armaments. The cost of past and future wars constitutes over 85 percent of our national budget.

This is an expense we cannot escape until we develop a U. N.-policed system of disarmament. Certainly our country cannot disarm when there is a possibility that other countries are remaining armed. We can disarm only under the full safeguards which are needed for what both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower called foolproof universal disarmament.

The Akron chapter of United World Federalists does not have a detailed plan for charter revision. We have no draft amendments to propose. Neither, for that matter, does our Ohio branch of our national organization. We do feel that the drafting of such proposals is a matter of first importance which requires the resources and the experience of our State Department and of established authorities on international law. We hope that such proposals will actually be drafted in the year ahead so that the United States will be able to present to the charter review conference a detailed description of what would be required to make disarmament foolproof under the United Nations.

I can only indicate in a general way some of the things that will be needed to this end.

NEED FOR WORLD LAW

First in importance is the need for world law, strictly limited to matters of the common security, and applicable to the individual.

The principle of world law applicable to the individual has already been accepted. The German war criminals were tried in the Nuremberg trials for violations of laws made after the crimes took place.

Senator Taft cried out against this ex post facto lawmaking. He was right, of course, but the fact remains that the principle of trying and punishing people for crimes against the peace of the world has been applied already. It remains to make the laws in advance of the crimes so that they will have a deterrent effect.

The laws will have to be made by a legislative body, and the General Assembly, with a better system of representation, is the body that should be given the power to do this.

UNITED NATIONS FORCES

Next, the United Nations will of course need forces of its own to replace national defense forces.

Naturally, if these forces were supplied by the nations individually they could not be sent into action by the U. N.

The use of U. N. military force to repel aggression has also been accomplished in the case of the Korean invasion.

How much better it would have been to have had the U. N. forces in existence before the aggression rather than afterward. Aggression would then probably not have taken place.

People have been talking for a long time about the need for an international police force and the time has now come when something should be done to make this idea a reality.

There also need to be procedures to equalize the contributions of nations to such a force. It is, in fact, absolutely essential that a charter review conference find a way to get all the U. N. member nations to share the cost, in manpower and money, of U. N. military establishments.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

Membership in the U. N. would need to be universal, automatic, compulsory, and without the right to resign. Resignation of Italy from the League of Nations after application of sanctions when Ethiopia was invaded is still fresh in memory.

Obviously no one nation should have the power to veto the use of United Nations military forces. The problem of the veto, fraught with many difficulties and complications, must be attacked.

We must also have a foolproof system of inspection to detect violations, and the ability to take steps, through application of law to individuals to halt such violations.

INCREASED AUTHORITY FOR INTERNATIONAL COURT

The International Court of Justice undoubtedly needs to be given authority over disputes which can be decided on a legal basis.

Most of the things I have said have come from my own mind. I have not had an opportunity to discuss my testimony with the national executive committee of the United World Federalists, and in any case the organization has consistently taken the position that the detailed implementation of the plans for a stronger United Nations must be drawn by those who have experience in the field. They must also result from careful negotiations with friendly powers. For these reasons I hope that your subcommittee will urge the State Department to begin immediately to draw up a blueprint with the help of your subcommittee in anticipation of the charter review conference.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that we in the industrial cities of this country are aware of the drastic changes in the political and social relationships of men which science and technology have brought about. We have seen that the destructive capacity of arms and armaments has increased geometrically since the last World War. We know that technology has been far from idle on the other side as well. And we know that civilization cannot survive another great war.

So we realize that man's skill in human relations and political science must now belatedly and rather quickly catch up with his scientific ingenuity and his productive powers. We think that the subcommittee is in a position to make a great contribution toward that development, and through it, to the preservation of our society, our civilization, and our race.

SOVIET PARTICIPATION IN A POLICE FORCE

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. MacGowan, do you believe that what you have suggested is feasible in view of world facts? Do you think that there could be a police force without the Soviet Union?

Mr. MACGOWAN. I think that the Soviet Union should be in the United Nations. The primary reason why I think so is that without it, you will not be able to have disarmament.

True peace and security will come only when the nations have all disarmed, and of course if the Russians and their friends are outside, there can be no disarmament on either side.

And if the Russians are outside the thing, there is all the more need, in my opinion, for what might be called a United Nations Army.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, but my question was broader. They are formally in now, so that they can raise all the racket they want. Many acts of theirs have indicated clearly that they do not intend to disarm, do not agree to inspection, and so forth.

Do you agree?

Mr. MACGOWAN. I think they are.

The CHAIRMAN. What would you do about it?

Mr. MACGOWAN. I think that you are right in saying that those are the conditions that prevailed up to this time. The Russians are full of guile and duplicity, and they have been very obstructive in the United Nations.

What they would do provided a revised charter were brought into existence which established the rule of law, and provided that a system of progressive gradual disarmament was brought into being under that charter, with suitable means of enforcement, is very, very hard to say.

They might very well veto the thing and not go along, but I think that the pressure of world opinion, and possibly the pressure of opinion from within the Iron Curtain, would perhaps be great enough so that they would not dare to leave themselves in the position of obstructing a workable idea for bringing peace to the world.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the real facts that we have to consider always is that there are about 2,300 million humans on this planet, and probably less than 300 million of them have any idea of freedom, of the way of life that we have under our flag.

It seems to me that we have to ask ourselves, "Well now, how can we make the United Nations more potent, to preserve peace, without de-

veloping a pre-Pearl Harbor mental attitude so that if and when the Kremlin strikes we are not alert?"

Mr. MACGOWAN. I agree with you on that, Chairman Wiley. If the Russians agreed to a revised charter which provided for disarmament, they either would or would not live up to its provisions. In other words, they would either disarm or they wouldn't. If they didn't disarm, we would be no worse off than we are now.

If they did disarm and we did, and everyone else did, then I see no reason why the United Nations should not have a military force of its own to replace the military forces that formerly existed and no longer did exist.

It is a question in my mind not whether a suitably revised charter would work if it were brought into being, but whether they would ever agree to it. But I think we ought to try it.

DANGERS OF WORLD FEDERALISM

The CHAIRMAN. There is just one other question I would like to get your reaction to. In view of the fact that since the Second World War the Kremlin has taken in its orbit something like 700 million human souls, in view of the fact that they haven't and did not disarm, but kept their vast army in existence, and in view of the fact that they have built the greatest air force, we think, in numbers, in the world—isn't it likely now, if we were to push too far the idea of world federalism, that it might cause a reaction against the United Nations?

Mr. MACGOWAN. A reaction?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MACGOWAN. Well, I don't think it would. I think that the people of this country are very hungry for peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, surely. So is the world. The Kremlin isn't.

Mr. MACGOWAN. You know, Secretary Dulles said the other day, in the world there is no security, and our people feel that. And they want to have something done. And it has to be something that I think is rather fundamental.

World federalism is a good solution only, I think, if the idea is kept to strict limits. Federalism, in other words, that were to set up a superstate of an all-powerful nature is a ridiculous idea. Anything that would penetrate into the everday concerns and affairs of a nation is an awful idea.

Actually, I think that we are espousing really just putting enough teeth in the United Nations to enable it to do its job, and no more at all.

A police force, a system of laws limited to this matter of arms and aggression, these laws applicable to the individual, courts to try these people, disarmament, inspection, there isn't in my opinion a hair's-breadth of difference between what I have been advocating here this evening and what Secretary Dulles has been talking about in his speech of August 16, and his testimony before your committee in January. It is simply the idea that we will give the United Nations now the strength to do the job that it was created to do.

As the previous speaker said, you have to have disarmament, or you won't have peace. You can't have disarmament unless you have law. You must have inspection, and you can't have those unless you set up the machinery to do it. Otherwise you are not going to have anything.

The CHAIRMAN. I agree with that. But until you deal with human beings who will keep faith, a mere declaration of law or institution of a law will not, in and of itself, get results. The Kaiser once said about a treaty, "It is just simply a scrap of paper."

Mr. MACGOWAN. Oh, you are quite right.

COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. MacGowan, you have made a sizable number of recommendations. I think probably as many as all the preceding witnesses.

I am only going to ask you about one thing: You mentioned compulsory membership. What did you mean by compulsory membership?

Mr. MACGOWAN. I meant, Senator Mansfield, the same type of compulsory membership which the Southern States of this country discovered they enjoyed in the United States of American when they attempted to secede from it in the year 1861.

In other words, once you are in, you stay. [Laughter.]

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, that worked, and I am sure it will continue to work. When you consider the fact that there are something like 75 or 80 sovereign states in the world, of whom 60 are voluntary members of the United Nations, it is rather hard for me, at least, to envisage an organization of any great strength and durability, if it is a question of forced membership, compulsory membership, rather than voluntary membership.

Mr. MACGOWAN. Oh, I don't want to be misunderstood. Membership in the first instance should not, of course, be compulsory. But once the thing is done, I don't think that the nation should be able to escape from their obligations to uphold the strength of the United Nations whenever it suited their convenience and their national ambition to do so.

We saw after the invasion of Ethiopia how Mussolini took Italy out of the League of Nations when sanctions were applied to him, and it is very green in our memory.

And you can have no stability, you can have no effective peace, if the people are free to withdraw at any moment whenever it suits them to do it.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. MacGòwan, that's a very interesting theory. I have never heard it before, but as I understand it, so I will have it clear in my own mind, the idea is that they voluntarily come into the U. N., but once they get in, they stay in?

Mr. MACGOWAN. That's just exactly what happened with our own Union of States, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mr. MacGowan.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mrs. Harry C. Long?

STATEMENT OF MRS. HARRY C. LONG, UNITED CHURCH WOMEN OF OHIO

Mrs. LONG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of making a short statement, which is a reflection of my own views.

I am in favor of revision of the United Nations Charter, because the experience of the past 8 years seems to evidence the need for some changes to correct inadequacies and to implement the purpose as stated in article 1, "To maintain international peace and security."

To make the United Nations more adequate to the needs of the atomic age—and I might insert that we will recall that the charter was drawn before we knew about atomic bombs, probably more realistic and stronger measures for dealing with the tremendous problems of universal disarmament, regulation and control of arms, might have been incorporated into the charter had we known about atomic bombs at that time. I believe amendments to the charter are necessary to achieve universal disarmament, under United Nations inspection and control.

The admission of new member nations is a subject for reconsideration in a fluid world. I favor granting membership to any nation ready and willing to take on the obligations of membership in the United Nations.

The question of the veto has been must debated and discussed. I haven't any wisdom to offer at that point, except that I realize it has been excessively used and perhaps abused. But it seems to me that questions coming before the Security Council might be discussed without this right being subject to the veto. In other words, abolish the veto in matters of procedure.

BACKGROUND OF WITNESS

Since the inception of the United Nations, and long before that, I organized study groups, led discussions, moderated panels, and have spoken with scores of church and club groups locally and over the State, on various phases of world affairs, with emphasis on world organization, and accent on the work of the United Nations. And as a member of the Christian world relations committee of United Church Women, I have visited the United Nations a number of times.

This summer I was a member of a European seminar made up of writers, speakers, ministers, and teachers, who spent the summer on a study tour of social, political, and economic conditions of Europe. I visited FAO in Rome, UNESCO in Paris, and the European headquarters of the U. N. in Geneva, where the Assembly of the Social and Economic Council was held.

I know something of the great humanitarian achievements and the social good accomplished by the specialized agencies of the United Nations. My desire is that we step up the political, legal, and diplomatic procedures and processes to break the arms race, and to lift the increasing cost of means of destruction, to hold and enlarge the social and economic gains by prevention of war.

