

UNITED NATIONS

No. 54/5

(The following is a special section entitled "U.N.--
Snare or Shield?" which appeared in the December 16,
1953 issue of The Christian Century.)

Concerning the United Nations, Mr. Average American is a puzzled man. His wife is just as puzzled. They hear so many conflicting opinions that they don't know what they think about it. Is this international organization of 60 nations a bulwark of peace? Does it help shield their beloved nation, the United States of America, from harm? Or is it useless? Even worse, is it a trap in which American strength is being drained off, American money wasted, the lives of American boys thrown away? The U.N. - is it any good, or isn't it?

Mr. and Mrs. Average American wish they could be sure. They hear and read a lot about the U.N. Hardly a day passes when the name doesn't come up in some form or other. Korea - that's the U.N. Vyshinsky - the U.N. again. Palestine, Morocco, Kashmir, refugees, human rights, child feeding - all the U.N. Yet Americans disagree violently as to its value.

President Eisenhower, for example, tells a group at the White House that "the U.N. is far more than merely a desirable organization in these days." He calls it "man's best organized hope to substitute the conference table for the battlefield". "Who knows," he asks, "what could have happened in these past years of strain and struggle if we hadn't had the United Nations?" And he could hardly put his endorsement in stronger words than when he says, "I think the U.N. has become a sheer necessity."

President Truman talked the same way when he was in office. In one of his closing messages to Congress he said, "Peace cannot be maintained for long unless there is an international organization" such as the U.N. In Mr. Truman's eyes it is "the first and greatest weapon against aggression and international immorality . . . a precious instrument . . . a great asset that we should constantly seek to reinforce, that we should never ignore or cast away." This was the Truman conclusion: "We can win the peace only by continuing to work for international justice and morality through the United Nations."

That's the way two Presidents, one a Republican and the other a Democrat, size up the U.N. But distinguished Americans disagree. "It should be painfully apparent," says J. Bracken Lee, Governor of Utah, "that as presently constituted the U.N. is a snare and a delusion." Representative Burdick of North Dakota told Congress that it must "watch well the United Nations for, as now constituted, it is Enemy Number 1 of free America." The St. Louis national convention of the American Legion cheered its former national commander, Donald Wilson, when in a speech he said: "The United Nations is dead. It was a fraud in its inception, a hypocrite in its operation; but for the fact that it first reddened Korean mountains with sacred American blood, it would have been a farce in its demise."¹

¹ Footnotes appear on page 44.

The attacks are not confined to men in public life. Here is a paper called The Cross and the Flag which, claiming to speak in the name of religion, turns loose a wild diatribe: "Its flag is the same color as the Jew Palestine flag and is the same design as the Russian military banner." Although forced to acknowledge that President Eisenhower has only good things to say about the U.N., this paper calls it "the most expensive denial of Christ in an attempt to please the anti-Christ in the history of the world." It declares the U.N. "the most elite and high-toned crucifixion our Lord has ever received."²

Wild words such as these can be shrugged off as rantings from the lunatic fringe. But on the day when this paragraph was being written, the most powerful newspaper in Chicago (it calls itself "the world's greatest newspaper") charged editorially that this nation's international difficulties spring from the fact that our government "meekly assents to the proposition that America takes its orders from the U.N." (There are members of the U.N. who would assert that its difficulties are caused by the fact that it too often takes its orders from America, but that isn't the way the readers of the Tribune hear it.)

The day before it printed the editorial just quoted, this same paper charged flatly that "the U.N. has proved a failure," and added that it is "Alger Hiss' major contribution to the vexations of the United States." The day before that it declared that Americans who support the United Nations "look forward with equanimity to the destruction of American independence and the subjection of the government of the republic to the authority of a U.N. supergovernment."³ A large number of people in the middle west get that kind of editorial diet steadily. There are other newspapers whose contempt for the international organization, if not as bitterly expressed, goes just as deep.

Is it any wonder, in the face of such divided counsel, that so many Americans do not know whom to believe or what to believe? This study is an effort to help such Americans make up their minds. It will try to give a balanced picture - the good and the bad; the strengths and the weaknesses; the achievements and the failures of the U.N. Then, it is believed, the Americans who have read it will find themselves better able to reach their own conclusions on this much-debated and immensely important matter.

In a study such as this, one must ask questions as well as try to answer them. So let's start with a couple. Why is there such an organization as the United Nations? If there were no U.N., would it make any great difference? Or, to phrase the second question a little differently, what would be the alternative to the U.N.?

Why is there a United Nations? Most Americans know, but it is worth saying again, that the U.N. traces back to the great change in world history which came with the First World War. As the United States and most of the other nations were drawn into that conflict, an American President, Woodrow Wilson, saw that its sacrifices would be justified only if it led to an organization of the nations to preserve peace, increase human happiness and provide a means by which their disputes could be settled around a conference table instead of on fields of battle.

So President Wilson went to the Paris Peace Conference in 1918 determined to see such an organization brought into being. In his famous Fourteen Points he had told the world what the United States was fighting to establish. The common people of every nation and on every continent had responded with enthusiasm to his proposal. About all that he demanded at that Peace Conference was that the peace treaty should establish a League of Nations to end the war-breeding international anarchy in which, to use Old Testament phraseology, every nation "did that which was right in its own eyes."

Perhaps, at Paris, Woodrow Wilson concentrated his attention too largely on securing the establishment of the League of Nations. Perhaps he let too many injustices and trouble-planting provisions slip into other parts of the Treaty of Versailles. We think he did. But that, he believed, was the price he had to pay to get the League. And he hoped that after the League had been in operation for a while it would find ways to correct most of the wrongs - which President Wilson knew were wrongs - in the treaty. The thing that counted, he insisted, was that the League had been formed. It wasn't perfect. It could not be expected to be perfect, growing as it did out of a terrible war and with its Covenant written by men who were still influenced by the passions of that war.

But it was a League of Nations - a body made up of most of the states which had gone through the agony of the war (even Germany eventually was admitted), sworn to deal with one another by peaceful methods and to restrain aggressors, to work out a body of international law and to carry disputes to a world court.

It is not the purpose of this study to discuss the League of Nations, because the League is dead. It is past history; water under the bridge. "Ah," says someone, "that's the point! The League died. It failed. Doesn't its failure prove that the nations will not work together successfully for peace in such an organization? If the League failed, isn't the U.N. doomed to fail likewise?"

Fair questions, and not easy to answer. Why did the League of Nations die? It accomplished a number of good things, and it had the support and prayers of millions upon millions of the world's people. Why did it die? Frequently it has been charged that it died because the United States stayed out. Certainly that was a factor, but it was hardly the decisive factor. As a matter of fact, after the bitterness subsided that had been generated by the partisan struggle between President Wilson and certain senators who blocked American entrance, the United States cooperated with the League to a degree which was scarcely distinguishable from membership.

The factor which spelled doom for the League, we are convinced as we look back at the record, was its rigidity. At the heart of the League Covenant was a pledge that the League would keep the boundaries of the nations exactly where they were drawn by the Peace Conference. That was intended to hold in check any future Kaiser Wilhelm who might be tempted to order his armies to invade another Belgium. What it actually did was to imply that the decisions of the Treaty of Versailles were perfect; that they were to be maintained world without end.

Of course, that just could not be. The Versailles decisions were far from perfect, as wise men were pointing out even before the Peace Conference adjourned. There was too much ferment in the new nations, too many old nations believed they were victims of a raw deal, too many yellow and brown and black men were fed up with the idea of a world run by whites. History is a powerful brew. It blew the decisions of the Treaty of Versailles sky-high, and in so doing it blew the League of Nations out of existence.

That brought World War II. Again, the President of the United States, as he saw this nation being drawn into a conflict which almost every American wanted desperately to keep out of, proclaimed the need for an organization of the nations where they would sit together, negotiate together, work together, continuously and by all pacific means, to maintain peace.

The first outline of the ends such an organization should seek came in the Atlantic Charter, which President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill drew up in August 1941 - four months before Pearl Harbor. Not long ago a writer working on this study was talking with one of the officers of the U.N. in his office high in its glass-walled skyscraper in New York. "When I find myself wondering whether the United Nations is keeping on the right track," he said, "I turn back to those provisions of the Atlantic Charter and check what we are doing against them. The essence of the purpose of the U.N. is all right there."⁴

Well, that was in August 1941. On January 1, 1942, 26 nations signed a declaration saying that they subscribed to the terms of the Atlantic Charter. (Later 21 more signed this declaration.) Then, on October 30, 1943, the governments of the "Big Four" fighting the Axis put their names to a promise to establish "at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership to all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

That, of course, was the key promise to establish the United Nations, as it was already being called. The governments who made that promise called such an organization "a necessity." The promise was fulfilled on June 26, 1945, when 50 nations signed the Charter of the United Nations at the organizing conference in San Francisco. Today, there are 60 nations in the membership. No nation has ever tried to give up its membership. There are 21 nations applying for membership today. That, by the way, is something to think about. If the U.N. is a failure, as charged, it is a peculiar sort of failure while nations keep clamoring to be admitted so that they can assume the obligations and costs of membership!

Why the United Nations? This, in brief, is the way in which it came to be. The U.N. was formed because the nations which had been scourged by two global wars within a single generation were driven by their losses and their fears for the future to agree that such an organization had to be formed. They had to have some regular, permanent, continuous way to consult together, work together, search together for peaceful ways of conducting the affairs of nations. So, eight years ago, they made that promise to mankind which, as it opens the Charter of the U.N., is worth reading again when one is trying to determine what to think of this organization:

We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined -

to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and

to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and

to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and

to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom,

and for these ends

to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors, and

to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and

to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and

to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples,

have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims.

Empty words? Certainly they are only words, and there have been many times since 1945 when, seeing what the nations who signed those words actually did, they sounded pretty empty. There will be more such times in the future. But there the words are - aspirations, if nothing more. "Not failure, but low aim, is crime." Perhaps the U.S. Senate was thinking of that well worn, but true, reminder when, on July 28, 1945, it ratified American adherence to the U.N. Charter by the overwhelming vote of 89 to 2.

