

Y 4. F 76 2: 76. 50 2

REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

4
4. F 26/2:
Un 35/2
R 341.1
U 561

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

RESOLUTIONS

RELATIVE TO REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
CHARTER, ATLANTIC UNION, WORLD
FEDERATION, ETC.

FEBRUARY 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, AND 20, 1950

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1950

need internationally controlled industries? Where would the force be located?

(i) What changes in the United States Constitution are involved?

(j) What changes in the constitutional authority of the Congress are involved?

We recognize, Mr. Chairman, that the growth of a world community requires the existence of an impressive beacon which reflects the aspirations of the world's peoples. We recognize the importance of working through the standards which have been set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. We recognize the concern of the American people and their desire to review under present world conditions what we undertook to accomplish in creating the United Nations. We also recognize that organizational form can contribute to clarifying public understanding of what they do and do not want to accomplish through international organization.

STATE DEPARTMENT CANNOT SUPPORT SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

But for the reasons given we cannot support this resolution.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. There was one question brought up in the discussion of this resolution which impressed, I think, all of us a great deal, and that had to do with the substitution of the rule of law for the rule of force in determining international difficulties. Now, the advocates of this approach argue that unless you look forward, at least, to some sort of a world organization and the development of some kind of world law, you will never get to the place where the rule of law will govern the affairs of men. You will still have the rule of contest and force. That is the main line that struck me as the most impressive argument advanced for this particular proposal.

Do you take the position today that we must postpone the immediate goal, at least, of world law in the place of force? Do you think it is so out of reach, that we ought not even think in terms of it in the future?

Mr. HICKERSON. By no means do I think that, Senator. I think we should debate these measures, we should promote the widest public understanding of these measures, and I think that of course we should work toward some kind of world law. We must feel our way very cautiously, Senator, in this thing. We must recognize that since the beginning of organized society the best thought in every community has tended to be in terms of some collective system of security and some system of world law. But we must recognize the difficulties in the way.

I feel very strongly that we should continue to study, to endeavor to understand the issues involved and to explore ways and means under the Charter of the United Nations of working toward that objective.

I do feel very strong that setting our sights on and setting forth the objective of world federation is not the way to achieve that.

WORLD FEDERATION OR ORDER

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. The suggestion was made by someone, I forget who it was, in the discussion of this resolution, that if

the expression in this resolution were changed from "world federation" to "world order," it might be more acceptable as an expression of an over-all ultimate goal. What is your opinion?

Mr. HICKERSON. I personally think, sir, that it would. I would still have misgivings about the advisability of passing a resolution of this sort at this time. I repeat, I think that the issues raised by this should be debated. I think that there should be the widest understanding of them and discussion of them. But I have doubts as to the advisability of passing even the amended resolution which you suggested, sir, even though that to me is an improvement.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I wanted to make it clear that I did not suggest that. It was suggested by someone at the hearing, and I am just trying to be sure we explore all of the suggestions that have come to us.

NEED FOR CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Of course, the thing that has precipitated this has been the terrible apprehension of people because of, first, the atomic bomb, and now the so-called H-bomb. They wonder whether we are going to have time to wait for anything. I realize that the world federation idea would be a long-drawn-out affair and it would not meet that immediate issue, but the people that are advocating this and all these other plans are concerned. I think Senator Thomas said a little earlier today they are concerned that something be done in the light of this critical situation.

How do you feel we can deal with the H-bomb proposition? Do you think we should go on pressing for the Baruch plan, for example, for the control of atomic energy, and now H-bomb energy, or how are we going to deal with that—just go on pressing that particular approach or trying something different?

Mr. HICKERSON. Senator Smith, I can understand, of course, that apprehension. All of us share it. We would like to do something. But we must bear in mind that if this subcommittee reported that particular resolution, or any particular resolution, let's say this one, and the Senate unanimously approved it and every country in the world agreed to join this world federation, and if by some magic it could be done in the next 3 weeks, we still would not have the solution to the bomb.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with that.

Mr. HICKERSON. It would not solve that.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with that. As I said, this world federation idea is too far ahead of us to deal with the immediate crisis. I was leaving that and trying to see how you are thinking in terms of the immediate crisis and what you can do.

Mr. HICKERSON. As to your question on the control of atomic energy, I can say to you, sir, that all of us who have done any work on the subject have reached the conclusion that the so-called Baruch plan—it should be called, I think, in fairness to the other countries who made their contribution, the United Nations plan of control—would work. Mr. Baruch made proposals of a United States plan. They, you will recall, were discussed for a period of 2 years in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. Numerous changes were made in those proposals. To the extent that they represented improvements, the

the Communist way of life in this very land, what they were doing, what they were thinking, and yet, as you say, folks in high places closed their eyes to the realities.