CHARTER REVIEW CONFERENCE

In my thinking, charter revision by way of strengthening it at the points indicated is an approach to peace and world order.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, you realize that there isn't any legal process in matters of procedure?

Mrs. LONG. I thought there was.

The CHAIRMAN. It has already become apparent, from the Kremlin, that the Soviet vigorously opposes any discussion of charter review. The Communists claim such discussion will serve to increase international tension.

Do you want to comment, first, on their mulish attitude, and, second, on whether it would increase international tension?

Mrs. LONG. Well, of course, it is true that Russia seems to be determined to kick up all the ruckus possible. I am not sure that it would increase tensions. It seems to me tensions are at a pretty high point at the present time, and I don't know that revision would cause too much more agitation.

The CHAIRMAN. Then, if they made it another East-West issue, like they have pretty near everything, you would still favor the holding of such a conference, despite the possibility that it might create, if such a thing be possible, a greater schismatic condition?

Mrs. LONG. Well, of course, we live in a world of change, and we have to be a bit flexible in our attitudes and our views. If it seems the part of wisdom, if that is expressed by the majority of people, as you go about the country, perhaps it would be well to go ahead with it.

Of course, if the feeling is that it is no time to hold such a conference, perhaps you will be guided by that attitude.

BENEFITS OF UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION

The CHAIRMAN. Is it your opinion that our participation in the United Nations has been more beneficial than harmful?

Mrs. LONG. Oh, my, by all means.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the general consensus of those that you come in contact with?

Mrs. LONG. I think so. I believe that it is quite generally agreed that church people had quite a bit to do with the forming and helping to bring into existence the charter at San Francisco, and I believe that quite generally church people are supporting the United Nations.

I know that churchwomen have made very thorough studies of the work of the United Nations, and I think that there is general support and considerable study right now among women as regards the possibility of revision.

You notice that I made no statement from the churchwomen, because they haven't gone on record yet, because they are in the process of studying this whole matter of charter revision.

The CHAIRMAN. In your opinion, they are not making a fetish out of the organization—they just think that it is an instrumentality to benefit the race; isn't that it?

Mrs. LONG. That's right, and we want to be informed and to be alert to the constructive work that goes on.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mrs. Long, I think that the churchwomen of all denominations are to be congratulated for the active interest they have shown down through the years in the United Nations and its affiliated interests.

Mrs. LONG. Well, thank you for that statement. I will be glad to relay it to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you leave the men out?

Mrs. LONG. No, indeed not, but he was speaking of church women.

Senator MANSFIELD. And you have done a good job, you have shown an active interest, and I think that the country is deeply indebted to you.

SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND ECOSOC

Now, you have mentioned something about your first-hand study of the FAO in Rome, the agricultural agency, the UNESCO organization in Paris, and the Economic and Social Council in Geneva.

This study of course covers the subsidiary organizations as well as the parent organization.

In general, are you pretty well satisfied with what you saw on your tour last summer of these organizations in Rome, Paris, and Geneva?

Mrs. LONG. Yes. I was particularly impressed by what Dr. David Dodd, our American Dr. Dodd, told us of the great work being accomplished by FAO.

We saw evidence of it in Italy. The new development there of hybrid corn, for example, and then Dr. Dodd told us about the rice council in southeast Asia, which has upped rice production 10 percent in the last year, and they hope to increase rice production 25 percent in the next several years. Now, that means very much in a country where rice is the main item of diet.

Senator MANSFIELD. Isn't it true, Mrs. Long, that a good many people, when they think of the United Nations in this country, think of the United Nations in New York City?

Mrs. LONG. Right.

Senator MANSFIELD. And forget what UNESCO, the FAO, and the other subsidiary organizations have done.

While you were in Geneva, did you have a chance to look into the activities of the World Health Organization, so-called WHO?

Mrs. LONG. Yes, a bit, I did.

Senator MANSFIELD. And do you think it is doing a good job?

Mrs. LONG. A great job. In the realm of agriculture, they are doing much, I think—that is, diseases among livestock, and in the malarial infested sections of Italy, much is being done by spraying DDT, and all that sort of thing.

Senator MANSFIELD. And they are doing a great work among the children of the world, are they not, in various diseases?

Mrs. LONG. That's right, control of epidemics is getting well established.

Senator MANSFIELD. Thank you, Mrs. Long.

The CHAIRMAN. Joseph Glazer, educational director, URWA.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH GLAZER, EDUCATIONAL DIRECTOR, UNITED RUBBER WORKERS OF AMERICA (ON BEHALF OF L. S. BUCKMASTER, PRESIDENT, URWA)

Mr. GLAZER. I want to say at the outset that I am substituting for my boss, Mr. Buckmaster, who is the president of the United Rubber Workers of the CIO.

I say this with regret, because Mr. Buckmaster, as a member of the CIO International Affairs Committee, has participated in many international conferences throughout the world, and has been very active in the formation of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which represents some 60 trade unions in approximately 60

or so countries, about fifty-some-odd-million workers, and he has been very, very active in conferences in South America, and most recently in Stockholm, Sweden. However, I will read his statement if I may.

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Glazer, may I interrupt there? The ICFTU that you refer to is the world anti-Communist labor organization; is that right;

Mr. GLAZER. Yes, Senator, it is the ICFTU, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, which is the anti-Communist international trade union group throughout the world.

Senator MANSFIELD. And what is the Communist group called, do you remember?

Mr. GLAZER. Yes. It is called the WFTU, the World Federation of Trade Unions. Its headquarters are in Vienna, and the headquarters of the ICFTU are in Brussels.

There is quite a bit of rivalry between them, I would say. As a matter of fact, there was a split in 1948, when the free trade unions and the World Federation was established.

Mr. Buckmaster didn't intend to present a broad blueprint representing the 200,000 men and women of the CIO Rubber Workers—and by the way, 50,000 of them are living in the so-called rubber capital of the world, in this area. He thought that he would present a few significant points dealing with the revision of the United Nations Charter.

In his statement he doesn't go into a long defense of the United Nations, because we think that has been pretty well established. The CIO even agrees with President Eisenhower that the United Nations represents man's best organized hope to substitute the conference table for the battlefield, and I think there are very, very few people who will disagree with that.

The CHAIRMAN. Why did you use the word "even"? [Laughter.] Did you have a hard time?

Mr. GLAZER. Well, there are 1 or 2 points on which the CIO disagrees with Mr. Eisenhower. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. We will let it go at that.

Mr. GLAZER. I will skip the particular points on which there is similarity with previous speakers, but I might just mention the one paragraph where Mr. Buckmaster pointed out that the United Nations, to underline it, was formed before the dropping of the atomic bomb, and certainly this alone should call for a study and revision of the United Nations Charter, because any thinking person, I believe, would know and would have probably been in favor of a stronger United Nations if we had know that we had been able to devise something which could blow us all to kingdom come.

PREPARATORY DISCUSSIONS ON THE REVIEW CONFERENCE

One point that I would like to read out of the statement on bottom of page 2:

> Along with those preparatory studies, it would be wise, we feel, for our Government to immediately initiate diplomatic discussions with the four other permanent members of the Security Council—

One of which, of course, is the Soviet Union.

> Each of these members, as you know, can veto any proposed amendments to the charter which might result from the review conference scheduled to be held in 1955.

Such diplomatic consultations can result in a precise determination of those procedural clarifications and/or amendments to the charter, for which the full support of the five permanent members of the Security Council can be obtained.

And this, I think, is an important point that Mr. Buckmaster would have made if he was here.

AREAS FOR CHARTER REVISION

The four areas that he suggests in his testimony as being worthy of study for possible revision of the charter are (1) the veto power; (2) inspection commissions, with the possibility of disarmament and other types of control; (3) more information about the United Nations to be available throughout the world; and (4) a codification of international and world law.

Now, if I may just take a moment or two on the veto power, Mr. Buckmaster suggests what Senator Mansfield has called a part-time veto, or a limited veto. Although the Soviet Union his consistently used the veto power, it appears to be in the best interests of this country that the power not be relinquished.

I think it is important to point out that many Americans don't want to relinquish the veto power, and so forth. We do feel, however, that some method should be found, if possible, to nullify the veto power in two particular matters: (1) Matters affecting admission of new members, and that has been mentioned here, and (2) on the settlement of international disputes.

Similar recommendations were contained in the Vandenberg resolution of several years ago.

RELINQUISHING VETO ON MEMBERSHIP

Now, in the first matter affecting admission of new members, there are many countries, such as Finland, Ireland, Ceylon, Portgual, and recently—well, not so recently—the defeated nations of World War II, such as Italy, Japan, and Austria, which are outside the United Nations, and certainly there should be some new thought given to this field here as to whether these nations should be permanently kept outside the United Nations, whether we should figure out some way of getting them in.

At present, decisions concerning this can be made by a vote of 7 members of the Security Council, and 1 veto by 1 of the major powers, such as the Soviet Union, is enough to eliminate this.

We suggest here that it might be possible to amend the charter so that decision can be made by any 7 members of the Council, irrespective of whether the 5 great powers are among the 7.

This suggestion is just an idea, it is not a blueprint that must be exactly followed, but there may be a possibility of some agreement with the Soviet Union on some kind of a limited veto power, so that we can bring into the United Nations many of the other nations which are now outside it.

RELINQUISHING VETO ON SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

On the second point, inspection commissions, we feel an amendment might be suggested which would make it possible for commissions, established by the Security Council or the General Assembly, to

function within the territory of member states, provided the Commission is investigating conditions which threaten international peace and security.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE U. N.

On the third point, briefly, for information about the United Nations, since the strength of the United Nations depends in many ways on world public opinion, it would be highly useful to establish among member states an obligation to permit the circulation among its peoples of information about the United Nations.

WORLD LAW

Point No. 4, on world law, in order to strengthen the legal basis on which the U. N. rests, a possible amendment to the charter could spell out more clearly the principle that members shall observe the rules and principles of international law, of the charter itself, and of the treaties to which they are parties, and that the interpretation and application of these rules and principles is an international question not within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

In spirit, we are in agreement with the conclusion drawn by Secretary of State Dulles in his testimony before this committee on January 18, when he stated:

> It is in my opinion important that the United States should approach this problem of charter revision with recognition that the charter as it is can be made to serve well the cause of international peace and justice. The defects in the charter can to a considerable extent be corrected by practices which are permissible under the charter.

And at the beginning of the testimony, which I skipped, this point is underlined by Mr. Buckmaster. However, in conclusion, our organization, the United Rubber Workers of the CIO, also believes that amendments of the nature suggested above, and other constructive revisions which might result from the review conference, might materially strengthen the United Nations. We are hopeful that hearings such as these will result in those recommendations which will lead to a strengthening of the United Nations as a force for world peace and security.

And, in conclusion, I might say that I am sure that if Mr. Buckmaster were here he would thank the committee for bringing these hearings to Akron, and for bringing you right down to the grassroots in what we call, in the union movement, the rank and file, these important problems for discussion and consideration, to help spread and build better understanding of the United Nations and the problems of the world, so that in the future there will still be a world for us to argue about.

THE RUBBER WORKERS AND THE U. N.

The CHAIRMAN. You said there were about 50,000 members of your union around here?

Mr. GLAZER. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it true that the members of your union are pretty well up on what the United Nations means as set forth in this statement?

Mr. GLAZER. I would say this, Mr. Chairman: At the regular annual convention of the United Rubber Workers, for the past many years,

since the establishment of the United Nations, we have passed resolutions very strongly in favor of the United Nations, and at those conventions we generally have about 600 delegates, about 100 of whom come from the city of Akron. They are elected by the membership and represent them at these conventions.