Note this, however. The Charter of the United Nations did not pledge its members to keep the world as World War II left it, without permitting any changes. In these eight years since the Charter was signed, nine nations with populations totaling more than 600 million have gained independence. And the Charter provided for its own change. In this basic difference between the Covenant of the League and the Charter of the U.N. it is instructive to see that the nations which formed this international organization in 1945 had learned wisdom from one of the great mistakes made by their forerunners in 1918.

If Not the U.N., What?

Now for our second question: If there were no United Nations, would it make any great difference? What would the world be like today without the U.N.?

President Eisenhower evidently believes it would be a world much more dangerous for the United States. That is the plain implication of his question we have already quoted: "Who knows what could have happened in these past years of strain and struggle if we hadn't had the United Nations?"

Why more dangerous? The answer may become clearer if we look at a few of the things that have happened since the end of World War II and think what might have happened had there been no United Nations.

Do you recall how, after the end of the war, when the other nations had removed their troops, Russia kept its forces in the northern part of Iran? Iran spells oil. It also constitutes a strategic control-spot for the whole Middle East. Iran was far too weak to defend its independence against the Soviet invader. The rest of the world was appalled at the prospect of a rapid Russian conquest.

If Russia had pushed on to seize Iran's oil and its coasts along the Persian gulf and the Arabian sea, other powers probably would have jumped in to forestall her. That would have brought another major war - perhaps another world war - right there. If they had let Russia swallow its Persian neighbor, that would have put the Communists in control of fabulous oil supplies - something Russia badly needs - and the sea route from Europe to the Orient. World communism would have become so strong, from a military and political standpoint, that it would have been far more of a threat than it has been.

But what happened? Iran appealed to the United Nations. The U.N. told Russia that, under the terms of the Charter, it had no business in Iran. In Moscow the Russian leaders weighed what it would mean to have the other nations in the U.N. against them. Within five months, the last Russian soldier was out of Iran. Peace had been preserved in that danger-spot of the Middle East by the operations of the U.N. But if there had been no U.N. for Iran to appeal to...?

Or remember what happened in Indonesia. That story will be told in some detail later in this study. Here it is enough to recall how the Dutch, who had ruled these rich islands in the East Indies for more than 300 years, tried to throttle the demand for independence of the native patriots who, after the defeat of Japan, had proclaimed the Republic of Indonesia.

For a time it looked as though a war for independence could not be avoided. It would have been a bloody war, for there are 70 million in Indonesia and they would have fought by the savage methods which are the only ones available to guerrillas striking from mountain fastnesses and tropical jungles. There would have been massacres of Dutch and retaliatory measures against Indonesians. The islands would have been desolated and Asia's anger against white colonialism incalculably increased.

But the Indonesian patriots had an alternative to guerrilla warfare. Their case was brought before the U.N. By careful negotiation, helped along by good sense and patience on the part of both the Dutch and the Indonesians, the issue was worked out peacefully. The Republic was established; the Dutch army went back to Holland; Indonesia is today an independent nation with membership in the U.N. But if there had been no U.N. to consider the Indonesian case ...?

Then there's the story of Palestine. War actually started there. It looked as though it would go on and spread until the whole Near East would be in flames. In other days, such a war in the Near East would almost certainly have drawn in the European powers, for they have great interests in the control of that end of the Mediterranean.

Then the U.N. stepped in. It tried to arrange a truce. The first representative of the U.N. who tackled what looked like an impossible task, Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden, was assassinated in Jerusalem. But Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, his American assistant, took over and after long, long negotiations, induced both sides - the Israelis and the Arabs - to agree to a cease-fire and a truce line. For that, Dr. Bunche was awarded the Nobel peace prize, and well he deserved it.

It may be objected that the U.N. obtained only a truce in Palestine, not a firm peace. That is true. The situation is still tense; sporadic outbreaks along the truce line from time to time remind the world how much danger of another explosion remains. But is it not better to have a truce, even an uneasy truce, than to have a continuing war which might easily bring on another world war? The U.N. provided the alternative by which that truce was gained. In so doing, it helped preserve the peace of the rest of the world, including the United States. What if there had not been this alternative?

Consider Kashmir. Here is a beautiful, rich region which two nations, Pakistan and India, are determined to possess. Fighting had started between irregular forces and armies were being moved up in preparation for a major war. Once again the U.N. offered its good offices; the fighting was stopped; a truce line was drawn and the process started for determining the future of Kashmir by peaceful negotiation.

Is it objected that the Kashmir question is not yet settled? That's true. But again, isn't a truce, which gives opportunity for an ultimate settlement by peaceful means, better than a war? A war between Pakistan and India would involve from the start half a billion people. Eventually, a war on that scale would probably drag in all the rest of us. Here's another instance where we can thank God that the U.N. offered an alternative, and that Pakistan and India, both members of the U.N., were ready to turn to that alternative.

Or reflect on what has happened with regard to some of the native peoples in Africa. Africa is seething today with the demands of some regions for independence and of others for much greater rights for the native tribesmen. The terrible things that have taken place during the Mau Mau

outbreak in Kenya show how easily the central part of this continent might be drowned in blood if the tribes became convinced that they had no way of gaining their rights except by uprisings against the colonial rulers and the white colonists.

But the U.N. has offered an alternative. Literally hundreds of complaints from African tribes, and even from individual Africans, have been received by the U.N. African delegations have appeared before the U.N. to plead their wrongs. Champions of the rights of the African tribesmen, such as that dedicated Anglican clergyman, the Rev. Michael Scott, appear to present the complaints of the tribes and are given a sympathetic hearing by the proper U.N. bodies, even though a state that proclaims white supremacy as its goal for Africa - the Union of South Africa - uses every device possible to silence this voice of Christian conscience and keep its spokesmen away from the U.N.

To be sure, about all the U.N. has been able to do in most cases has been to make impartial investigations and then to place on the conscience of the colonial powers the conditions which have been discovered. Africa's revolt against colonialism and white rule is a long way from settled. The U.N.'s moral suasion can only work slowly. But isn't it better to have the Africans able to resort to the alternative of peaceful appeal to the U.N.'s Trusteeship Council than to face repetition all over the continent of the tragedy in Kenya?

But, someone objects, how about Korea? Did the U.N. provide an alternative there? On the contrary, didn't it involve us in a terrible war - a war which cost the United States the fourth-largest number of casualties in our history and from \$15 to \$20 billion?

We shall speak of Korea again and in more detail. Yet it should be made plain that the U.N. did give us an alternative in Korea. At the start, it provided the alternative of a country peacefully divided into two parts, a democratic and a communist part, instead of one left to be fought over until one part conquered the other. Then when the Communists refused longer to accept this peaceful division and invaded the south, the U.N. gave the United States an alternative. It did not have to act alone; it could take the crisis to the U.N. and call on the U.N. for help.

Suppose there had been no U.N. when North Korea invaded the south. What would have happened? If the United States had done nothing, South Korea would quickly have been overrun and a Communist Korea established, pointing straight at the area of American interest in Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines and the rest of the far Pacific. Certainly the United States would not have let that happen. It would have plunged in alone to keep the Communists out of South Korea.

An out-and-out war between the United States and the Communist state of North Korea would have brought Communist China rushing in officially and immediately. (It is worth remembering that Communist China never technically entered the war against the U.N. The Chinese troops who fought did so under the legal fiction of being "volunteers" who went of their own free will - like the German and Italian "volunteers" in the Spanish civil war - to help their

communist friends in North Korea.) War would have been declared between the United States and Red China.

Then the fat would have been in the fire! Soviet Russia has a treaty which binds it to come to the aid of its Communist China ally if that country is attacked. Moscow might have tried to put off honoring that treaty promise, but the moment the U.S.A. forces penetrated Chinese soil, or American bombs began to hit Chinese targets, Soviet Russia would have been forced to come in. Why? Because not to have done so would have been notice to all the other communist allies that Russian promises were worthless; the communist world bloc would have collapsed.

Russia would have come in. Then it would have been war between the United States alone and Soviet Russia with Communist China at its side. That is the very war which the United States most wants to prevent - the war the American people most dread. What the losses of such a war would be, one's mind almost refuses to contemplate.

None of us can be very content with what actually has happened in Korea. But to that possible war between the United States alone and the Russian-Chinese alliance, the U.N. did offer an alternative. The outcome of taking that alternative is still in doubt. But as this is written, the Communist attempt to seize all Korea has been stopped in its tracks. The Communist armies are back north of the line from which they jumped off when they launched their aggression. A cease-fire has gone into effect. A truce line has been drawn. Thousands upon thousands of North Korean and Chinese troops have told the world that they want nothing more to do with communism.

Isn't that alternative, with all its shortcomings, better for the United States and for our American homes than it would be for our country now to be locked in a lone death struggle with Russia and its Asian ally?

The United Nations is young - only eight years old. It is not as strong as it would be if it were not plagued by the inner rift between its Communist and non-Communist members. There are many things we wish it could do that it is not able to do - at least not yet. But with all its weaknesses it has already, in such cases as have been cited, where a crisis arose that threatened terrible bloodshed, offered an alternative which either headed off or stopped the fighting, or - in the single instance where its efforts at peaceful settlement were thwarted by outright aggression - it has saved this nation from having to deal with that aggression singlehanded and against a gigantic Communist alliance.

No wonder President Eisenhower, the man who best knows the dangers his country faces, talks of what our peril would be today if during these recent years there had been no U.N.

How the U.N. Operates

Because there is still so much confusion about the way in which the United Nations carries on its functions, a quick glance at its organization may be helpful in assaying its merits. There are Americans who speak of the U.N. as though it were a supergovernment of some kind. It is not.

It comes closer to being a sort of committee - a world committee with little more than advisory powers.