But, at long last, we have our friends now, a majority joining us in "Me too-ism."

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to avoid any expression about "Me too-ism," no matter what it refers to. I am not knowingly a follower of the blind.

I might add this, yesterday's press carried the statement that the CIO organization had expelled I think either four or six unions because those unions were dominated by Communists. That is a fine step forward, even though it came at this late date. Just a year or so ago when the House committee had before it the question of the communism of Mr. Flaxer, who was named in last night's press as the head of one of those expelled unions, an attempt was made to learn whether, at the White House conference which occurred in February of that year, the President had not supported the officers, Mr. Flaxer and Mr. Bernstein, Communists, in their efforts to force local employers to deal with them, notwithstanding the fact that under the Taft-Hartley Act they did not need to deal, and in answer to the House subcommittee's subpoena, Mr. Steelman wrote, and I have the letter, that on the order of the President, he refused to appear. The President still refuses to give either Senate or House the files on Communists.

Senator WILEY. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILEY. Mr. James P. Warburg.

It is good to see you, Mr. Warburg. Will you identify yourself for the record.

STATEMENT OF JAMES P. WARBURG, GREENWICH, CONN.

Mr. WARBURG. I am James P. Warburg, of Greenwich, Conn., and am appearing as an individual.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, of the exigencies of your crowded schedule and of the need to be brief, so as not to transgress upon your courtesy in granting me a hearing.

The past 15 years of my life have been devoted almost exclusively to studying the problem of world peace and, especially, the relation of the United States to those problems. These studies led me, 10 years ago, to the conclusion that the great question of our time is not whether or not one world can be achieved, but whether or not one world can be achieved by peaceful means.

We shall have world government, whether or not we like it. The question is only whether world government will be achieved by consent or by conquest.

Today we are faced with a divided world—its two halves glowering at each other across the iron curtain. The world's two superpowers—Russia and the United States—are entangled in the vicious circle of an arms race, which more and more preempts energies and resources sorely needed to lay the foundations of enduring peace. We are now on the road to eventual war—a war in which the conqueror will emerge well-nigh indistinguishable from the vanquished.

The United States does not want this war, and most authorities agree that Russia does not want it. Indeed, why should Russia prefer the

unpredictable hazards of war to a continuation of her present profitable fishing in the trouble waters of an uneasy armistice? Yet both the United States and Russia are drifting—and, with them, the entire world—toward the abyss of atomic conflict.

SUPPORT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

Mr. Chairman, I am here to testify in favor of Senate Resolution 56, which, if concurrently enacted with the House, would make the peaceful transformation of the United Nations into a world federation the avowed aim of United States policy. The passage of this resolution seems to me the first prerequisite toward the development of an affirmative American policy which would lead us out of the valley of death and despair.

I am fully aware that the mere passage of this resolution will not solve the complex problems with which we are confronted. Our recognition of the inadequacy of the present United Nations structure, and our declared determination to strengthen that structure by Charter amendment, will not alone overcome the Russian obstacle. But it will, at long last, chart our own goal and enable us to steer a straight course toward a clearly seen objective. Moreover, it will unite us in purpose with the vast majority of the peoples of the non-Soviet world.

Until we have established this goal, we shall continue to be fogged and befuddled our own vision by clinging to the illusion that the present structure of the United Nations would work, if only the Russians would let it work. That has been our position to date.

Until we establish this goal, we shall continue to ask other peoples to unite with us only in the negative purpose of stopping Russia. Fear-inspired negative action makes poor cement for unity.

Once we shall have declared a positive purpose—once we shall have cemented the united will of the free peoples in a common aspiration—we shall be in a far stronger position to deal with the obstacles presented to the realization of that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer Senate Resolution 56 to other resolutions now before you for two major reasons:

UNIVERSAL FEDERATION REQUIRED

First: Senate Resolution 56 goes to the root of the evil in the present state of international anarchy. It recognizes that there is no cure for this evil short of making the United Nations into a universal organization capable of enacting, interpreting and enforcing world law to the degree necessary to outlaw force, or the threat of force, as an instrument of foreign policy. It states the objective in unequivocal terms.

Second: Senate Resolution 56 does not commit the United States to any specific next steps to be taken toward the attainment of that objective. In the present state of world affairs, it would seem to me unwise to commit ourselves to any fixed plan of action, without first exploring all the possibilities.

In contrast to Senate Resolution 56, other proposals before you seem to me either to set a goal short of what is needed to ensure peace, or to foreclose the ultimate attainment of a universal organization by an