I don't think you would believe me, and I would be telling you an untruth, if I were to say that every 1 of the 50,000 members of the United Rubber Workers understands everything about the United Nations. I think the same would hold for members of the Chamber of Commerce, and for any other organization in the world.

Part of my job, I might say, as educational director—and it is a difficult job—is not only to train our people and to inform them as to the operations of our union and of our contracts, but also as to their responsibilities as citizens, not only of the union and of the community, but as citizens of the world.

In every one of our 1-week summer schools and our weekend conferences, we hold classes on international affairs, world problems and legislative issues.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, what you said would apply to every other group. In your educational work, you feel that by and large the members of the union are really interested in this overall problem?

Mr. GLAZER. I think that is my experience, Senator—and I deal constantly with groups of people right from the shop, because the leaders are in the shop, the union representatives and the shop stewards and the rank and file members, in my experience, when they are acquainted with the facts, they show a tremendous interest in the United Nations and in this whole problem of world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I think that Mr. Glazer and Mr. Buckmaster are to be commended for coming before us and presenting the views of the United Rubber Workers. I am delighted to find that the CIO and Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles are still on the same side in this matter, so I don't want to ask any more questions.

The CHAIRMAN. That's fine. We thank you very much, sir.

(The full statement of Mr. Buckmaster follows:)

STATEMENT OF L. S. BUCKMASTER, PRESIDENT, UNITED RUBBER WORKERS OF AMERICA, CIO

My name is L. S. Buckmaster and I am president of the United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum, and Plastic Workers of American, CIO. Our organization represents approximately 200,000 men and women in the rubber and allied industries in 33 States of the United States and 2 provinces in the Dominion of Canada.

To begin with, I would like to express my personal appreciation to the committee for the privilege of submitting our thinking on the vital matter of the United Nations Charter and its possible revision.

As the committe probably knows, the rubber workers union and the Congress of Industrial Organizations have consistently supported the United Nations and have long been on record in advocating the strengthening of that organization so that it can better serve the causes of international peace and justice.

We feel that the U. N. can realize its fullest potentialities under the existing charter provided all aspects of that charter recognized and respected in both spirit and intent by member states. It is clear, I believe, that where the United Nations has failed to live up to its expectations the fault has generally lain not with the charter itself but rather because of the obstinate resistance of the Soviet Union to constructive policies of the U. N. Therefore, we believe that if the principles outlined in the basic charter could be fully utilized through voluntary agreement there would be practically no need to revise the charter.

Voluntary agreement with the Soviet Union at this time is unlikely, however. Therefore, though the charter has the potential for establishing and maintaining world peace, it would seem wise that certain additions or amendments be made to it to set forth procedures under which the spirit of the existing charter might be fulfilled.

Before we list and explain our recommendations on those procedures which we feel will make the U. N. Charter more effective in those cases where present circumvention of the spirit and intent block the constructive functioning of the U. N., I would like to suggest that the General Assembly immediately undertake a thorough and complete study of the extent to which the U. N.'s failure to function have been due to defects in the charter.

Such a study would provide the background for examining those parts of the charter which could be implemented by certain procedures and techniques to help the U. N. function more adequately.

Another project which it appears to me could be profitably pursued by the General Assembly is an evaluation of the effect of atomic and nuclear weapons on the operations of the U. N. For it must be kept in mind that the U. N. Charter was adopted some months before the world knew of the atomic bomb.

Along with those preparatory studies, it would be wise, we feel, for our Government to immediately initiate diplomatic discussions with the four other permanent members of the Security Council. Each of these members, as you know, can veto any proposed amendments to the charter which might result from the review conference scheduled to be held in 1955. Such diplomatic consultations can result in a precise determination of those procedural clarifications and/or amendments to the charter for which the full support of the five permanent members of the Security Council can be obtained.

We believe the following are areas where amendments might be considered:

1. The veto power.—Although the Soviet Union has consistently used the veto power, it appears to be in the best interests of this country that the power not be relinquished. We do feel, however, that some method should be found, if possible, to nullify the veto power on matters affecting admission of new members and on the settlement of international disputes. Similar recommendations were contained in the Vandenberg resolution of several years ago.

At present decisions concerning peaceful settlement of disputes between nations must be made by a vote of seven members of the Security Council, including concurring votes of the permanent members of the Council. In this field it might be possible to amend the charter so that the decision can be made by any 7 members of the Council irrespective of whether the 5 great powers are among the 7.

2. Inspection commissions.—We feel an amendment might be suggested which would make it possible for commissions established by the Security Council or General Assembly to function within the territories of member states, provided the commission is investigating conditions which threaten international peace and security.

3. Information about the United Nations.—Since the strength of the United Nations depends in the last analysis on world public opinion, it would be highly useful to establish among member states an obligation to permit the circulation among its peoples of information about the United Nations.

4. World law.—In order to strengthen the legal basis on which the U. N. rests, a possible amendment to the charter could spell out more clearly the principle that members shall observe the rules and principles of international law, of the charter, and of the treaties to which they are parties, and that the interpretation and application of these rules and principles is an international question not within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

In spirit, we are in agreement with the conclusion drawn by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in his testimony before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 18, 1954, when he stated:

"It is in my opinion important that the United States should approach this problem of charter revision with recognition that the charter as it is can be made to serve well the cause of international peace and justice. The defects in the charter can to a considerable extent be corrected by practices which are permissible under the charter."

However, our organization also believes that amendments of the nature suggested above and other constructive revisions which might result from the review conference might materially strengthen the United Nations.

We are hopeful that hearings such as these will result in those recommendations which will lead to a strengthening of the United Nations as a force for world peace and security.

We will have to move right along. I suggest that the next speakers, if they can, limit their statements to 5 minutes.

The next statement is Mr. Rudolph Erich, president, Croatian-American Citizens Club, member of the board, International Center; national president, Croatian Circle of Knights.

STATEMENT OF RUDOLPH ERICH, PRESIDENT, CROATIAN-AMERICAN CITIZENS CLUB

Mr. ERICH. Mr. Chairman, honorable Senator, honorable mayor, ladies and gentlemen, if ever there was proof needed of democracy and freedom in the United States, this gathering here tonight would be sufficient.

MINORITY GROUPS IN EAST EUROPEAN NATIONS

According to the present United Nations Charter, only those nations recognized as states and those created after the Second World War, have the right to enjoy the blessings and benefits offered by the United Nations Charter. Due to the recognition of only the established states, many democratic-minded and freedom-loving nations have been, against their will, forced to poin another nation to form a state and have become subjugated.

To illustrate my point, we have the creation of World War II—Communist Yugoslavia, the Slovenes, Macedonians, and Croatians in Yugoslavia are the oppressed nations. Each of these is striving to gain freedom and establish their own independent state.

The second creation is the state of Czechoslovakia where the Slovaks are oppressed and are trying to establish their own state. Then we have Ukrainian movement for liberation from Russian domination. Let's not forget the people of Latvia and Estonia. All those nations have been placed in today's situation against their will, and are looking toward the United Nations for liberation and the right of self-determination.

It is my firm conviction that the following proposal will be in accordance with those suppressed nations that I have mentioned.

THE U. N. AND MINORITIES

Given this opportunity, I propose—

1. An amendment to the United Nations Charter whereby any nation which has been forced against the will of its people to form a state with another nation, will have the right of an appeal.

2. The establishing of a special committee in the United Nations which would hold hearings with those national representatives who were recognized by their own people as a legal government before or during World War II and are now in exile.

In conclusion, I hope that some of the ideas given here will be used to benefit the world, and I wish to express my sincere gratitude for the opportunity to participate in such a democratic gathering.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you very much, sir. You have emphasized one fact that we have not overlooked, but haven't called to at-

tention heretofore. There are a group of enslaved nations which present a tremendous problem, not only to the people enslaved but to the rest of the world, and also raise the thought for all of us, a real question as to what the world can do about it, what the United Nations can do about it.

Any questions, Senator Mansfield?

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Erich, the committee wants to thank you for coming before us and giving us the benefit of your views. We are getting so many ideas here in Akron that I am frankly surprised at the amount of information which is forthcoming.

We are delighted you came before us, and we appreciate your testimony, and will give your views every consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness is Attorney Joseph G. Miller, president, Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH G. MILLER, ATTORNEY, PRESIDENT, AKRON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MILLER. At the outset I, too, gentlemen, would like to express my gratitude for the opportunity to appear before you this evening.

I am here today as president of the Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce to present the point of view of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, and then I would like to present my personal point of view.

The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce is an organization of young men between the ages of 21 and 36, having chapters in all 48 States and in almost all communities in those States. In Ohio, the Jaycees have 125 local chapters with a membership of approximately 9,000, and here in Akron we have approximately 430 members. The United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, representing over 200,000 young men, has taken a position in this matter, and by formal resolution passed at its national convention held in Minneapolis in June 1953, at which time President Eisenhower was our principal speaker, United States Jaycees adopted the following resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas the fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States is to achieve a just and lasting peace by supporting and strengthening the United Nations; and

Whereas the President of the United States confirmed and elaborated upon this policy in a recent speech; and

Whereas effective universal disarmament is the key to just and lasting peace; and

Whereas the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge have stressed the opportunity of amending the United Nations Charter in 1955; and

Whereas the Pittsburgh Junior Chamber of Commerce has passed a resolution requesting the responsible authorities be convened for the purpose of discussing and acting upon such changes in the United Nations Charter as they deem necessary and proper to strengthen the United Nations, so that it can achieve and enforce universal disarmament and guarantee a just and lasting peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the USJCC in convention assembled on this 7th day of June 1953 at Minneapolis, Minn., That the President of the United States appoint a committee of the proper authorities with the responsibility of discussing and acting upon such changes in the United Nations Charter as they deem proper to strengthen the United Nations, so that it can achieve and enforce universal disarmament and guarantee a just and lasting peace; and be it further

Resolved, That the USJCC recommend the adoption of this resolution by the other local chapters; and be it further

Resolved, That the USJCC investigate and study such possible changes for future action thereon by it and recommended similar action by the local chapters.

It is apparent that the United States Jaycees most actively favor the calling of a charter review conference and further, favor the strengthening of the United Nations into a more effective instrument for the prevention of war and for the preservation of world peace.

Here in Akron, as well as on the State Jaycee level, we have carried out many educational programs for the purpose of learning more about the United Nations and for purposes of supporting United Nations Day and celebrating United Nations Week. I think this desire on the part of the Akron Jaycees to learn more about the United Nations is generally indicative of the feeling of the American people that the United Nations is an integral part of our lives and therefore we should know as much about it as possible.

Personally, I find that I wholeheartedly concur with both our Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, and our President, Mr. Eisenhower, in their statements concerning the need for a charter review conference. I refer specifically to the speech made before your committee on January 18, 1954, by Secretary of State Dulles and I also refer to Mr. Dulles' speech before the American Bar Association on August 26, 1953. I believe that the United Nations, even as presently constituted, represents man's most encouraging effort to save our civilization from the horrors of an atomic war.

EXPECTATIONS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE U. N.

When the United Nations was initially formed in 1945, it inspired not only the American people, but I believe most of the peoples throughout the world, to a high level of hope and expectation that at last an organization had been formed that could insure international peace. We would be foolish if we did not say that the many high hopes of 1945 have not been realized. For if the United Nations would have accomplished what we hoped for it, we would now have international peace and world order. Yet, we cannot write off the United Nations as a failure, despite the fact that in the primary area for which it was formed, the area of prevention of war, it has not been successful. Yet the United Nations has a record of notable achievements. I would call to mind the following:

1. The establishment of the Indonesian Republic.
2. Support of Greece when attacked by the Communists.
3. Forcing Russia to withdraw her armed forces from Iran.
4. The creation of the Libyan State.
5. The effective resistance in Korea to the armed aggression of the Communists.