The United Nations is a body composed of sixty sovereign nations - and the key word is "sovereign." They are sixty independent nations. They meet on terms of equality. Meeting together, the aim is to bring their national policies into harmony. But they remain independent, self-governing (i.e., sovereign) nations. That is the reason why sometimes the U.N. is unable to do what many would like to see it do in forcing certain nations to act in certain ways.

You may have heard it said that the U.N. can give orders to the United States and to other countries. It has been charged, for example, that it "dragged" us into war in Korea. The truth is just the opposite. It was the United States which appealed to the U.N.'s Security Council to approve action against the Communist aggression in Korea and to call on other member-nations of the U.N. to help throw back that aggression. But note that it could only ask these other nations to help; if they did not want to, the U.N. could not order them to.

Moreover, the Security Council cannot act in any matter against the wishes of the United States, for this nation is one of the five permanent members of the Council any one of which is able to block action at any time by its sole vote. (This is the much-debated "veto", about which more will be said later.)

Again, you may have heard it said that a U.N. supergovernment can impose laws on the people of the United States and of other countries. This also is a fairy tale. It got started when a decision by a single judge in a lower court in California argued that the U.N. Charter constitutes a treaty superior in authority to American laws. A higher court set aside this decision. The fact is that the U.N. is specifically forbidden by its Charter "to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."

The U.N. is so far from being a supergovernment, so stringently prohibited from interfering in our U.S. domestic concerns, that many students of international affairs will argue that the nations - our own included - have gone too far in circumscribing its powers. But that is a theoretical debate; what we are interested in is what the U.N. actually is - and isn't.

The U.N. organization is easy to understand. There are 60 members, all, as has been said, independent nations. These nations send their delegates to a General Assembly which meets annually, unless it should be called into special session. In this General Assembly, each nation has the same number of delegates (5) and each casts one vote. The United States and Uruguay, for instance, meet as equals in the Assembly.

The Assembly does most of its work through committees. Some of these are standing committees; some are committees which function during the interval between sessions of the Assembly; some are special committees set up to deal with a particular situation which threatens peace. An example is the U.N. Conciliation Commission for Palestine.

Years ago John Foster Dulles called the Assembly "the town meeting of the world". The name has stuck because it is so apt. Any conceivable question, provided it bears on the maintenance of peace, can be handed to the Assembly by any member. If its steering committee agrees that it is a question which should be considered, it goes to the appropriate committee for recommendation. From there it comes back to the full Assembly. Actions on important matters have to be by a two-thirds majority; on other matters by a simple majority. But actions in the Assembly can only be advisory. They depend for their influence on the moral weight of world public opinion behind them.

Alongside the General Assembly the U.N. has its Security Council of eleven member-nations. This was planned as a sort of executive committee and it was given power, not only to investigate and consider situations which threaten peace (as the Assembly also does), but to take action against aggressors. To make sure, however, that such action was not taken against the wishes of the greater powers, the Security Council was set up with five veto-holding permanent members and six non-permanent who rotate in two-year terms.

The Security Council is always, theoretically, in session. But it can act in important matters only when seven members including all the permanent members - China, France, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the U.S.A. - agree. In other words each of these five has a veto on actions which might be supported by all the others. Before Americans grow too indignant at the Russians for the way in which they have used their veto power again and again, let them remember that when the U.N. was formed the United States demanded that there should be such veto powers.

These two bodies - the General Assembly and the Security Council - are what might be called the peace-keeping and peace-making agencies of the United Nations. But there are other agencies which in other ways also serve the cause of peace.

There is the Economic and Social Council, which is designed to deal with those human problems of food, work, living conditions, educational opportunity and so on which so often have caused the misery out of which international trouble has come.

There is the Trusteeship Council, which supervises all "trust territories," as they are called, under their administering nations, and is trying to bring them along as rapidly as possible to the point where they are ready for self-government. In addition, it keeps an eye on all the colonial administrations in the world - there are about 70 - and gathers annually reports on how well they are being administered, all to the end that their peoples may be prepared for eventual self-government.

Then there is the International Court of Justice, which sits at the Hague. Its name sufficiently suggests its function. And finally there is the Secretariat - the company of about 4,500 international civil servants who are the technicians who make the multitudinous committees and commissions and agencies work. These are drawn from all the member-states but they are pledged to put the peace of the world ahead of the interests of their own nations. To an

astonishing degree, most of them succeed in doing that. The longer they serve in the Secretariat, the better they succeed. At the head of the Secretariat, serving as the principal executive officer of the U.N., is the Secretary-General. The present Secretary-General, serving a 5-year term, is Dag Hammarskjold (pronounced Hammer-shield) of Sweden.

This sketches only the barest bones of the United Nations organization. It does not begin to indicate the number of different agencies of one kind and another which are always at work around the world under U.N. auspices. If you want a complete chart of the U.N. organization, write to its headquarters (just address The United Nations, New York, New York.) and the Secretariat will be glad to send you one. In this study we have deliberately kept to a minimum this account of the machinery through which the U.N. functions. We believe that Americans who are trying to decide on the merits of the U.N. are not primarily interested in its mechanics. What they ask is whether the mechanics work.

What the U.N. Is Up Against

Does the U.N. work? That's the question Americans want answered. There is a widespread impression that all the U.N. does is talk. Perhaps the "Town Meeting of the World" characterization has fostered that idea. Town meetings talk. And the U.N. talks. But does the U.N. do more than talk? Is it true that when the chips are down, when it is confronted by a real crisis--such as Korea--or a real dilemma--such as trying to control atomic weapons--the U.N. can do nothing but talk?

Already we have seen that this is not true. The U.N. talks a lot. Sometimes the talk is largely a play to the propaganda galleries; sometimes it clears the way for action. At any time when hustling Americans are tempted to complain about the U.N.'s habit of talking they can profitably remind themselves that talk is preferable to shooting. But the U.N. does more than talk.

The U.N., as we noted, got the Russian troops out of Iran. It helped to get the British and French troops out of Syria and Lebanon. It stopped the fighting in Indonesia, in Palestine and in Kashmir. It brought independence to Libya. It helped Greece free its northern borders from Communist guerrillas. It took the first collective action in history against the Communist aggression in Korea. It has fed millions of hungry mothers and children. It has shown dozens of regions with low living standards how to increase their food production or the goods they manufacture. It has wiped malaria out in large regions, and is cutting down on T.B. and a number of other menaces to the world's health. It is improving schools--largely by showing how to train better teachers--in many backward regions and it is wrestling with the problem of democratic self-government by pushing literacy campaigns wherever the illiteracy handicap is high.

These are all things that the U.N. has done, or is doing. No fair-minded person, we believe, can look at such a record and say that the U.N. does nothing but talk. On the contrary, when one thinks back about the sort of world this has been since the end of World War II--the bitterness, the poverty, the suspicion, the rivalries, the threats and the armed invasions--one should be impressed by the fact that

the U.N. has accomplished as much as it has in these eight years. Eight years is a short time in which to try to straighten out this tough old world!

Nevertheless, the U.N. has not accomplished as much as its founders hoped it would when they formed it back in 1945. It has tried to do some things and failed. Some other things that many would have liked to see it do it has not even attempted, because it knew it could not. And a number of tasks it has tackled have not been carried through to completion; they may end in success or in failure. These are the failures, or partial failures, in the U.N.'s record. In the next section of this study we will list them more fully.

Fairness, however, requires that in appraising these failures one take into account what the U.N. is up against. Let's consider some of these things with which it must contend.

For one thing, it is up against a world that is not at peace. When the United Nations was formed - while the war was still going on in the Pacific and before the first atomic bomb hit Hiroshima - the plan adopted for it was based on an assumption. That assumption was that the major nations which had been fighting the Axis would write peace treaties with their defeated enemies, and then the U.N. would take over the peace thus made and maintain it. But the victor nations did not make those peace treaties. They made one, with Italy. Years later (in 1952) some of them made another, with Japan. But Russia did not sign that treaty. No peace treaty has ever been signed with Germany or Austria.

This may look like a technicality, but for the U.N. it is more than that. It means that there never has been a formal, legal peace, covering the whole area of the Second World War, for the U.N. to preserve. In other words, the premise on which the U.N. was founded has never existed in actuality. Quite a handicap, that!

Instead of a peace to maintain, what kind of world has this been during these years in which the U.N. has been struggling to gain a grip on the international situation? It has been one in which the U.N. itself has been internally divided by the East-West struggle. Russia and the free world have been on the very edge of an open break time and time again. Czechoslovakia and Hungary have been pulled into the Russian orbit. China has been overrun by Red armies. The Republic of Korea has been attacked. The Communist bloc of nations - usually five votes - has been voted down again and again in the various agencies of the U.N., but always it has stayed in there doing all it could to thwart the will of the majority and to throw as many monkey-wrenches into the U.N. machinery for keeping the peace as it could lay hands on. The cold war has been the most omnipresent, as well as the most dangerous, fact in the day-by-day life of the world.

The Communist nations in the United Nations have never shown any intention of leaving the international body. (On a few occasions they have walked out of U.N. agencies. They have lived to regret it, and are today seeking to join certain agencies.) But there never has been a time when they have not seemed to want to do everything possible to reduce the U.N. to futility. Their role has too often been that of a wrecking crew. Some handicap!

Another thing the U.N. has had to struggle against has been a natural but touchy pride felt by young nations, newly independent, which are determined that no one shall cast a shadow on their independent sovereignty. When they show an intention to do as they please, it is to prove that no one can make them do otherwise. In dealing with these nations the U.N. has had to show patience, caution and great understanding of their national pride. That has been the case in dealing with India and Pakistan over Kashmir. It was the case in Palestine. It is the case today when President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea adds so many complications to the effort to work out a peace in Korea.

