

DR. COLCORD FORECASTS THE STIMSON DOCTRINE
AS EARLY AS 1930,
GIVES EXACT TERMS OF ENACTMENT OF THE
DELEGALIZATION OF WAR AND TELLS
BY WHAT AUTHORITY IT
MAY BE ENACTED

Quoted from His Letter to Secretary Stimson

New York City, April 22, 1932.

HONORABLE HENRY L. STIMSON,
Disarmament Conference,
Geneva, Switzerland.

Dear Secretary Stimson:

Your proposals in the interests of world peace have been of a character to promise that they will be remarkably effective and all have been timely. Only one has aroused the opposition of other important friends of peace, namely the proposal for the abolition of aggressive armaments. It would be well if this could be adopted, but I fear the opposition of Tardieu and other powerful influences will not permit its adoption at this time.

You will see by the following quotation from the printed copy of a commencement address I made in June, 1930, at the University of Oregon and repeated at the University of Utah and the University of Minnesota that it covers the "Stimson Doctrine" hailed throughout the world as a great aid to peace. It was put forth in my address in these words:

"As to the terms in which the delegalization of war may be enacted no authority is more competent to decide than is our Department of

State. To aid my own thinking I have formed it in my mind in terms that, after the usual introductory formalities, may be stated as follows:

"It is decreed by the nations by their duly accredited representatives here assembled that, on and after the conclusion of this enactment, the prohibition of war between sovereign nations shall be a basic principle of international law and any possession or gain thereafter acquired by any other than peaceful means shall be held an illegal possession subject to recovery under this fundamental law." The important difference between this form of enactment and your statement seems to be that it supplies the law upon which legal action for recovery may rest.

Limiting it to war "between sovereign nations" is important because we cannot and we have no right to forbid wars of revolution, else no oppressed people could throw off the yoke of tyranny, and the recovery under this fundamental law is properly limited to acts committed after the enactment because to attempt to correct all the wrongs of the past would wreck every nation on the earth. It was wise in your statement not to go so far as this, which I have no doubt you will approve if it goes so far as an enactment.