I believe that the United Nations is the first international organization to resist effectively and collectively armed aggression.

NEED FOR CHARTER REVISION

When the United Nations was created, the peoples of the world should have realized that it was in an experimental period. A number of nations objected to the composition of the Security Council and particularly to the veto power reserved to the members of the

Security Council. I think the greatest weakness of the United Nations is the inability of the Security Council to discharge its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international law ond order. However, like many other great documents, the United Nations Charter was the result of compromise. Realistically, we could not expect a new international organization to cope with the problem of war without encountering many difficulties. I think that the men who drafted the present charter were wise in providing for the question of a charter review conference to appear on the agenda automatically at the end of 10 years. It would seem that ordinary prudence would dictate that the question of the workability of the charter be reviewed at a later date in light of new developments.

Even our own Federal Constitution has been amended over 20 times, and our Constitution has been referred to as man's best example of a good basic document. So, we should accept the necessity of review as being part of the normal process of civilization's development.

So, I support Secretary Dulles when he states that the United States favors the holding of such a conference. I believe that his stand is courageous anid realistic. It would seem that the executive branch of our Government is indeed fortunate in having the Senate, and particularly your committee, at work on this question. I feel that widespread discussion of the United Nations Charter and its possible revisions is healthy and necessary in maintaining a strong democracy. Not only does this serve to help you understand the thinking of the American people, but I think it helps the American people crystallize their own thinking. Secretary Dulles stated that there were several major questions which should be brought before the Charter Review Conference and on which he felt there should be an educated public opinion. I must say that I agree with him in all six points.

ENFORCEABLE DISARMAMENT

The stake the United States has in the United Nations is security from all future wars. To have security from war requires universal and enforceable disarmament. The United States should give its considered judgment to what is necessary to make universal disarmament foolproof under the United Nations. I would like to suggest some of the requirements that would seem to be necessary in a charter revision to make the United Nations an effective organization to preserve the peace.

The United Nations will need its own forces rather than to be compelled to call upon member nations to supply their forces in time of need. As Dulles says, the United Nations would need universality of membership, if disarmament is to be universal. It would seem wiser to have all nations be members of the U. N. rather than to restrict membership to those who hold the same views . I believe that to achieve world peace, we should have a system of universal enforceable disarmament. But as Secretary Dulles has stated, a system of world law must precede world disarmament. The heavy burden imposed on the American people to pay for past, present, and future wars cannot be reduced until a foolproof system of disarmament under the United Nations can be evolved. Certainly, the United States should not disarm unilaterally.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you think that could happen before people cease being fools?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes. There are many fools that exist in many communities, and they are still subjected to laws, and thank the Lord that they are.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. MILLER. Disarmament can only be achieved effectively through a foolproof system of inspection and policing by the United Nations. It would seem that not only must we have a body of international law, but we must also give the administrative or executive body sufficient power to administer these laws. However, I believe that these laws must be strictly limited to matters concerning disarmament and preservation of the peace. The United Nations would need forces of its own, as police forces, to enforce violations of international laws strictly confined to disarmament.

U. N. NOW BETTER THAN NO U. N. AT ALL

In conclusion, I would like to say that I think it is important for the United States to approach this problem of charter review with the realization that the United Nations as presently constituted is better than no United Nations at all, that within the framework of the charter, the United Nations can be made to serve its primary objective of international peace and that the defects that exist in the charter can be corrected without undermining the United Nations itself. I think it is important that the American people continue to assert their belief, their faith, and their hope for eventual world peace through the United Nations. As President Eisenhower stated in his state of the Union message, "The United Nations deserves our continued firm support." I believe that mankind has reached a decisive fork in civilization's path. Unless we develop the capacity to deal with the problems of man and unless we develop enforceable world order, we may never be given another opportunity. I think that this committee can make a great contribution to the preservation of our civilization. We have the apportunity today to advance the noble objective of the United Nations. I hope that the American people are sufficiently courageous and sufficiently determined to seize that opportunity.

SURRENDER OF SOVEREIGNTY IN WARMAKING

The CHAIRMAN. Many people, of course, in the United States, are concerned about surrender of sovereignty. Do you contemplate, in view of the world condition, that there could be any surrender of sovereignty, especially since Russia and some of her stooges are in the United Nations? What is your thought on that?

Mr. MILLER. Well, in the area in which we are discussing the matter of sovereignty, I would suggest that I don't believe there is any sovereignty. I think when the Kremlin can call the shots on the size of your budget and the amount of money you spend for arms, and the number of men that have to spend time in the armed services, I submit to you there is no sovereignty in the area of war, and I think if we were to give up any sovereignty, that sovereignty would be the right, the absolute right of nations to declare war and commit mass suicide.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, time flies. I had more in mind.

Do you think the world is ready to create a police force and to give an international court the right to try some of our own citizens?

Mr. MILLER. I think the world is ready for any constructive change that would be a step forward toward preserving world peace.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say the world, do you mean America? Or do you mean the 2,300 million, most of whom don't think on the subject at all?

Mr. MILLER. I think they think on the subject of life and death. I think that's very close to the heart of every human being, regardless of his economic status, and I think it affects every person regardless of whether he lives in a backwoods or progressive country. And if this question that you have expressed applies to him, I suspect his reaction would be the same.

Senator MANSFIELD. No questions, Mr. Chairman, but an excellent statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Our next witness is Mr. Edward Piotter, an individual employed by the the Goodyear Aircraft Corp.

STATEMENT OF EDWARD PIOTTER, EMPLOYEE OF GOODYEAR AIRCRAFT CORP., MEMBER OF THE AMERICAN RALLY

Senator WILEY. Mr. Piotter, we can file your statement, and if you desire, go ahead and take 5 minutes explaining it.

Mr. PIOTTER. I have it abstracted here.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. Go ahead.

Mr. PIOTTER. My name is Edward Piotter, of 414 Cole Avenue, Akron, and I speak for myself and as a representative of American Rally, a national nonpartisan citizens' association which has an active chapter in this city. I am a laboring man sharing the problems and outlooks of the ordinary workingman with a sizable family and not-so-sizable pay envelope in the face of today's price and tax situation. As a wage earner I have been a leading participant in rank-and-file labor organizational efforts within Akron's industries. I have been since my first time clock a devoted partisan of democratic unionism, of cooperative and fraternal union in seeking common solutions to common problems. My personal approach to the United Nations, and the orientation of my organization, does not flow from any bias against cooperation on a world scale. I speak as a veteran of the 37th Ohio Infantry Division, a combat infantryman of 4⅔ years' active service and 40 months of frontline duty in the Asiatic theater. I took part in the campaigns of the Solomons and the Philippines. As a combat veteran, like all of my kind who still scratch old scars and carry malarial blood within them, I am most certainly consecrated to the cause of peace. With American Rally, I stand for "Peace here, now, and for all time."

I think I am a qualified witness for that aspect of the larger question which I have chosen. I do not pretend to speak for the legendary grassroots. My only claim is that I speak from them. I thank this committee for the opportunity.

To begin with, the grassroots' view of the U. N. is not to be captured, pigeonholed, or conveniently framed in so many words. The professional elite of the governing group, the commercial purveyors of opinion, and other nongrassroots categories seem to have a monopoly on words and phrases. The so-called plain people, the ostracized

"little man"—who is not always quite so little—are generally wordless. They are inept in polite phraseology. The nomenclature and terminology of a factory locker room, even when the topic is the U. N. in all its phases, is not the kind I can safely transmit on this occasion. Whether it is much different from the talk in a Senate locker room I am not qualified to say.

It has been the rule to kill an idea with a word. This operational control has been effective for at least a generation, whether the word was "isolationism" or "communism."

SOVEREIGNTY AND THE U. N.

The one antiquated term which best described the issue in the grassroots view concerning the U. N., or any kind of world government, is the word "sovereignty." This is a word the guy on the streets does not use often, if at all. Huey Long used it for him in the communicable idea of "Every man a king." Mostly—and I regret to report it—the grassroots of which I am a part views sovereignty in its negative obverse. As a soldier, a conscript foot soldier at that, I knew what "high brass" meant. As a union militant in the lower echelon of the CIO, I know very clearly what "bossism" signifies. Unable to define sovereignty, we can eloquently describe the absence of sovereignty. As an American, regardless of origin or condition, I know and the grassroots community knows the symbolism of sovereignty as expressed in the tattered banner, "Don't tread on me."

The titanic threat of the 20th century has broken upon the heads of grassroots America in three forms, which are essentially one phenomenon: (*a*) Mechanism, (*b*) centralism, (*c*) bureauracy.

The inclusive designation of this threat is statism. Some call it communism, socialism, and fascism. Some call it the New Deal, and others call it General Motorism in government. Like many in Akron, I have gone through the incubation stations which have been auxiliary to the organized labor movement—the socialist and neosocialist political forms. The grassroots community has not been entranced by any of these ideologies, and most of the sincere individuals have been disenchanted.

SUSPICION OF THE U. N.

The people have fallen back on the resources of their own best weapon: that weapon is suspicion. My first statement in reporting to you the sentiment of my kind is that we are suspicious of the United Nations in all its aspects because we think it is mechanized in its approach to living problems, because it is overcentralized in its structure, and because it gives evidence of supporting a bureaucracy which has its own motives and its own aggrandizement, independent of our own.

We are gravely suspicious of the U. N. because, all in all, its direction appears to be statist in general—a superstatism, encompassing all the vices and none of the virtues of the member states within its orbit.

I am supported in this belief by the growing affinity among the ranks for the propositions inherent in the constitutional amendment offered by Senator Bricker, of this State. Not for almost a hundred years have the highways and byways of American thought been

agitated over such a high state question. The great debates in the Halls of Congress over the Atlantic Charter and other ramifications were sterile by comparison. What is this thing called treaty law? What is the power of the President to secretly commit us to power agreements? What is this World Court, and how can it affect you and me?

The dynamism of interest and, I repeat, suspicion toward U. N. was not generated by talk shops or syndicated editorials or by subversive organizers. It has blossomed up in hometown America as a direct and bitter consequence of the war that was not a war in a far-off place called Korea.

The fruits of Korea are manifest in many ways but most of all by a mounting interest, a watchful, "wareful" interest, in this multinational creation which was given the onerous task of sponsoring the action there.

In 1952 the mass of voters voted against their own traditional restraints in favor of a strong President against a weak one—for a military man against a charming civilian. They did this because they wanted out of Korea and because they wanted to revive their own status as citizens of an autonomous nation, away from subservience to the U. N. and its Korean adventures.

It is not germane to this discussion, of course, that I think the voters leaned on a very feeble stick. There was, apparently, no other course open to them. But I do claim they were driven by a desire to establish sovereignty or reestablish it for the United States of America.

POWER BLOCKS IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The grassroots has watched, with chagrin and some amusement, the antics of the Russian bloc in the Security Council and the General Assembly. But, if this honorable committee feels that the American grassroots is persuaded that the U. N. is an arena for only two antagonistic ideologies—the American and the Soviet—to battle it out, then I want to help undeceive the committee. The mainstream of all alert opinion in this country is as well posted now as it has been for 50 years that not 2 but 3 main blocs or power ideologies are in the contest.

We know that British foreign policy contends along with the Russian and our own, whatever it may be. We know that the British have done very well, indeed, in using the U. N. in pursuit of their balance-of-power plotting and conniving. We do not blame the British Foreign Office or chastise it because it pursues survival and it does only what it knows best to do. But we are resentful and suspicious of those agencies in and out of the Government who confuse our own sovereign interests with those of the British and who seek to foist off the Russian bugaboo as the only threat we have to meet.