The U.N. has likewise been forced to reckon with national fears. Take the attempt to promote world disarmament as an illustration. Everybody wants disarmament. The nations want it because they need to use the billions they are spending on arms for more constructive purposes. Their citizens want it because they are carrying a tax burden which all but breaks their backs. Governments and people alike dread the outcome of the armament race - particularly the race in atomic and thermonuclear (hydrogen) weapons. One of the purposes of the U.N., as set down in its Charter, is to secure disarmament, and a U.N. commission has been working at that task almost from the start.

It has failed to get to first base. Why? Because every proposal so far made has involved opening the plants in which A-bombs, H-bombs and bacteriological weapons could be produced to international inspection. The prospect that Russian members of a U.N. inspection team might come prying around our American munitions plants, ferreting out our secrets, frightens us as much as the prospect of American inspectors on a U.N. team in the Soviet Union frightens the Russians. Here again is another unwelcome fact of today's international life which the U.N. has to far found no way to get around.

Furthermore, the U.N. has to reckon with a world condition which, for want of a better name, may be called national self-centeredness. By that we have in mind the habit of nations - and their people - to think almost exclusively in terms of what seem to be their own immediate interests and not to admit that others also have interests which must be taken into account.

Here is something which bobs up almost every time the U.N. proposes some kind of negotiation. For example, what happens when the United States considers negotiating with the Reds over Korea? Our representatives outline a list of our demands. They look to us like reasonable and just demands. But the other side also has its demands. Now, negotiation implies give-and-take. It means making concessions to gain concessions. But this seems to some appeasement, and to others surrender. These are the people who are always afraid that every negotiation is a trap in which the slightest concession will be a betrayal of the national interest.

This state of mind is not peculiar to the U.S.A. It is even more evident in the Communist countries. It leads to conducting international relations on a basis of "Do as I say, or else -" There is far too much of this state of mind left in this unhappy world to make the conciliation efforts of the U.N. easy. It always has to be conceded that a nation, or nations, not in a conciliatory mood constitutes a

nearly insuperable obstacle to conciliation. The U.N. is trying to foster that mood - not an easy or quick job.

The United Nations also has to reckon with the impulse, strong in the strong nations, to go it alone, to do things by themselves which might better be done through the international organization. There is a reason for this. Often it is more difficult to do things working with and through others than to do them alone. The opposing ideas, the hesitations, what sometimes seems the downright orneriness of the others, have to be taken into account. Who was it said that "the best committee for getting things done is a committee of two, with the other member out of town"?

The same principle often seems to apply in world affairs. A nation which feels strong enough to do a particular job prefers to do it alone, thus not being bothered with collaborators and alone gaining the credit for whatever is accomplished. The disinclination of the United States and of the British Commonwealth to merge their Point IV and Colombo plans in the U.N.'s Technical Assistance program illustrates what we have in mind.

Sometimes national legislatures, which have to appropriate the funds by which the U.N. operates, think it costs too much. We will consider the U.N. budget later, and will show that in actuality the cost is amazingly low when compared with the costs of national governments or when measured against the importance of the issues with which the U.N. deals. But these legislatures are always under pressure to hold down expenditures. If they don't, they know they will hear from the taxpayers except in those countries where the taxpayers have nothing to say beyond a very occasional small groan, discreetly muffled.

Since the U.N. does not swing blocks of votes in national elections, the temptation is strong for national legislatures to cut appropriations to the U.N. to the lowest possible point at which the international body can keep functioning at all. The U.N. therefore never has the money it would require to do all the things it should do in the way they should be done. It does not complain about this, for it knows how governments work. Yet this, too, is a tough fact it will always have to take into account.

One more difficulty which confronts the U.N. is public apathy. Perhaps apathy is too strong a word, but no better one occurs to mind. There are too many people in all the U.N. member-nations who pay little attention and show little interest until some big international crisis bursts on the front pages of the papers and howls over the radio. Then they are likely to begin shouting, "Why has the U.N. let this happen? Why doesn't the U.N. straighten this out?"

Almost certainly, the U.N. will be doing its level best to straighten out whatever the trouble is, and has been at work to keep it from developing into a major contention. But the U.N. cannot do much to guide the nations toward a peaceful solution of their problems beyond what world public opinion supports. When the delegates know that the public is watching, and not only watching but getting ready to support measures that make for peace, then the U.N. is likely to function most nearly as it is supposed to function. But one thing too often lacking is this sort of intelligent public attention and support in times of what might be called normal U.N. activity, and not simply when some great excitement is stirring the nations.

These, of course, are not all the difficulties the U.N. has been up against ever since its birth. But these are some of them. They are enough, we believe, to suggest that although there have been U.N. failures - plenty of them - its achievements, in the light of its difficulties, have been considerable.

These are days of world upheaval. That is so obvious, and has been said so often, that many do not listen when it is said again. The efficient functioning of the U.N. has been badly handicapped by the various forces let loose by the world upheaval. They will continue to affect and to some degree hamper its operations as long as any who read these words remain alive. But the thing which impresses us as we study the record is that, through these wild eight years past, the U.N. has kept alive; it has grown in membership; it has been called on by the nations to deal with increasingly difficult and dangerous issues; and little by little the United Nations has moved toward becoming an indispensable factor in world affairs. "A sheer necessity," President Eisenhower called it.

One who knew the record well summed it up in these words: "One hour after Trygve Lie arrived in the United States as Secretary-General of the United Nations, in March 1946, the Ambassador of Iran handed him the complaint of his country against the presence of Soviet troops in its territory. From that moment the United Nations has lived in constant crisis - Iran, Greece, Indonesia, atomic energy, Palestine, Berlin, Korea, China. In every crisis there were plenty of voices to say: either you settle this one quickly or the organization is dead. It is still alive and still in the midst of crisis." Probably for all the years of this generation the United Nations will continue to live in the midst of crisis. Perhaps for as long as it exists.

Where the U.N. Has Failed

"The United Nations is a failure." That's the verdict some Americans pass on it - flat, sweeping, final. Is it a reasonable verdict? Would it not be more in accord with the record to say that the U.N. has failed to do some things we wish it had done? The staunchest supporters of the U.N., including members of its Secretariat, will agree that the organization has had failures as well as successes. In evaluating the worth of the body, however, the relative importance of these is what needs to be considered. Have the failures outweighed the accomplishments? You be the judge.

A year ago Walter W. Van Kirk, who is known to millions of American churchmen as the man who has done more than any other to interpret world affairs to the churches, wrote a straight-shooting booklet on the U.N. As executive director of the Department of International Justice and Goodwill of the National Council of Churches, Dr. Van Kirk did a fine job of telling "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth" about this world body as he watches it close at hand and every day. He said without hedging: "The U.N. has had its failures. Otherwise the fear of a Third World War would not be so widely prevalent." That is a just conclusion.⁶

Dr. Van Kirk listed four major failures which must be set down on the debit side of the U.N. balance sheet. The first was its failure to stop the cold war. It still hasn't

stopped it. When they signed the U.N. Charter all the member-states promised to "practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." In the light of what has happened since the nations took that pledge, that's a laugh - a bitter laugh.

The world has divided between the Communist nations and the free world nations, and the U.N. has divided in the same way. The U.N. Charter says, as Dr. Van Kirk recalled, that the U.N. is to be "a center for harmonizing the action of nations." Only on rare occasions has it been that. On the contrary, the U.N. has often been a means of showing how deep are the divisions between nations and how unfriendly their feelings toward one another. There are reasons for this for which the U.N. is not responsible. That, however, does not alter the fact. The cold war goes on, always threatening to become a hot world war, and the U.N. has not been able to stop it.

Next Dr. Van Kirk spoke of the U.N.'s failure to induce the nations to disarm or to reduce their armaments. Along with that of course goes its failure to lead them to agree on any method to control the new and terrible methods of warfare which, as Sir Winston Churchill says, "cast their shadow on every thoughtful mind." For all its life the U.N. has been trying to end the nightmare arms race. It has a Disarmament Commission which has instructions to prepare proposals which would provide absolutely dependable information as to the size and nature of the armed forces and of the armaments of every nation, effective international inspection of those forces and their arms, and some workable system to insure that once disarmament procedures had been pledged the pledges would be fulfilled.

The U.N. Commission has not failed to carry out these instructions for want of trying. Nevertheless, it has failed. It has not even been able to bring disarmament plans to a point of sufficient clarity and possible agreement where it would be worth while to call its members into conference to consider them. That certainly looks like nearly total failure.

Third in his list of failures Dr. Van Kirk placed the U.N.'s abortive efforts to work out a system of collective security for its members. The Korea experience did not solve this problem. True, there was collective action against Communist aggression in Korea. But most of this was action taken by only the troops of two nations, the Republic of Korea (South Korea) and the United States. Many of the member-states were not willing to take even token action.

The issue of collective security is so important that we will consider it in a separate section. But no one will deny that it is a problem which has not yet been solved. This means that up to now the attempt by the U.N. to provide a system of collective security which the nations can trust for their protection has been a failure.

Finally, in his list of failures Dr. Van Kirk came to the veto. This, as we have seen, is the right which any of the five permanent members of the Security Council (China, France, Britain, Russia and the U.S.A.) has to stop any action by that body against which it casts its vote. The Soviet Union has used its veto dozens of times, and China - which in the U.N. means the Nationalist government on Formosa - has

threatened to resort to its veto many times. A threat of that kind is usually as effective in tying up the Security Council as an actual veto. Do not put this down as a stumbling-block for the U.N. contrived solely by Russia, for it is by no means certain that the U.S. Senate would agree to allow this nation to deal with the Communists in the Security Council unless the U.S. delegate likewise continued to be armed with the veto.

The veto stops the U.N. Security Council from doing many things most U.N. members would favor. It has thwarted the efforts of the U.N. again and again. But while the Charter remains as it is - and no one thinks it can be changed at this point, for changing the Charter is itself subject to the veto - this is a problem unsolved.

Because Dr. Van Kirk was writing a very compressed pamphlet, despite the candor with which he named some U.N. failures he did not name all of them. Here are a few more which, even in a partial study, seem to us should be added.

Not to make the picture more black than it really is, consider first one or two instances in which the U.N. has achieved a partial success, where the present failure may still be turned into a complete success. Palestine and Kashmir are examples. In both, a cease-fire and a truce line have been established. That was an important achievement, for the wars starting in both places could have developed into major wars which might have involved many nations, including the United States. But in neither Palestine nor Kashmir a firm peace been gained. In both, the danger of a renewal of fighting continues.

In Palestine, this danger is intensified by the 800,000 Arab refugees who exist in misery around the borders of Israel. Nothing has worked yet to solve the problem of those Palestine refugees. They have but one thought - to get back to the homes in Israel from which they fled more than four years ago. In their hatred for the Israelis and their despair they form an active focus of trouble in the Near East.

Success may still crown the efforts of the U.N. to bring peace to Kashmir and Palestine. If it does not, as in the case of disarmament it will not be because the U.N. has not tried by every means that seemed available to gain peace. So far, however, it has gained only a truce; so far, failure must be acknowledged in everything beyond that.

The Korea story may turn out to be the same. But it is too early to tell, for as this is written the U.N. is still in the midst of its maddening negotiations with the Communists, trying to turn another cease-fire into a peace. In trying to solve that problem, account must be taken of Syngman Rhee as well as the Communists.

Tunisia and Morocco are at least partial failures. Its Arab members have tried to induce the United Nations to call on France to grant those two North African protectorates independence. Unquestionably they are more ready for freedom than was Libya, the former Italian colony which the U.N. started off as an independent nation in 1951. And the growing unrest in both protectorates constitutes an undeniable threat to world peace.

Nevertheless, the most the U.N. has dared to do is to provide a platform from which the Tunisian and Moroccan nationalists could tell their story to the world and to adopt some toothless resolutions expressing hope that France would bring both rapidly along to self-government. Perhaps the fact that the U.N. heard the case of the two North African protectorates even though France stalked out of the sessions - and threatened to do worse - can be regarded as a minor achievement. In the old, pre-U.N. days Tunisia and Morocco would have had nowhere to make their appeal except to the fortunes of armed revolt. But the festering sore of these two spots remains, and it marks another U.N. failure.

The U.N. has failed to induce the Nationalist government of the Union of South Africa, headed by that iron-willed Boer, the Rev. Dr. Daniel F. Malan, to abandon its apartheid policies. It has carried out a careful study of the segregation of races which Dr. Malan's government has made the cornerstone of its policy. In a voluminous report it predicts that this will lead to tragedy in the African future. But the resolutions it has passed have seemed only to confirm the intention of the government of South Africa to go forward in its trouble-breeding way.

Another failure has to be admitted in the effort to bring the Union of South Africa to acknowledge that it must ask the U.N. for the right to administer the old League mandate of South West Africa, and must report to the U.N. on its stewardship of that responsibility. South Africa argued that case before the International Court of Justice, but the verdict given there was not a clear one and South Africa had already served notice that it would not be bound by it. All attempts by the U.N. to establish its final authority over South West Africa - which are really attempts to protect the natives against the harshness of the Malan government's racial policies - have failed.

Failure has plagued the efforts of the U.N. to induce many of the nations - conspicuously the United States - to ratify the genocide treaty. This is the treaty which defines genocide - the mass killing of great groups of people because of their race, religion, nationality or ethnic origins - as a crime under international law punishable in the courts of the nation where the crime is alleged to have taken place. The genocide treaty has been ratified by 42 nations and is in effect among them. But the U.N. has failed to persuade the United States to ratify. (And this even though the U.S. delegation in November of this year voted for a resolution in the Assembly which exhorted all nations that have not ratified to hurry up and do so!) American action on the genocide treaty at present seems stalled.

The U.N. has called on its four member-states with occupation forces in Austria to speed up conclusion of a peace treaty with that unhappy little country. Result to date: failure.

Perhaps as regrettable as any is the U.N.'s failure to work out the question of admitting new members. If the United Nations is to achieve its full stature and shoulder all the responsibilities which it should, it needs to become the United Nations. That is to say, it should have in its membership every nation which wants to join and is willing to accept the obligations of membership laid down in the Charter. At the start, it looked as though the U.N. would soon achieve this universality, when its original membership of 51 quickly mounted to 60 nations.

Here again, however, the split between East and West, aided by the veto in the Security Council - which must pass on all applicants for membership - has blocked off the desired end. There are 14 nations applying for membership whom the Western nations would like to vote in. Among them are such important European states as Italy, Portugal, Ireland and Finland; such important Asian states as Japan, Ceylon and Jordan. There are seven states, all Communist, whom the Soviet Union is pushing for membership. Up to the present, Russia has continued to blackball our candidates and we have paid her back by blackballing hers. (The case of Communist China is not included here. Clearly, such membership cannot be considered so long as Red China is at war with the U.N.) So a stalemate exists on the matter of membership. While it exists, the need of the U.N. to attain universality is being ignored. This, too, must be accounted another U.N. failure.

What About Collective Security?

At this point it is necessary to look at what some regard as the U.N.'s worst failure, and what certainly is its most controversial aspect. That is its effort to provide collective security for its members against the danger of war.

There are 111 articles in the Charter of the United Nations. Of these, articles 33 to 54 inclusive provide for the settlement of disputes between nations. These are the "collective security" articles, and many will say that they constitute the essence of the U.N. It was to set up this system of guaranteeing peace for its members, they insist, that the U.N. was formed. And if the system outlined in these articles is not working, then the U.N. is not working. The whole thing is a failure and a fraud.

Oh yes, they will admit, the U.N. may be doing any number of other admirable things. It may be relocating refugees and protecting the rights of natives in African jungles and showing Pakistan farmers how to head off another wheat crop failure. All these enterprises are good, but they are not vital. Vital, that is, to the future of the U.N. and of world peace. Nor are they vital to the security of the United States. The United Nations will be judged by its ability to protect its members from another world war. It will stand or fall by its ability to provide collective security.

When men talk this way they generally have in mind, in speaking of collective security, military security. They picture the United Nations as a great alliance in which the member-nations pool their military strength to keep the world's peace. Such an alliance would be so strong, if it held together, that no potential aggressor would dare challenge it. Aggression would be fore-doomed to defeat, and so probably would never be tried. If it were tried, it would be sternly suppressed at the point where it occurred, and so would not develop into a world war. That, it is said, is what the U.N. is supposed to do. If it doesn't do this, it is worthless.

(Strangely enough, many Americans who have talked in this way about the responsibility of the U.N. to provide collective military security have been most bitter in their criticisms of the U.N. for the heavy losses in Korea. That was one instance in which the U.N. tried to work in the way it is said it should. It did so successfully, at least to the

extent of stopping aggression in its tracks and driving it back beyond its jumping-off point. But doing so cost many lives - and the U.N. is excoriated for that. All of which is simply another reminder that few of us are as logical beings as we like to think we are.)

What can be said about the U.N. system for providing collective security? First of all, it is not primarily a system of military action. Out of the 22 articles in the Charter which outline this system, the first six provide for what is called "the pacific settlement of disputes." These require that "the parties to any dispute ... shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." Here is a wide range of action to preserve peace which has nothing military about it. Any or all of these means are to be used before the proposal to use armed force is to be considered. Yet all these are truly a part of the U.N.'s collective security system. They are, it is fair to say, the normally employed part of that system.

Take that matter of mediation as an example. Twice now in its brief history the United Nations has used mediation to halt what threatened to develop into wars which could have engulfed the world. The first time was in Palestine. Mediation looked almost hopeless when it was attempted there. The first U.N. mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte of Sweden, was assassinated. When Dr. Ralph J. Bunche took over the task, at first he could not induce the representatives of the Arabs and the Israelis to shake hands or to enter the same room.

But the U.N. mediator would not give up, knowing that behind the Arabs who were fighting in Palestine there stretched a tense Arab world all the way from Morocco in the northwest corner of Africa to Indonesia in the southeast corner of Asia - an Arab world which would almost certainly be drawn into the war if it continued. And if that happened, then other nations, with their interests in the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East, would follow. The possibility of a Third World War was grim and growing.

Finally, by even-handed dealing, by patience and by superb statesmanship Count Bernadotte won a truce-line dividing the belligerents. True, it is a precarious truce and there have been raids back and forth across the truce line. But it is not the Third World War. That is what counts.

Right now another U.N. effort at mediation is going on. This is being handled by a mediation team headed by Dr. Frank Graham, who gained fame as president of the University of North Carolina and was briefly a U.S. senator. India and Pakistan were on the verge of an all-out war over the disposition of Kashmir when India brought the question to the U.N. It would have been a bloody war, for there are issues of religion as well as ethnic rivalries involved. Nearly 500 million people would have been fighting in that war at its start, and you cannot have that many at war without probably involving many, many more. Kashmir could easily have brought on a Third World War - as easily as Palestine.

The U.N. mediation has not yet solved the Kashmir problem. But it has gained a truce, and it has brought the heads of the Indian and Pakistan governments closer and closer

together in peaceful discussions. There is still a possibility of failure, but there is a much greater possibility by now it is a probability - of a successful outcome for the negotiations, and peace. Surely the continuation of the negotiations, long as they are proving and hard as they are on the nerves of all concerned, is better than the terrible alternative.

U.N. conciliation helped to head off all-out war in Indonesia and to secure the recognition of the independent republic there, together with its admission to the United Nations.

All these peaceful methods, we repeat, come first in applying the U.N. system of collective security. And they work! At least, they have worked several times and under discouraging circumstances within the brief span of eight years.

But the Charter goes on to provide that, if peaceful methods do not suffice to settle disputes, the Security Council can act. It can impose "complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations." If this doesn't work, "it may take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." If for some reason it does not want to take such action with the force of all the nations, it can act through the forces of regional associations approved by the U.N., such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

There would seem to be plenty of deterring factors here for any would-be aggressor to take into account. But this, experience has shown, is the part of the collective security system about which most doubts cluster. Why?