The American grassroots knows one theme in foreign policy which has been negated and violated by the United Nations from the very beginning. That theme is stated in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence, applying not only to King George but to all nations then existing and to come. It said with revolutionary simplicity that our attitude should be, "In wartime, enemy; in peacetime, friend." This we understand.

This is why so many of us rallied to MacArthur, who showered his disillusionment with power politics across the land. We have had no brief for this strange exercise called the cold war. We cannot tolerate any more "police actions," whether in Korea or in Indochina.

WEAKNESSES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

And yet—against the grain of our predilections—this course appears to us to be the course of United Nations. We are suspicious now; and, given no constitutional outlet, that suspicion may well up overnight into outright opposition.

The U. N. was postulated to us on the terms of peace, cooperation, and world brotherhood. In the 12 years of its evolution we have seen these words contravented by actualities of war, maneuvers, chicanery, and deceit.

We read the United Nations which blazons the principle of the sovereign equality of all members, all nations. Americans, despite the grandiosity of our own Republic, have sympathy and affection for the smaller powers. How have the smaller powers fared in the U. N.? Those of us who are part of the labor movement and who have smarted with the injustice of union bossism as it made puppets and playthings of us—we know that the Security Council rules the roost in a most domineering way. We are sophisticated enough to realize that there is no majesty of sovereign equality within the U. N.

We read in the preamble to the U. N. Charter that one of its interests is to enforce "respect for obligations arising from treaties." We read also that its principle is "Nonintervention in the domestic affairs of any state." We recall Eleanor Roosevelt's clearcut statement in 1949, that these covenants would "have to be ratified, and would then be legally binding. Being a treaty it would require all nations to change their laws to comply."

I respectfully submit that the grassroots is not too dumb to interpret all this. We were part of the great steel crisis which ended in President Truman's unconstitutional seizure of the mills in 1952. A great many of us managed to struggle through the minority opinion written by Chief Justice Vinson. I remind you again that we are not champion manipulators of gobbledygook, but we certainly know when the U. N. is being used, or the attempt is made to use it against the constitutional law which protects our sovereignty.

This is why such a large section of the public will be increasingly alienated from U. N. endorsement unless the Bricker amendment, or its equivalent, insures us as a people against the backdoor authority of treaty law. We saw Senator Sparkman last year singlehandedly approve the treaty with Ireland! We have watched our sovereign status as individual workmen in what was alleged to be an industrial democracy debased by minority rule and bureaucratic decree within the union movement. We have learned to beware of these innocent technicalities and the fine italicized print in the footnote clauses.

U. N. BASED ON THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The United Nations, in our eyes, is a product of war. The Second World War gave rise to it as an institution. Our suspicion of it is the product of another war 10 years later. The devastation of the Korean war has opened our eyes to many dangers.

There is the looming question as to whether a fine, glorious agency for world peace can be produced from the unclean cauldron of a power war. The U. N. came to birth in the Atlantic Charter. In real sense, it was a trick, a trick of propaganda, and not a nice trick at that. We learned later that it was an afterthought, a document mostly written by Sumner Welles to cover up the real significance of the Roosevelt-Churchill meeting on January 1, 1942. Almost from the beginning, Churchill made it clear that its coverage did not extend to the British Empire. Still later, President Roosevelt declared it did not apply to enemy peoples. Before VJ-day it was apparent that it did not apply at all.

Upon this flimsy and palpably unreliable prop, the United Nations was based.

This kind of shysterism in world politics is reminiscent of the League of Nations, to which unhappy history the U. N. is often compared. Historians bill it as a very shrewd stroke that President Wilson inserted the League's covenant at the head of the Treaty of Versailles and other treaties of peace. A very shrewd stroke, indeed. Unable to effect principled agreement, the Wilson coup forced every signatory to a peace treaty to automatically subscribe to the covenant. A ruined Europe is witness to the folly of Versailles, in spite of this.

SUSPICION OF THE U. N.

The U. N. was hatched while the infamous events of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were in progress. The San Francisco Conference, managed so ably by Mr. Alger Hiss, convened on the premise of our country's greatest error, the stupid policy of "unconditional surrender," and the useless atomic bombing of Japanese cities.

Since that time, and also as a consequence of the debacle in Korea, the grassroots have become alarmed and most suspicious of the Hisses and the Whites and the bureaucratic manipulators from Dumbarton Oaks through Bretton Woods. We are sick of secret diplomacy, disgusted with deals and counterdeals. The brave new world of the U. N. has given us more of the same, not less.

We have grown afraid of tricks and shrewd strokes and one-man commitments. In this negative fashion we have become concerned over the abstract issue of sovereignty. However, the grassroots does not traffic in abstractions. We know that sovereignty starts with the tip of our nose.

We fear a cancerous statism that makes itself felt with a knock on the door in the middle of the night. Our reservists who were dragooned into the Korean war by U. N. dictates, and without constitutional sanction, know what that knock sounds like.

In our community groups, including the institutions of the labor movement, we know what the supremacy of a Security Council implies. It means authority—authority with no resource to it, no debate and no vote. This is hardly our concept of the brotherhood of man in the parliament of the world.

Our ideals, our aspirations, our hopes for world peace are not diminished by what has happened. We are learning. We are not ready to scrap all that is valid, by throwing the baby out with the bath. We want very much to retain our fraternal assembly with the smaller powers; we have no desire to give the diplomatic initiatice to either Russia or Britain.

The U. N. claims to not be a federation, although its charter is silent about the right of a member to withdraw. Its proponents have claimed it represents nothing more—since San Francisco—than a multilateral treaty.

Let us recognize it as such and block now and forever its unhealthy propensity to grow into a world government or a superstate. And as a treaty, let us buttress our constitutional integrity with the amendment offered by Senator Bricker.

MAINTAINING UNITED STATES SOVEREIGNTY

Let us establish a concrete principle on this vague issue of sovereignty. Let us agree that sovereignty like so many things begins at home. A sovereign citizen in the State of Ohio had his sovereignty enhanced, not degraded by the formation of the Union. The tip of his nose was more protected, not less, with the establishment of the Federal Government. Our Federal Government rests not upon States but upon people. The ringing phrase begins, "We, the people of the United States * * *" not, "We, the people of Ohio, New York, Alabama, etc."

What does this mean in terms which we of the grassroots know and understand? It means the revolutionary colonial, the emergent American of the Revolutionary Period, had matured to the point where he could handle his sovereignty. He was ready for it. He had earned it.

This is not so today. It is a callous lie to speak of so many nations as possessed of a sovereign equality. If the social and general status of that one individual citizen with the very sensitive tip of his own nose is not sovereign, and if he has not worked up institutions to continuously express that sovereignty—then nothing is sovereign. Not the nation and not the United Nations. It is a hoax to speak otherwise.

There are some who speak with substance about the debasement of our own condition should we be party to an embryonic world government. This is so. Our sovereignty, conjoined with Brazil or Spain or Timbuktoo or even Britain would be lessened, truncated, and violated. Yet this is not the prime point. The prime point is that we have yielded our sovereignty locally. We can hardly blame Timbuktu for that. We have watched encroachment after encroachment eat away the vital processes of American liberty on an individual level. Mechanism, centralism and bureaucracy are grown here as no other place on the globe. Statism is entrenched and must be uprooted.

NO WORLD FEDERATION

The world federalists and their sympathizers know this. They reckon well how many unsolved problems, how great the accumulation of dilemma is at home. But they would escape the reconstruction job—they would move out of the Augean stables into the Rockefeller building. Everyone, without exception, with two eyes and at least one head has seen the foundations of the American Constitution undermined and corroded. The U. N. advocates say, "Let us climb higher in the building."

I feel strongly that this retreat into the higher reaches of bureaucracy will solve nothing, will only augment our peril. From the Atlantic Charter through Korea, we have stumbled along in confusion and fear. I think the grassroots shares my declaration to you now, "Not one step more until we know where we are."

I cannot see the justice of calling such an attitude toward the U. N. program isolationist. However, it does not greatly worry me, whatever it may be called. I think the so-called internationalist program of Churchill and Roosevelt, Truman, and now Eisenhower has done worse than isolate us in the world community. It has alienated us from the grassroots of other nations. We have followed a big neighbor policy, and Uncle Sam has become the alter ego of John Bull across the world, scorned and feared, toaded to and worked against.

I saw this in many Asian areas, during the Second World War. My private and public sovereignty was offended and abused when I came into contact with other nationals. My Infantry mission against enemy nationals was made more difficult and my fraternal relations with allies were crippled by a foreign policy that was not right. Not only the tip of my bayonet but the tip of my nose suffered because of the foundations of United Nations policy.

There is no worse isolation than that brought about by alienation. The world has become hostile territory. I do not propose to retreat from it. But I am personally unwilling to continue a campaign which drives friends from our side and leaves us a beleaguered outpost wherever we may be. If our U. N. policy, issuing I presume from the State Department and sanctioned I hope by our Senate on a traditional treaty level, will return to the simple theme of "In wartime, enemy; in peacetime, friend," when we may build friendship, and discharge from position all the architects of disaster.

RED CHINA ISSUE

We have been dragged into an untenable position of judging the fitness of China to sit in the United Nations. In the middle of a hard, bitter war we have seen our diplomats barter the bodies of our sons and sip blood along with our wartime enemy. Bad war or good war, you cannot put the American public in such a position.

If the U. N. is based on honesty and fair recognition, then there is no argument about Red China's right to representation. Support to an outlaw government is the worst kind of deceit. But do not ask us to wage war against this China, as the U. N. has forced us, and then meet in equal sovereignty with her. Among the grassroots, this kind of double dealing is not of our custom. It is useless to call it un-American. I will call it British—the carrying of water on both shoulders, a treacherous maneuveristic diplomacy which has no bridge or support from the people themselves.

WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES FROM SECURITY COUNCIL BUT NOT THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

I would propose in conclusion that the United States remain in the General Assembly, using it honorably as a forum for world expression. That we withdraw from the Security Council, fighting on the principled program of removing the Council's authoritarian supremacy

and working for the democratization of the Assembly through proportional representation.

Our connection with U. N. should not be as sponsor and underwriter for British duplicity, and as the foil for Russian maneuverism. We must shake ourselves free of all anticonstitutional obligations and recognize only honorable treaties sanctioned in open Senate deliberations. We must extend the bridge of our friendship to the lesser powers by working by their side, as colleague not as mentor, in the Assembly. Let us take our chances in a free market place of opinion.

DECENTRALIZATION OF POWER

Let us resist every move to centralize authority. Let us initiate and support all movements to build and enhance the sovereign citizen who is the cellular support of all sovereignty.

The true opposite and remedy for centralization is not decentralization. I do not offer the centralization back to States of the Dixiecrat persuasion. Nor do I propose decentralization upward through the U. N., which amounts to world centralism. Sovereignty is a matter of power.

The kind of power which I think the grassroots is willing to talk about is that power which is based on individual inviolability, liberty, and freedom to function in sovereign matters. To approximate this, power must be dispersed, not decentralized. It must be widely and evenly distributed throughout the citizenry.

I tell you the grassroots is sore and suspicious. Remembering the watchword, "Don't tread on me," let me report that we know to our grief that we have been trod upon. Sovereignty is the issue—not as a word but as an operational principle. The people are thinking in these terms.

"Every man a king" is a flight of poesy, but "Every man a citizen" makes sense—including every woman, too. In its present status the U. N. program is not promoting our citizenship. It does not strengthen and enhance our sovereignty. Therefore, the relation of the United States to the United Nations must change.

If it does not change in the direction I have indicated, then a giant reaction will be felt. It may well be a negative and a destructive reaction. If something like the new and adjusted relation which I have offered is brought about, then I feel we will be a better Nation for it, and I am sure that every nation in the world will be also.

When the impact of the American Revolution struck the world community, all instincts and tendencies toward social maturity and emancipation were catapulted forward. Our best gains have always come from a general leavening. We never have risen by crushing somebody else to the ground. We are not ready and the world is not ready for world government.

THE AMERICAN RALLY

I fear that along the lines of the present United Nations we will never get ready.

The CHAIRMAN. You say that you are a member of the American Rally Organization?

Mr. PIOTTER. That's right.

The CHAIRMAN. How big an organization is that?
Mr. PIOTTER. Well, countrywide it is about 5,000 or 6,000.
The CHAIRMAN. How many have you here?
Mr. PIOTTER. In Akron we have about 50 people.
The CHAIRMAN. Do you speak for them or merely for yourself?
Mr. PIOTTER. I wrote the speech myself. I speak for myself, as a representative——
The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand you to say that the U. N. is a superstate?
Mr. PIOTTER. No; I didn't say that. I said it tends in that direction.
The CHAIRMAN. That's all. Senator Mansfield?
Senator MANSFIELD. Well, Mr. Chairman, all I have to say is Mr. Piotter has given us a very interesting statement. Thank you.
The CHAIRMAN. Attorney Robert P. Whipple.
Carry on, Mr. Whipple.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT P. WHIPPLE, ATTORNEY, FIRESTONE TIRE & RUBBER CO., TREASURER, AKRON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMECE

Mr. WHIPPLE. First, I wish to give my appreciation for this opportunity to express my opinions. And I will read my statement, starting at the center and cutting out the first part in order to shorten it.

My name is Robert P. Whipple, a resident of 100 Davenport Avenue, Akron, Summit County, Ohio. My employer is the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and any statements which I make are my own and are not to be considered in any way endorsed by my employer. My age is 34, and I am a graduate of Lehigh University with a B. S. degree in chemistry and of Akron Law School with an LL. B.; a member of the Ohio State bar and of the bar of the United States Patent Office.

During World War II, I served as an officer in the Navy, with 23 months' overseas service. I am not a member of any veterans' organization. I am a member of the Active Reserve.

At the present time I am treasurer of the Akron Junior Chamber of Commerce. I am not a United World Federalist; my religion is Protestant, and I am a Republican by politics. I am married and have three children.

I am not a student of government or of foreign affairs and speak only as one who tries to keep track of current events through magazines, newspapers, and some other reading.

The question as I understand it is whether the United States should endorse the holding of a charter-revision conference in 1955 as provided for by the present Charter of the United Nations.

In my opinion, such a conference should be held and the United States should support whatever measures necessary to hold this conference.

EVOLUTION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has been successful, perhaps to a limited degree only, but still successful, since its organization. It is not a perfect organization, as no political or governmental organization is a perfect organization, and because it is not perfect, and perhaps far from perfect, there is good reason for holding a charter-revision conference.

As I view the situation, our own United States Government is an evolution of political experience of the various Colonies and States. By uniting in a central Federal Government the individual Colonies provided for security in international and economic as well as in the field of public health. The first efforts of our Federal Government were not completely successful and were subject to review, criticism, and amendment. Amendment is continuing and will continue. By analogy it follows that to provide for universal protection from war and aggression as well as to provide for improved social and health conditions, the individual states of the world must form some sort of a world organization. The League of Nations was a first attempt to provide this world organization. It failed in that the inherent weakness of lack of power to enforce its decisions was not corrected. The United Nations is a second attempt to create a protection agency and only by continually reviewing the organization of the United Nations and examining and reexamining its successes and failures can the nations of the world evolve an organization which can provide world security.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know, a famous statesmen once said that the League of Nations failed because the nations were not ready for the League of Nations.

Do you think that situation obtains now?

Mr. WHIPPLE. I think so, inasmuch as the Colonies were not ready for the first Federal Government.

But in this case, I think the difficulties are even greater, because of the differences of religion, of language, and of customs, which have to be broken down. So perhaps where it took 150 years for us to evolve our present set of rules and government, it will take even longer to evolve a workable system universally.

I think it is a period of evolution, and the question in my mind, of course, is, "How fast can we go in the world?"

CHANGES PROPOSED IN THE U. N.

Many changes must eventually come in the U. N. either through the charter or otherwise to make a better world organization. Among those which must be made are—

1. Elimination of the veto.
2. Establishment of a U. N. police force to enforce international law.
3. Revision of the trusteeship of backward, mandated countries to provide administration by U. N. commissions rather than by member countries.

VOTING IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The time is not yet ripe for eliminating the veto in regard to membership since the present membership balance would be upset by admission of countries which do not qualify morally for membership, such as Communist China. To make the U. N. a workable organization some time in the future, the veto power must be abolished, but before this can happen votes in the General Assembly must be reapportioned to give fair representation to large countries as well as small countries. Perhaps 10 to 20 or 30 years may elapse before the veto may be eliminated.

U. N. POLICE FORCE

A U. N. police force made up of troop units from member nations is necessary to quickly and effectively carry out U. N. decisions to halt aggression, maintain order, and enforce law among nations. Such a force would include air and naval units and should be formed at the earliest moment. All 60 or so member nations should contribute to this force and be obligated to support it with their national armies.

TRUSTEESHIP

As soon as practical, mandated and trustee countries should be administered by commissions made up of mixed groups of citizens of the member countries of the U. N. To me the present trustee system appears to support the colonial system. Yearly reports of trustee countries on the status of countries under supervision could be self-serving to the reporting country. Government by U. N. commission would be more fair to trustee nations.

DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

There is no reason why a world organization such as the U. N. should not be able to fulfill its responsibility without encroaching upon the constitutional liberties of the citizens of any member nation. Equipped with a code of international law, a court to interpret and apply the law, and an international police force to enforce the law, the U. N. must deal only with disputes between nations.

The U. N. in addition to the duty of suppressing aggression among nations must be empowered to continually work toward world disarmament. Disarmament is a very difficult problem and because it is such a problem disarmament may be achieved only by continued meeting and remeeting of nations to discuss methods of solution. The United Nations supplies a permanent forum for discussion and collective action toward world disarmament.

Only by the continuous review of the U. N. Charter in light of its successes and failures can a better world organization evolve. Such a review is possible in the form of a charter revision conference in 1955 and such a conference should be held.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Senator Mansfield?

WEIGHTED VOTING IN THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Senator MANSFIELD. Mr. Whipple, do I understand you to say that you think that the voting procedure in the General Assembly, where each state has now one vote, should be modified so that people or nations with more people would have a greater vote?

Mr. WHIPPLE. I think so. As I understand the situation now, the Security Council, with its veto power, makes the United Nations predominantly a big-nation organization.

However, if the veto power were done away with, I am afraid it would automatically become a small-nation organization, because of the fact that each nation has one vote.

Now, in our system of government we have apportioned our Represenatives in the House of Representatives according to the popula-

tion. So therefore we have a balance between population and between the States as they stand. In other words, each State having two votes in the Senate, and proportional votes in the House of Representatives. I think that's a fair system in the United Nations.

Senator MANSFIELD. Would you say then that it would be your hope eventually that the veto could be done away with, and some sort of majority rule substituted for it?

Mr. WHIPPLE. I think it must be done away with eventually, but I think it is a matter of evolution, and it can't be viewed subjectively.

We are in the middle of a very critical period now, and we must try to keep objective about it, because in 10, 20, or 15 years, the situation will probably be different.

Senator MANSFIELD. That's all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. David Horn, Oberlin College student.

STATEMENT OF DAVID L. HORN, OBERLIN COLLEGE STUDENT, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS OF OBERLIN

Mr. HORN. Mr. Wiley and Mr. Mansfield, I think I ought to say from the start that I was not handpicked to come here tonight. A group of us up at Oberlin are pretty interested in this international dilemma, this power struggle, this ideological struggle coupled with totalitarianism, and we have spent quite a bit of time trying to examine these problems and examine the thinking of various individuals on them, to try to come up with more sound ideas ourselves.

DISARMAMENT AND THE U. N.

I think it can no longer be overlooked that we are never going to be able, the United Nations is never going to be able, to enforce peace as long as the nations have their own individual armies.

In other words, under article 43 of the charter, we can put the 1st Marine, the 24th and 25th Infantry Divisions at the disposal of the Security Council; France, Italy, Western Germany, then might contribute divisions, and then if an aggression occurs, say Russia attacks Iran, well, we can send these Security Council divisions in to fight Russia. But obviously it is going to be just another war.

The United Nations can only enforce peace once it has it in its power to totally disarm nations. In other words, as Mr. MacGowan has said, and Mr. Doutt has said, and others, the United Nations are going to have to have the ability to go in and arrest the individual violators before they succeed in mobilizing.

Now, the second thing I think we can no longer overlook is that we can't separate the issue of disarmament and talk about revising the United Nations over here. In other words, we can't make the United Nations capable of enforcing the peace without disarming the world.

At the same time we can't talk about disarming the world until we realize that it is a world which can only be progressively disarmed, according to whatever agreement we can work out, and when we are progressing stage by stage, a self-enforced agreement, at the same time the United Nations has to come into being that is going to, in the end,

have a force which is going to be able to enforce this law we are talking about.

This it seems to me is the central problem we have to recognize. This has been very well developed by Grenville Clark. For some of you who are not familiar with Grenville Clark, he is not a dreamy-eyed pacifist or leftwinger; he is a member of the board of Harvard University; he was one of the coauthors of the Selective Service Act in 1941; he is certainly a hardheaded realist if there ever was one, and certainly he knows today that we can no longer expect to get peace and expect to get disarmament without a United Nations capable of enforcement.

IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

There is just another matter that we have to seriously consider. I think there has been too much tendency in the past of our national policymakers to overlook the fact that the struggle we are involved in today is essentially an ideological struggle; that the only basis of power today, or rather the ultimate basis, the principal basis, is peace.

We see as Vice President Nixon. When he came back from the Far East he made the statement that half, many people in the world, sincerely believe that the United States is just as much to blame for the international tension as Russia. They say we are not getting our message across.

I think the committee has to really address itself to the question, How can we get our message across? And it seems to me the most obvious way we can get our message across is to make it our stand, bring this matter up, formulate a plan for disarmament and a United Nations Charter revision, and be realistic enough to realize we are going to have to get the United Nations to force disarmament, and then push for it at the international council tables, day in and day out, week in and week out, over the Voice of America and over all our means of communication with these billion beople on the earth who are fence sitters, who are going to determine which way the struggle does go.

And I think it is only by this way that perhaps our present policy of playing military expediency can be justified and can be prevented from maybe leading us straight to disaster.

I think I have pretty well taken up your time, sir.

Senator MANSFIELD. You have done a good job. Keep it up.

The CHAIRMAN. If the spirit moves you, you can carry on for another minute or two.

Senator MANSFIELD. Or would you rather we asked you questions?

Mr. HORN. Let me bring up this additional thought. All right, I am going to be in Indochina a couple of years from now, probably carrying an M–1. I don't like the idea of seeing combat, I don't particularly want my brother to have to, but I realize I am part of it.

Our Nation is dedicated in this arms race. We are having to pursue a policy of naked military expediency; that's just what it means.

THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER

Now, take the case of bases in Spain. We need airbases in Spain so in case Russia starts a general war she knows we have the power to hit her back. This fact serves as a deterrent. We must have bases in Spain; we must have bases in north Africa. We must arm

France and Italy and NATO, and so forth, but at the same time many of these actions are giving the Communists, the anti-Americans, a tremendous source of means by which they can create anti-American resentment, hatred, and this is the very source upon which Communists are deriving so much of their power.