For one reason, any major action, such as a military measure, requires unanimous action in the Security Council by the five powers with a veto. That is seldom available in the present world situation. In the case of Korea it was available only because the Soviet Union was boycotting sessions of the Council at the time North Korea attacked.

Second, because the elaborate scheme for a U.N. army, which is outlined in the Charter, is one which the member-states have so far refused to carry beyond the paper stage - and there is no indication that they ever will go farther.

Third, because nations cannot be expected to risk the lives of their citizens in fighting where their own interests are not clearly involved.

And last, because any attempt by the U.N. to apply collective military measures against a major power would be another world war, no matter what persuasive name might be given it. If the military measures proposed in the Charter were ever invoked against a major power, the U.N. would be wrecked.

It is for such reasons that many individuals and some nations do not believe in the reality of the military security offered by the United Nations. In 1947 John Foster Dulles wrote an article for the Christian Century which revealed his skepticism. Mr. Dulles was not then secretary

of state, but he had been a member of the U.S. delegation at the San Francisco conference where the U.N. Charter was adopted. Here are some of the things he said:

Some consider that the United Nations has proved to be an almost complete failure.... Those who wanted an organization with "teeth" see that the only teeth yet possessed by the U.N. are paper teeth.... Speaking in November 1944 before the Federal Council of Churches I said.... that while the Security Council could be useful as "a forum where controversial matters are discussed, where public opinion may focus its pressures,.... the force proposals are little more than scenery."

There is less chance today for collective military action by the whole membership of the United Nations than there was when it was formed. That is why those who think the best hope of peace is through amassing overwhelming armed force against a possible aggressor more and more rely on the development of the "regional arrangements," authorized under Article 51 of the Charter. The United States is a party to three of these - NATO, the Pact of Rio de Janeiro and the ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, U.S.A.) pact.

This is not to deny the possibility that, against minor offenders or in limited local situations, the U.N. might occasionally find it possible to deal with threats to the peace through police action. But the critics who hold that the U.N. is a failure unless it is ready at the drop of a hat to suppress any aggressor are not thinking about something on the scale of an invasion of Costa Rican villages by Nicaraguan guerrillas. And it must also be borne in mind that "police actions" cannot always be kept within their intended limits. Remember Korea.

Summing up, therefore, we believe that it is a mistake to expect much in the way of maintaining peace from collective military action by the U.N. Something may be contributed to that cause by the restraining powers of regional agreements. More is to be hoped for from the "mediation, conciliation, arbitration and judicial settlement" of Article 33. But the great hope for the future lies in the development of the General Assembly as an agency for inquiry, discussion and the promotion of negotiation. Especially of negotiation.

In the Service of Humanity

To see the United Nations at its best, one should watch it when it gets down where the human problems of survival and development are most harassing and works at solving those problems in man-to-man terms. When the U.N. is trying to deal with the big political problems of nations, there are times it seems baffled and weak. But when it tackles the misfortunes of human beings it shows a remarkable ability to provide all kinds of practical help in an efficient, inconspicuous and astonishingly inexpensive way. This is the sort of thing it is doing every day of the year.

Surprisingly little is known by most Americans about this aspect of the U.N., perhaps because it is another instance in which the old analogy of the iceberg applies. Nine-tenths of an iceberg is never seen, but that is the part ocean navigators have to take into account. In much the same way, the part of the United Nations which operates most constantly and successfully to reduce human distress, and thus to ward off the international trouble which rises out of it, is far below the surface of the sensational headlines in the newspapers.

While this study was in preparation, for example, the press was filled with accounts of international crises involving the U.N. which were gravely testing its capacity. In Korea the effort to get a peace conference under way and to dispose of the prisoners who had said they did not want to be repatriated seemed hopelessly snarled. In Palestine it looked as though fighting might break out again along the U.N. truce line almost any day. In Trieste mobs were howling in the streets and Yugoslavia and Italy making threats. The world picture, as the press printed it without exaggeration, was very black. No one could be blamed for wondering whether the U.N. could cope with it.

But while these political crises were being debated in the Assembly, the Security Council and in various standing committees, that was far from all the U.N. was doing. While the diplomats glowered and occasionally shouted and sometimes even shook verbal fists at one another, the constructive, under-the-surface humanly helpful work of the U.N. went steadily forward. Here, for instance, are some of the other things which took place in U.N. operations during only three days while the Korea-Palestine-Trieste crises boiled.

Twenty-one more nations pledged financial help for the technical assistance program, of which more will be said a few paragraphs farther on. Some of these nations had never given to this cause before; the others almost without exception increased their pledges. Representatives of 37 organizations met under U.N. auspices to work out plans to ease difficulties in migration, with special attention given to ways of helping the Arab refugees who can be admitted to the United States under recent legislation. Experts from Mexico, El Salvador, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Colombia, Venezuela, Haiti and Jamaica were invited to a conference on the training of community workers to be held in Bogota in December 1953.

The chairman of the Costa Rican delegation signed the protocol for the suppression of the international opium traffic, making the 22nd country to join this coordinated campaign to end an ancient human curse. The U.S.S.R. turned in its report for the Yearbook on Human Rights to show what had been done to protect such rights - they are outlined in the U.N.'s Declaration of Human Rights, concerning which more presently - in Byelorussia and the Ukraine. The U.N. received and referred to its Economic and Social Council 173 communications alleging that religious persecution was taking place in Poland. Other communications, handled in the same way, alleged violation of human rights in Austria, Cyprus, Hungary, India, Peru, Spain, Russia and Yugoslavia. There were four such communications, which would be considered later, charging invasion of the rights of conscientious objectors in European countries.

One of these days brought to its close a four-day session of the Committee of Ministers of Economics of the Central American Republics. They had adopted resolutions regarding future technical assistance to their countries, for improving transportation, creating a school of public administration to provide trained civil servants for their governments, and providing a uniform system of customs nomenclature. They had also established a committee to study unification of their customs procedure - something for which any American exporter to Central America or any American traveller passing from one to another of those republics should give three rousing cheers. Before adjourning the committee changed its name to the Committee on Economic Cooperation in the Central American Isthmus. If it lives up to its new name, this body which the U.N. has fostered will bring a genuine advance in this field of world trade.

Throughout one of these days various U.N. delegations and members of the Secretariat held a briefing conference for 230 United States army officers from the War College at Carlisle Barracks, giving them information on the world picture as it looked from the vantage point of the international organization. On the same day, also, the U.N. published 11 books (including the Yearbook of International Trade Statistics which is invaluable to all Americans who trade overseas) and 12 special bulletins, plus 11 official records of its proceedings in English, French, Russian and Chinese.

There is a condensed list of some of the things that were happening at the U.N. or under its auspices, during just three typical days. Probably not a single one of these was mentioned in the press or over the radio. But every one was of genuine importance. And this takes no account of the services which were being rendered during those three days by more than a thousand technical experts and advisers who, in more than fifty countries, were showing the inhabitants how to guard their health, improve their housing, increase the amount and quality of their food, life their educational standards, prepare their young men and young women for high-grade government service or to carry through many kinds of needed community enterprises.

If you look at a chart of the United Nations organization you will see boxes which designate 24 subsidiary and affiliated bodies. These work with the third major organ of the U.N., its Economic and Social Council. This ranks right along with the General Assembly and the Security Council, and it is possible that as the years pass it may become more helpful than either of the others in securing the sort of world where wars will not always be threatening. Not all these humanitarian, technological and financial organizations can be listed or discussed here. Since they are commonly referred to by their initials, they are the agencies that make up what the jokesters have called the U.N.'s "alphabet soup."

But in that part of the world where a billion people never have enough to eat, where the average yearly income is under \$50, where a child at birth has scarcely one-third the life expectancy it would have had if it had been lucky enough to be born in the United States, where preventable diseases still rage almost unchecked and where illiteracy still condemns most of the population to poverty and hopelessness - in such places the U.N. "alphabet soup" is no joke. On the contrary, it is the brightest promise on the horizon for the under-developed nations and their people.

Henry Ford II, a member of the American delegation, knew this when he said that on "these grass root functions the United Nations may well stand or fall."

What do these organizations of the Economic and Social Council do? Take what the U.N. calls its "Expanded Program of Technical Assistance" as an example. Most Americans have heard of "Point IV," the program of their government for helping the development of less fortunate countries by supplying technological assistance and some financial help. But how many know that through the U.N.'s technical assistance program over 60 nations--are working to build and safeguard peace in an international effort of the Point IV variety? This is the work of the Technical Assistance Administration and its related specialized agencies.

The Expanded Technical Assistance Program--we might as well save space by calling it ETAP hereafter--operates on a very simple plan. Any nation which has a problem affecting its people's livelihood or living conditions can apply to the U.N. for help. The U.N. never goes where it is not asked. In almost every case, the nation aided bears most of the local expense. When it goes, it usually sends only a few technicians to size up the situation and to make recommendations. Then, if the government launches pilot projects, the U.N. will supply experts to help get these running properly. At the same time, it will help train people on the spot to carry on when the pilot projects are expanded into national programs. The idea is for the U.N. to recruit the technological knowledge of the world to help nations and regions use the resources of man-power and of materials they already possess to gain the improvements in living which hitherto have eluded them because of their lack of what Americans call "know-how."

That's the theory. How does the theory work out in practice? Well, Afghanistan asked the U.N. if it could do anything to help stop the famines which periodically afflicted that country tucked away in the mountains of central Asia. So TAA sent a Haitian agricultural expert at the head of a small team. He was picked because it was felt that his experience in a relatively simple agricultural society would fit Afghanistan's situation. He showed the Afghans how to increase their cotton crop two-and-a-half times and how to harvest their grain in a fifth of the time it was consuming, thus making possible the cultivation of much more land. How did he do it? By bringing in tractors and combination reaper-binders? Nothing of the sort. He showed how much more effective a scythe is than a sickle, a hoe than a mattock, and planting cotton properly instead of in the haphazard way it had been done. That was all, but it brought an economic revolution to Afghanistan! All it took was maybe half a dozen U.N. technical advisers with most of their local expenses joyously paid by the Afghans.