Consider the economic situation. In France, we know the average French worker makes something like $30 a week; he has to pay 15 percent of that in income taxes. That's all in the New York Times.

Now, under NATO, France is being asked to give 14 divisions to NATO. This means taxes to support those divisions, higher taxes for the French worker, and that means a lower standard of living. And who benefits by a lower standard of living of the French worker? The Communist CGT labor union, and so forth.

And again in the United Nations, we are forced to vote against the investigation of the murder of Farhat Hached, the Tunisian labor leader of the ICFTU, the anti-Communist union; we were forced to vote against the Arabs. Why? Because obviously we want to keep France in power in north Africa, because our airbases may be in danger if we don't. But at the same time, when we back this French colonial policy, we are contributing to a situation where the Communists can make it much easier to get the people on their side.

NEED TO DISARM

It seems that what we have got to do is—very few people are going to say, "Well, we have got to disarm unilaterally, we have got to quit the policy of military expediency." That's obviously senseless.

But at the same time, to continue this policy alone, without the presence of a superhuman effort to achieve endorsement of disarmament under a U. N. capable of enforcing it, that may very well result in a situation in which the Communists can cut the ground right from under our feet.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you have analyzed pretty well the critical world situation. I believe that you believe that the U. N. is a potential instrument for good, but that we have got to keep our powder dry and not fall asleep; is that correct?

Mr. HORN. That's absolutely correct, Senator. That's absolutely correct.

I think that the 1955 charter review conference will provide us an excellent opportunity to face up to the realities of the situation, and recognize that the problem of disarmament and the problem of making the United Nations effective to enforce peace are inextricably intertwined, and though there may not be sufficient public support in America today for the ideas expressed by Mr. MacGowan and by Mr. Grenville Clark, we are going to have to recognize it sooner or later.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Mansfield?

HOPE FOR THE U. N.

Senator MANSFIELD. David, before I came to Congress 12 years ago, I used to be a professor of history and political science at Montana State University. I had that job for about 10 years.

The CHAIRMAN. He doesn't look that old, does he?

Senator MANSFIELD. During that period I was able to solve a problem a day from the book.

But I must admit, in all honesty, that since I have been in both the House and the Senate, that the answers aren't easy to find.

I think you are to be congratulated for coming down here from Oberlin College and giving us the benefit of your views. I hope you never see the day when you have to pack an M–1 in Indochina or anywhere else, but it is only through you and your generation, and through the women, who have done a great deal of good for the United Nations, that I think we can be able to get ahead and bring about the type of a world organization which we would like to see, able to insure the peace.

I mentioned this afternoon that the U. N. was created not to take over at the end of a war, but to assume its responsibilities once peace has been achieved.

Peace has not been achieved yet, and the result is that in spite of these difficulties, the U. N. has done a great deal of good, all things considered. It has made many mistakes, it is true, but nevertheless it is a step in the right direction.

I am going to read your statement with a good deal of interest. It is rather long. I know the committee will take great interest in reading it.

All I want to say personally is, thank you for coming down and giving us the benefit of your views this evening.

(The document referred to follows:)

WHAT AMENDMENTS SHOULD BE MADE TO THE U. N. CHARTER?

The proposition need not be argued that the U. N. is outdated and that amendments to its charter are necessary if it is ever to achieve its intended purpose—to maintain international peace and security. Of the three reasons for the U. N.'s inadequacy given by Secretary Dulles in his courageous speech before the American Bar Association last summer, the most outstanding was that it was erected upon the foundation of collective security, the idea that peace could be maintained by the threat of war.

The division of the world into two armed camps and the passing of the Korean war have fully demonstrated the inadequacy of this concept. Ideally, it meant burning down the barn to kill the rats; in actual practice, it is unworkable in light of the present East-West power struggle.

THE DISARMAMENT PROBLEM

Today, few people will argue the statement that lasting peace and security is possible only in a totally disarmed world. The U. N. cannot enforce its will upon nations that possess the military might to defy it. The problem that dogs us now is how to bring about disarmement. Total universal disarmament has always been an objective of our national policy.

We have submitted plans for disarmament before the United Nations, but they meet only with propaganda blasts from the Communist bloc. If the Communists would only accede to our present disarmament proposals, we would have peace. Yet, year after year, the Communists reject our disarmament proposals and still manage to convince the whole world outside the Iron Curtain that we are as much to blame for the state of international armed tension as they.

Only last week, at the Berlin conference, Molotov injected the disarmament question into the talks. It was only a propaganda tactic, but it reminded many of the fence sitters in the power struggle that the U. S. S. R. was always ready to try and reach an agreement on the fundamental issue.

A critical study of the East-West positions on the disarmament question reveals, however, a considerable area of agreement, and other areas where a persistent effort at negotiation, conciliation and compromise, by the West, may bring further agreement, or at least put the Communists under tremendous pressure to yield from their position.

It was a willingness to negotiate and compromise on our part that brought the Korean war to an end. Had we stuck to our original position on prisoner repatriation, and never accepted the Indian compromise, we might still be fighting in

Korea today. As it was, we adopted the Indian position on repatriation, making our position so reasonable that the Communists were able to hold out against it only at the risk of it being made evident to the people whose allegiance they were buying that they, alone, were responsible for the war's continuation. The negotiation and compromise that resulted in the truce agreement did not constitute "appeasement" or "loss of national honor," on our part, and certainly our future security is in no greater danger because of it.

It is the same sort of effort that must be continually made to settle the disarmament question. The President stated it very well in his excellent speech last April 16: "The details of such disarmament programs are manifestly critical and complex. Neither the United States nor any other nation can properly claim to possess a perfect, immutable formula."

The same position was reiterated in SCR No. 32 introduced by Senator Flanders last June:

"That the President continue to search for a practical program of complete, enforceable, world disarmament, and also explore whether changes in the U. N. Charter may be required for the achievement of disarmament."

In both statements the frank admission is made that our present position is not the only one we will accept, and that we are not going to "stand pat" upon our present proposals. This is the only kind of approach whereby we can expect to get results.

We would have peace if the Communists were to accede to our present disarmament proposals. We would also have peace if the Communists were to accede to a Western demand for unconditional surrender.

The crucial question for Americans becomes: Is it possible to modify our present position to any considerable extent, without making concessions that, if incorporated into a disarmament agreement, would endanger our security?

The informed consensus is that such modification is entirely possible.

The remainder of this statement will be devoted to two points which, I feel, must be greatly emphasized:

(1) That a superhuman effort by the United States to achieve universal enforceable disarmament is absolutely imperative, both for insuring our own security and fighting communism.

(2) That this effort to achieve universal, enforceable disarmament will definitely involve recognition that certain basic changes must be made in the United Nations Charter to make disarmament possible, and for this reason the questions of disarmament and United Nations Charter revision are inseparable.

FURTHER EFFORT TO ACHIEVE ENFORCEABLE DISARMAMENT

To take up the first question, consider the proposition that it is greatly to our advantage to evolve a position on disarmament so reasonable that the Communists cannot reject it without losing a tremendous amount of good will.

In the first place, we need not belabor the point that American security can no longer be guaranteed by any amount of military preparation. As President Eisenhower said in his December 8 speech before the U. N. General Assembly, no absolute defense against a surprise atomic attack is presently, or ever likely to be, possible. Armaments, while absolutely necessary, can no longer guarantee our security; they can only deter aggression by assuring the aggressor of retaliation. American security can only be attained in a completely disarmed world.

COST OF EFFECT OF ARMAMENT BURDEN

In the second place, recognize that the continuation and acceleration of the present arms race greatly favors the spread of international communism. Economically, rearmament means poverty and low living standards. Under France's obligation to contribute 14 NATO divisions, in addition to the war in Indochina, the average Franch worker takes home roughly $30 a week, of which 15 percent goes for income taxes and another third for food. Tax money which goes to support NATO divisions means a lower standard of living for the French worker. The lower living standards mean more power to the Communist CGT labor union, and more strikes and unrest, such as we witnessed last August.

In Italy, with 12 divisions to contribute to NATO, the housing situation is so serious that in 1952 3 million of Italy's 9 million dwelling units were considered completely uninhabitable. Government funds which might alleviate this problem must be devoted to rearmament. The housing situation is only one aspect of the Italian political scene, which has witnessed an increase in the Communist vote from 33.1 percent in 1948 to 35.3 percent in last spring's elections.

In Japan, a nation where 18 of its 90 million people must import all their food or starve, factories which might produce sewing machines to pay for this food deficiency must be manufacturing automatic rifle parts, Last April's elections sent one Communist and 138 neutral Socialists to Parliament, as opposed to only 46 Socialists the year before.

In his April 16 address, the President stated that a substantial portion of savings achieved by disarmament would be diverted to a fund for world aid and reconstruction and help develop the underdeveloped areas of the world. Funds spent in digging irrigation wells and combating malaria in India mean fewer Communist converts, and while those funds remain unspent, the festering sore of Travancore-Cochin threatens to become a cancer that may envelope all India.

On the political front the benefits to international communism through continuation of the arms race are equally striking. We are building along a 2,500-mile North African perimeter a series of airbases, from which we can bomb Russian cities, should they start a general war. These bases constitute a deterrent against Russian aggression.

Yet it is no secret that American airbases on Arab soil provoke hatred of America among the natives. In Tunisia and Morocco we must support the hated institution of French colonialism in order to keep these airbases in friendly hands. Anti-Americanism in these areas, fostered by such policies, is a fertile breeding ground for communism.

Recently talk has emerged concerning the sending of American arms to Pakistan. Pakistan, of course, needs arms to defend herself against a Russian attack. In New Delhi, however, where anti-Pakistani feeling over Kashmir runs high, the news of American arms aid for Pakistan provided grist for the Communist propaganda mills.

In Egypt, the fate of the Naguib regime, the first stable, forward-looking, anti-Commuist government Egypt has had, may rest on whether Naguib can get Great Britain out of Suez. Yet the British must retain control over the Suez as long as a general war remains possible.

Finally, $226 million of American money has been used to bolster the tottering fascist dictatorship in Spain. We needed Spanish airbases for our military security. We finally got the airbases, and in Western Europe, where Franco is loathed, the Communists seized upon one more opportunity to fan resentment against the United States.

POLICY OF MILITARY EXPEDIENCY

Yet we have no sensible alternative to this policy of naked military expediency. It is impossible to justify on moral grounds unless, at the same time, we can demonstrate convincingly that we are doing everything in our power to bring about a world situation in which this policy were no longer forced upon us.

But international politics is not "moral" and we should not base any argument for a continuing superhuman effort by Americans to achieve enforcible universal disarmament upon "moral" grounds. Rather, the situation must be viewed from the standpoint of our own self-interest in fighting communism, and when looked at in this light, we are driven to conclude that this policy of naked military expediency, unless accompanied by a militant effort to bring about disarmament, may by itself lead to disaster. Patton tanks sent to Italy may one day face us, should the Communist vote there pass the 50-percent mark. Possession of the world's biggest H-bomb stockpile will give us little comfort, if and when India falls to communism.

Too long our policymakers have failed to recognize that the battle with communism is essentially an ideological struggle, a contest for the allegiance of a billion people in the world, uncommitted at present, but who hold the balance of power between democracy and the forces of communism.

We have striven to build up "situations of strength" and a "balance of power," all too often failing to realize that the ultimate basis of power in today's world struggle is people. When Vice President Nixon returned from Asia, he told the American people: "There are millions of people in this area of the world who honestly believe in their hearts that the United States is just as great a threat to peace as are the Soviet Union and Communist China. We are not getting our message across."

The Vice President doubtless realizes that it will take more than bigger appropriations for the Voice of America to get this "message" across.

CHARTER CHANGES NECESSARY TO PROVIDE FOR ENFORCEABLE DISARMAMENT

The question before the committee is now, "Does this superhuman effort to achieve universal enforceable disarmament mean that certain changes must be made in the United Nations Charter in order to make this disarmament possible?"

Let us assume that an agreement is reached under which each nation disarms by progressive stages, certified by inspectors, and so forth, to the point where each has only those lightly armed forces needed for maintenance of internal order. Under these conditions, what happens if one nation, say Russia, suddenly violates the agreement, seizes her industries and begins rearming? Obviously there is no recourse for the remaining nations, save for them to expropriate their own warmaking potentials, and begin rearming also.

The present United States proposal, embodied in the U. N. majority plan, purports to meet this contingency by: (1) regulating nuclear industries under a U. N. control organ, and maintaining them in such a state that it would take 6 months to convert them into bomb production if they were seized by a violating nation. This safeguard would prevent a surprise attack by the violator. (2) A "strategic balance" of nuclear industries, such that no nation could get control over a preponderance of potential A-bomb factories by seizing those within its borders. It was assumed, and still is by western diplomats, that some sort of allocation of Oak Ridge and Savannah River could be agreed upon by East and West, that would give neither side a preponderance of atomic power in event of seizure.

We submit that these proposals are wholly unrealistic and inadequate. To begin with, even if the U. N. control organ were set up and an agreement reached for a "strategic balance" of nuclear industries, there is nothing in the proposal to give assurance against a violation occurring in the first place.

Should such a violation occur, we would find ourselves once more in an arms race. A roughly similar situation has already happened; the 1920 naval limitation agreement was violated by Japan, when she began building her *Mogami* class light cruisers in the 1930's. What could the rest of us do except denounce the Japanese leaders and begin rebuilding our own fleets? World War II soon followed.

In the second place, a critical examination of its presuppositions throws the "strategic balance" concept itself into the question: Would it be possible to get the U. S. S. R. to agree to a disarmed world with 3 atom plants in the United States, 3 in Great Britain, and 3 in Russia? Since the event of violation and seizure would find the United States and Great Britain alined against Russia, the Reds would be bound to insist upon at least six plants. Could the west agree to this?

And what about Italy and France? An atom plant in either country might now be considered on the west side of the balance. But suppose a Communist government comes to power in either country. The "strategic balance" would quickly become an unbalance. The threat of the "balance" being upset by political upheavals in countries like France or Italy would, itself, provoke violation of the disarmament agreement by other nations, ourselves included.

Everything here said concerning the concept of strategic balance as applied to nuclear industries can be repeated for the problem of what to do with stockpiles of fissionable material that could be used as raw material for atomic explosives.

Thirdly, and finally, the concept of peace through "strategic balance" would presumably have to be extended to all industries and resources that constitute a nation's warmaking potential. Suppose, by some miracle, a "strategic balance" of nuclear industries ond stockpiles of fiissionable material were established? Then suppose Russia were to double her output of steel and electronic devices.

Could we be expected to permit this, when we know that if this tremendous industrial output were suddenly diverted to rearmament, we would be in great danger? The idea of achieving peace by a disarmed world with a "strategic balance" of warmaking potential among the several nations, in view of these considerations, would appear to be quite visionary.

The concept of peace through "strategic balance" must be discarded by our policymakers. From its rejection must come the realization that any realistic disarmament proposal today must provide assurance that no nation could seize its military potential and begin rearming. It is wishful thinking to believe that this Nation or any other nation can forego armaments as a means of security, until we can trust that security to some sort of an international body with those strictly defined and limited powers necessary to enforce total, worldwide disarmament.

From this line of reasoning spring the conclusion that we can no longer segregate the issue of disarmament from the problem of amending the United Nations Charter to make that organization capable of fulfilling its original function. The U. N. will never be able to keep peace in a world of armed sovereign states, no matter what effort we make to implement the collective security provisions of article 43 of the charter. It will only be able to enforce peace when it retains a virtual monopoly of force in a disarmed world.

POWERS NEEDED BY THE U. N. TO ENFORCE DISARMAMENT

At the same time, a disarmed world cannot be achieved unless we concurrently proceed to give the U. N. those concrete powers it must have to enforce disarmament. What are these concrete powers?

(1) The power to enact legislation in the strictly limited fields of war prevention and arms control. Such legislation would prohibit manufacture of weapons of mass production and illicit production and ownership of small arms. It must be emphasized that these areas within which the U. N. can legislate must be strictly defined and delineated in the charter. All other powers must be explicitly delegated to the member nations. While we must recognize that the U. N. be given ultimate jurisdiction in matters of war prevention, there is no good reason for giving such a body any powers that it does not need out of strict necessity. The assumption of powers in the areas of trade, immigration, and currency is entirely unwarranted, and must be guarded against by explicitly stating so in an amended charter.

(2) The power to enforce U. N. law in the above-mentioned areas by civilian inspectors and police forces in turn backed by United Nations armed forces. These enforcing agencies must apprehend individual violators. A United Nations armed force must be militarily superior to any forces remaining to a nation or group of nations for internal policing. Elaborate provision must be made to insure a United Nations armed force from subversion and control by any national group. Such safeguards are discussed in detail in Grenville Clark's writings.

(3) The power of compulsory jurisdiction in all disputes arising between nations, instead of the voluntary jurisdiction now provided for under article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. Enforcement of the Court's decisions would be made possible by adequate U. N. police forces suggested above under (2).

WEIGHTED VOTING

These appear to be the minimum powers that must be granted the U. N. if it is to enforce disarmament. These powers must, obviously, be implemented by proper amendments to the charter. It is not the purpose of this statement to specify the exact nature of these amendments. It is quite evident, though, that the present representation system of 1 nation, 1 vote, must be supplanted by a more equitable system of representation.

If the U. N. Assembly is to determine the size and use of United Nations armed forces, the United States has a right to expect more than 1 vote out of 60. In this respect, the Ryder formula, using a population and education factor, merits serious study.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

Since all nations must be disarmed and subject to U. N. jurisdiction, it would be impossible to exclude any nation from participation. This means the pretense of excluding totalitarian governments must be dropped. Spain, Communist China and other dictatorships must be allowed to participate in an organization that is enforcing disarmament upon them.

The danger of the revised U. N. Assembly becoming controlled by such totalitarians would be negligible under a proper system of representation.

Amendment of the United Nations Charter to make that organization capable of enforcing disarmament and maintaining peace is a vastly critical and complex task. It is no understatement to say that the achievement of this goal is the supreme challenge to your generation, our generation, and possibly our children's generation. Do not be appalled by it. The stakes are too great.

Once these prerequisites for peace are recognized by yourselves and incorporated into this Nation's position on disarmament and U. N. Charter revision, years of the most militant efforts to bring the Communist and other totalitarian governments into agreement will be required. No lasting peace and security will be possible without their agreement. Yet, as already emphasized, our adoption

of this position and our persistently pushing for it week in, week out, year in, year out both in the international council chambers and over our media of mass communication, may in the end determine the allegiance of the billion people who hold the balance of power in the struggle between democracy and communism.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID L. HORN,
(In behalf of United World Federalists of Oberlin).

The CHAIRMAN. There was a voice raised a little while ago by someone who hadn't read the notice in the paper last week, or 10 days ago, whenever it was, asking those who wanted to be heard to make arrangements to be heard.

Now, this group has to leave for Washington tonight on the B. & O. We have to be in Washington tomorrow.

If the gentleman who did rise wants to take 5 minutes, I will assign him that, or if he desires, he can prepare a statement. Anyone can prepare a statement and forward it to the Foreign Relations Committee in the Capitol, at Washington, D. C., and that statement will be placed on file.

Of course you realize that this is the opening meeting, as we have said, on several occasions here today. The United States is a pretty big piece of territory that we have got to cover. We cannot expect to hear 160 million people.

We have to set up hearings. We like to hear the different views of people, particularly those who have constructive suggestions.

Except as they relate to the subject, we are not discussing all the world issues. We are discussing one subject, and that is the United Nations and other organizations, like NATO, and so forth, that are important to our security. We are looking for light; we are not here to instruct, we are here to be instructed.

Do you want to be heard for 5 minutes?

Mr. HARDEN. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You can come up and take the chair. You will have to hurry unless you have pull with the railroad so that you can hold the railroad up for us.

STATEMENT OF RAYMOND HARDEN, STATE HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT

The CHAIRMAN. What is your full name, sir?

Mr. HARDEN. My name is Raymond Harden.

The CHAIRMAN. And what is your business or work?

Mr. HARDEN. I am an engineer.

The CHAIRMAN. Where?

Mr. HARDEN. With the State highway department.

I don't think anybody else had to give their occupation up here, did they?

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the statements.

Mr. HARDEN. I am a member of the American Legion and I am a veteran.

The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. If you resent my statement, that's no way to approach this problem.

The question we are considering involves your country and your attitude on the United Nations. Now, if we have said anything that irritated you, we apologize. We are but servants of the Nation. We come here looking for information, if you have such.

Carry on.

HARMFUL EFFECTS OF THE U. N.

Mr. HARDEN. Ladies and gentlemen, I think the United States should get out of the United Nations and get the United Nations out of the United States. I think it has done us more harm than good.

For instance, when General MacArthur was fighting communism in Korea, he had to report to a Russian officer. Now, my friends, that just simply doesn't make sense.

Furthermore, it has enabled the Iron Curtain countries to have big delegations here, who many times have constituted spies. I cite you the instance of the Russian who was expelled, who was a friend of Judith Coplon, who was stealing documents out of the Department of Justice for him.

Furthermore, the war in Korea, what did the United Nations do? The United States officials in Korea permitted the North Koreans to arm and did not arm the South Koreans.

Here is another case: The scandalous treatment of a million or more Arab people who have been chased off their land to establish a state for the people of Israel. I don't think the U. N. can be satisfied with that. We are giving $100 million a year to Israel; we are giving the Arabs a few loaves of bread and some tents to keep them alive while we are building whole cities in Israel with your money and mine.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think we have accomplished much, if we bring a million refugees in and make another million refugees in turn.

The United Nations has also attempted to influence our schools. So much U. N. propaganda was being carried on in the schools of Los Angeles that the people complained against it and rebelled, and stopped the whole United Nations educational program in the Los Angeles schools. Los Angeles, you know, is one of our major cities.

The people in a city like Los Angeles did not want to support the United Nations, I don't see why the people of Akron should want to support the United Nations, or the people of Ohio.

That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. We thank you, sir.

CLOSING STATEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN

Now, if there are any other folks here who want to express their views, it will have to come in writing. As I said before, we are on our way back.

I want to say just a word again to the kind people of Akron. We have had only kind words, we have had a wonderful reception. We are grateful to all of you who testified.

This is America. We can differ, we can go to church on Sunday, going down arm in arm, you go to your church and I go to mine, and then we come out and continue the journey. That's America.

Today we have had expressions where at least two witnesses have indicated quite clearly, including the last one, that they are not in favor of the United Nations. That is their constitutional right.

We have had testimony of others indicating that they feel that the United Nations should be continued, that there should be a convention of the independent nations in due time, to discuss matters of continuing the same, involving amendments, and so forth.

That's the objective of these hearings, as I have said so many times, to get your viewpoints. The privilege of an American is that he can express his viewpoint in public, and to his public servants who come from Washington.

The meeting will now stand adjourned. Again I thank you all for your courtesy and your friendliness.

(Whereupon, at 10 : 10 p. m., the hearing was adjourned.)

×