Haiti sent an expert to help the Afghans. But Haiti herself asked for help. Her people were suffering from lack of the higher proteins in their diet. Where did ETAP find the technical assistance Haiti needed? In Indonesia! For centuries Indonesia has developed fish-farming, often raising the fish to supply needed protein to supplement its basic rice diet right along with the rice in the wet paddy fields. So the Indonesian "know-how" is now being applied to the dietary needs of Haiti and of Thailand and soon will be to those of Israel. Fish can be raised cheaply; they will make up for many countries' most pressing nutritional needs; no elaborate machinery or great army of experts is required.

In fact, most of the U.N. help in this matter has been extended by granting "fellowships" to a few Haitians, Thais and Israelis to go to Indonesia and learn on the spot how fish-farming is done.

Something was said in the preceding paragraph about rice. That is the basic food for nearly half the world's population--the hungriest half. Growing more rice has become a matter of life or death for millions of Asians, since the population of that teeming continent has increased by more than 10 per cent in the past 12 years while rice production is still below the pre-1940 level. Food must now be imported, and when too many begin to starve it must be begged. Sometimes the American gifts, as in the recent case of Pakistan, are accompanied by congressional oratory which does nothing to improve relations.

Space limitations make it impossible to tell the full story of what ETAP is doing to help Asia grow more rice. But the experiments now under way at the Central Rice Research Station in the state of Orissa, India, quite conceivably can turn most of that continent from a food-deficit to a food-surplus area. Do you see what that could do to the effort of communism to entice hungry Asians? This experimentation is based on the fact that in Japan an acre of rice yields 2,352 pounds, while in India an acre yields only 772 pounds and in Indo-China only 716.

Hybridization seems to be the answer, just as it has been for cereals in the United States. So ETAP, working with the government of India, with the help of the British Commonwealth's Colombo Plan and through its own Food and Agriculture Organization, using experts of all sorts from all over the world, is searching for the hybrid rice which will make all the rice-producing areas of Asia yield as much, or nearly as much, as do the fields of Japan. They haven't found the answer yet, but they are confident they will.

If there were space we'd tell how the U.N. helped the people of Greece rebuild the roads in their war-scarred country; how it has shown isolated Iran the way to open its communications with the rest of the world by planning modern airfields and training the young men of Iran to handle their intricate equipment; how it is working to show jam-packed Israel ways to build very low-cost "stabilized earth" housing. The stories of ETAP achievements are endless, even though this U.N. program has only been under way since 1950.

In some instances the U.N. has tackled more than a single specialized problem; at the request of certain governments a whole program for government and social improvement has been worked out. Thus at present El Salvador is entertaining 16 experts: a Chilean to advise on social welfare; an American on economics, another American on a survey of family income, another on farm management and two more on health education; a Dane on dairy technology; an Italian on educational administration; a Belgian on grade school education; a Mexican and an American on civil aviation; a Peruvian, a Colombian, a Briton, in addition to the two Americans already listed, on health education; a Mexican on health statistics and a Frenchman on social legislation.

"Jules Verne himself," says a booklet recently published in Switzerland, "would find it hard to imagine that technical assistance could mean that a Haitian coffee specialist went to help Ethiopians to establish a new

industry, that an Icelandic marine engineer was invited to give advice [on the designing of fishing boats] in Ceylon, that the new nation Libya, so dependent upon agriculture, borrowed a man from Rhodesia because his training could assist it to set up its first department of agricultural statistics."8

The best thing about all this is not its low cost, though it is astonishing that ETAP costs less than \$25 million a year--say, about one-tenth the cost of a single airplane carrier! No, the best thing about it is that it gives all the nations a chance to contribute to the needs of others, as well as a chance to get highly competent help in meeting their own needs.

U.N. technical assistance experts have been sent to 65 countries, and "fellowships" of the sort we saw aided the Haitians to study Indonesian fish-farming have been granted to individuals in 97 countries and territories. But the more significant figure is that 64 countries provided experts of one sort or another to help others, and 76 countries and territories provided study facilities for "fellows" from other lands. U.N. technical assistance is certainly no give-away program. Neither is it tinged with condescension or the sort of philanthropic self-esteem which sets a recipient's teeth on edge. Technical assistance under the U.N. is a two-way street. Whoever needs expert help gets it, but everybody gives help.

In thus writing of ETAP it has been necessary to keep the picture simple, and not to try to distinguish all the associated U.N. agencies involved in this joint program. Books have been written about almost every one, and they deserve it. UNESCO (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization) got off to a bad start, mainly because it couldn't make up its mind what it wanted to do and so tried to do too many things at once. Now, however, it is shaking down into a working organization dealing with immediate and practical problems in its field. Its main concern is education, principally lower school and vocational education. It is just beginning to develop model schools to train teachers for work in primitive regions. One of these at Patzcuaro, Mexico, has 100 teachers from ten Latin American countries in its first classes. The other, just getting started at Sirs-El-Layen, Egypt, will pioneer in teacher training for Arab countries.

For some reason UNESCO has been attacked as an "atheist" organization seeking to undermine "loyalty to the United States" in order to prepare school children for "world citizenship." By world citizenship, these attacks contend that this U.N. agency means a world supergovernment which will displace the United States and all the other governments now in the United Nations. UNESCO has also been accused of being under Communist influence. These attacks have occurred in scattered spots throughout this country, but seem to have been most severe (and scurrilous) in southern California. Generally, those who have made them have seemed to be aiming at UNESCO while really trying to spread distrust of the whole U.N.

So widespread became these attacks, and so unprincipled the whispering campaign which spread them, that President Eisenhower finally appointed a committee to investigate. This, headed by Irving Salomon, a Chicago industrialist, brought in its report in September 1953. Nothing, it said, in the actions, publications or statements

of UNESCO, supports the charge that it is atheistic, antireligious, controlled or influenced by communists, trying to establish a world government, undermining the loyalty of Americans to their country or seeking to plant un-American ideas in the minds of our school children. Perhaps the findings of President Eisenhower's investigating committee will lay these slanders finally to rest.

No account, however, brief, of this aspect of the United Nations can omit the work of the World Health Organization. That, along with the Food and Agriculture Organization, is always working alone and with ETAP to clean up the world's disease-ridden regions. Whole areas, for example, have been cleared of malaria where formerly practically every child contracted that disease in babyhood and never got over it. Ever try to work while you had malaria? Ask some of the Pacific war veterans what it's like; they'll tell you.

You never had yaws, did you? No, for that's a skin disease which makes work impossible and life miserable for people in tropical regions. WHO is using penicillin to wipe out yaws. (Frequently, one shot will do it!) The whole outlook on life of a large part of the population of Thailand, for example, is likely to be changed by the time WHO completes its campaign there against yaws. Similar campaigns against T.B. and against the rats and other vermin that carry plagues are also making great headway. One of the U.N. enterprises which seems of most promise is the plants to produce anti-tuberculosis vaccine, penicillin and DDT which WHO--in cooperation with UNICEF--have established at Ankara, Turkey, Quayaquil, Ecuador, and outside Bombay, India.

As a single illustration of what an international organization like WHO can do, see what happened to Dr. Kessler. Dr. Henry H. Kessler, head of the Kessler Institute for Rehabilitation, in West Orange, New Jersey, is one of the most famous doctors in the world in the field of restoring the crippled to physical activity. Yugoslavia, after the war, was full of cripples. There are 80,895 disabled veterans on the war department lists and at least 500,000 others--men, women and children--who were the victims of bombings and the other war terrors. Moreover, the war reduced the number of Yugoslavia's doctors from 16,000 to 6,000, who work with little equipment.

Marshal Tito asked the U.N. for help. Technical assistance turned to WHO. It sent Dr. Kessler to look the situation over. Dr. Kessler told Marshal Tito, after he had made a thorough study, that three things needed to be done: (1) the government should set up an agency to push rehabilitation work for these war victims; (2) three pilot centers to demonstrate the possibilities should be established; (3) various young Yugoslavs should be given TAA fellowships to prepare themselves to carry on the work.

The recommendations were adopted. Dr. Kessler got the first rehabilitation center under way in Belgrade and stayed to instruct its staff and see that its methods were the best known today. Later, he had young Yugoslav doctors in his own institute in New Jersey, and took them with him to assist as he operated in various New Jersey hospitals.

The whole story is a thriller, but in brief what it boils down to is this: The U.N., through TAA and WHO, thus got a whole program for the rehabilitation of the maimed started in Yugoslavia--a program which will presently cover

the country, be entirely of, by and for Yugoslavs, and will turn the despair and bitterness of thousands of war victims and their families into hope. Can you beat that for a return on the investment of a few thousands?

Then there's UNICEF. We deliberately used those initials a few lines above without spelling out their meaning for UNICEF has become such an accepted symbol of one of the most helpful humanitarian enterprises ever launched that it hardly seems necessary any longer to identify it as the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund. As a matter of fact, the nations have dropped that "Emergency" out of its title, but habit is so deeply formed that they continue to call it, in alphabetical shorthand, UNICEF.

If the United Nations had not accomplished another thing during its eight years of life, the work done by UNICEF would still entitle it to the gratitude of mankind. The story of what this fund has accomplished is so impressive we regret that in this study we can hardly do more than report that there is a United Nations Children's Fund. If any reader wants to know the full story, we hope that he (or she) will send half a dollar to the publications department of the U.N. in New York city for the 1953-54 volume of the UNICEF Compendium.

UNICEF "just grew." It started in 1946 when the world began to comprehend the terrible conditions in which the war had left millions of widows and children in the devastated parts of Europe. In the beginning, it did little more than try to get milk for the children, food for the mothers, some kind of clothing and temporary shelter for all of them. After 1948 it began to do the same things for Palestine refugee mothers and children. Those were the days when this was an "emergency" program, and an emergency it certainly was.

Conservative figures show that UNICEF fed 60 million children milk that otherwise they never would have tasted, vitamin capsules which made up for the dietary lacks which were inescapable, fish-liver oils to keep them from growing up stunted and scrawny burdens on society. It also provided the medicines or vaccines to fight the diseases rampant among these children--diphtheria, tuberculosis, whooping-cough, syphilis. And it provided the same sort of emergency help for the mothers.

As the post-war emergency passed, UNICEF began to turn to long-range programs of benefit to children, especially in underdeveloped countries. For example, instead of shipping dried milk to Yugoslavia for the children orphaned there by the war it shifted its operations to starting a milk-drying and pasteurization industry which gives safe milk from Yugoslavia's own cows. Not only are the children cared for, but the country's dairying industry has greatly enlarged to meet this steady and enlarged market for milk. Thus the country has been helped two ways--with a dairying industry put back on its feet and with a prospect that a generation of future citizens who had bid fair to be small in numbers and stunted in strength will be normal in every respect.

Is this another "global give-away"? Well, hardly. From its start in 1947 to January 1, 1953, UNICEF provided \$440 million for child-care projects. Of that sum, the governments where the help was extended gave \$267 million. And this does not include the immense amount of voluntary labor which was given by those in the receiving countries who

assisted in the distribution of the UNICEF supplies. In some countries, the stimulus given by UNICEF and WHO--they work as a team on medical problems--has increased government health and welfare budgets as much as 300 per cent.

"In the small town of Trebihoth in the Bohemian hills," said Mrs. Oswald B. Lord of the American delegation in a recent speech to the U.N., "I saw the beginning of the vast BCG [tuberculosis vaccine] campaign carried on with the World Health Organization and UNICEF. Children streamed toward the small schoolhouse where a Scandinavian team of a doctor and nurses waited to test and vaccinate the first of 50 million children who have since been tested and over 22 million who have been vaccinated against T.B. Cost? \$1 to test and vaccinate eight children."

That is the financial scale of all the U.N.'s humanitarian enterprises, and the financial policy. Costs kept to a bare minimum; recipient nations to contribute much more than half the costs. By sticking to these rules the current cost of the Expanded Technical Assistance Program runs only \$25 million a year, of UNESCO \$9 million, of WHO \$8.5 million, of UNICEF \$23 million. Add them all and you get a total equal to just about one-tenth of 1 per cent of what the United States is spending every year for purposes of military defense.

Here is a defense which consists in winning the confidence and friendship of other peoples by restoring them to health and strength, by wiping out the endemic diseases which have afflicted them, by opening up new opportunities to education, better jobs, better homes, and in scores of other ways. Because this is being done through an international organization in which all bear a hand, there is no resentment against a suspected patronization and there is no fear of a suspected "imperialism" or of control by one big nation or other ulterior political motives.

Yet it is a fact that the Congress of the United States, which voted four times as much for General Franco without bothering to take a roll-call, has shown great reluctance to vote the American share of these small appropriations for the U.N.'s humanitarian agencies. It looked for a time in the spring of 1953 as though the U.S. Congress was about to deprive UNICEF of every cent of American support. Fortunately for America's reputation, that did not happen. Fortunately the present administration has announced that this country intends to go on carrying its full share of the U.N. budget. In what other way could so few dollars contribute so directly to increasing good will, and so to building peace, among the peoples?

In the Service of Freedom

When World War II ended eight years ago 800 million people were still living under the rule of others. Today, 600 million of these have won their independence. That means that about a quarter of the entire human family has gained freedom in the past eight years! Never in history has there been a comparable emancipation.

It is not claimed that the United Nations liberated all these 600 million. It had a hand in bringing about the independence of several of their nations--Libya, Israel, Indonesia--but most of the grants of freedom came from colonial powers which recognized that the era of colonialism is fast

ending. What the U.N. has done has been to see that the worldwide movement toward the extension of freedom is not allowed to halt, but is kept pushing toward the day when all nations and peoples shall be free.

Sometimes progress toward that goal is slow. The U.N. has done much to see that it never stops. That it has accomplished as much as it has in so short a time and in so divided a world is a greater achievement than many realize.

How has the United Nations sought to advance the cause of freedom? One way has been through its Commission on Human Rights. This body was formed in 1946. It accepted as its first task the writing of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Suggestions poured in from all over the world, but in two years of hard work the commission completed its labors. In December 1948 the Assembly adopted the Declaration without a dissenting vote, although a few Communist delegations abstained from giving it their endorsement.

The Declaration of Human Rights is too long to quote here. Its noble preamble and its 30 sections, each defining a right of human beings which it is the business of governments to see they can exercise, by now has been translated into 46 languages and distributed by every conceivable means in every part of the world. This formulation of the basic personal, political, civil, economic, social and cultural rights of every living man, woman and child is undoubtedly the most widely known statement the U.N. has ever made. If you have never read it, you should do so.

"But," someone objects, "isn't the Declaration of Human Rights just so many words? Fine-sounding words, to be sure, yet only words. No nation has to pay any attention if it doesn't want to. The nations where the Declaration is most needed are the ones where it is most ignored. So what good is it?"

It seems to us that the Declaration is worth a great deal, for at least three reasons. First, granted that it represents more aspiration than realization, it is a healthy thing for all the nations to see what their goals should be and to be measured by them. Second, the actual record shows that, although the Declaration is only five years old, it already has had a great influence in the writing of numbers of new constitutions and laws. Offhand we think of the constitutions of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Haiti, Indonesia, Syria and Puerto Rico; of new laws adopted or under consideration in Canada, West Germany, Sweden and Britain.

Nor is that the full story. What may be the final influence of one single episode such as that which Elizabeth Gray Vining, tutor of Japan's crown prince, mentions in her book, Windows for the Crown Prince? In the winter of 1950, says Mrs. Vining, she and her pupil took the Declaration of Human Rights "for the center of our study."

The third factor which makes the Declaration important goes back to its adoption. When it was before the U.N. Assembly, Mr. Vyshinsky attacked it bitterly on the ground that people do not inherently possess rights--as the American Declaration of Independence asserts they do--but that governments possess rights, by virtue of their sovereignty,

which they may grant to their people or withhold as they please. It was the communist philosophy of the nature of government and of the subjection of the citizen to government. Yet in the fact of Mr. Vyshinsky's impassioned objections, the Assembly went ahead that very day to adopt the Declaration. By that act it committed the United Nations to the proposition that human rights precede and are superior to all others, and that governments may not, without injustice, invade or deny those rights. In other words, it put the U.N. on record squarely against the communist philosophy of government and the rights of man and for the democratic philosophy. That is important!

Since the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted five years ago the U.N.'s commission has been working at another task. It has been trying to write a pair of "covenants," as they are called, which, when and if ratified by the nations, would give the human rights named by the U.N. legal recognition in the ratifying nations. Frankly, this effort has run into difficulties. The trouble is that some nations think the human rights in such covenants should be confined to the kind of political and civil rights which are guaranteed for Americans by our constitutional Bill of Rights, while other members of the U.N. want these covenants to establish a wide range of social and economic rights.

The American position is that while this wide difference of opinion persists as to what rights should be included in the covenants, the U.N. should go slow in trying to push them. Instead, say the American delegates, let the U.N. for a while concentrate on collecting and publishing annual reports from all its members which show exactly what human rights they are protecting. Let experts study efforts that are being made to enlarge human rights in specific places and situations, and where U.N. "technical assistance" can help these efforts along, let it be made available. Thus, eventually, suggest the Americans, a climate of opinion will be created in which there will be fairly general agreement as to what human rights need to be given legal status. Then the covenants can be drawn and will be observed. So great is the influence of the United States in the U.N. that something like this seems likely to be done.

But one convention bearing on human rights the U.N. has adopted. It would grant women who do not now have it the right to vote, the right to run for office and the right to hold office on equal terms with men. More than 20 nations have signed it. The United States apparently does not intend to, perhaps because the women of this nation already possess these rights. For most of the world's women, however, this U.N. convention comes as a "new birth of freedom."

The other principal means by which the United Nations carried forward the fight to extend human liberty is through its Trusteeship Council. Here is the fourth major agency of the U.N.--Assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, now Trusteeship Council. The work of the Trusteeship Council is concerned with development of 11 "trust territories" which the U.N. administers directly through nations it has chosen. These are former German, Italian or Japanese colonies, some of them once "mandates" of the League of Nations, all now designated for international supervision. Then there are 70 countries or regions which the U.N. speaks of as "non-self-governing territories," but which are really surviving colonies under the old colonial system.

The U.N. Charter provides that the Trusteeship Council shall "insure the political, economic, social and educational advancement" of the native peoples in these trust and non-self-governing territories. It also states its purpose "to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions." In other words, the U.N. declares its purpose to be to get these people in colonial regions out of the status of dependencies just as soon as possible, and to push them along the road to freedom and self-government.

Again, that's a fine aspiration, but it will not be done easily. In the 11 "trust territories" where the U.N. has final authority, the problem is not too complex. Its difficulty mainly lies in the fact that most of the inhabitants of the trust territories are still primitive people, and much educational work must be done before they can hope successfully to govern themselves. But in one of these territories, Western Samoa, the administering nation--New Zealand--has pushed the people straight ahead on the road to self-government and will next year permit an elected constitutional convention to adopt a complete plan of self-government.

Another instance of the way in which trust territories are being brought to freedom is Somaliland. This former Italian colony, still administered by Italy, is to become an independent nation by 1960.

The Trusteeship Council is very direct in supervising the trust territories. It requires each of the administering nations to turn in a yearly report covering 247 different items. At least once every three years it sends out a team of its own experts to investigate on the ground the kind of job the administrators are doing. Moreover, every tribe, every organization, every person in a trust territory has the right to appeal directly to the Trusteeship Council when it is believed that some right or justice is being denied.

These appeals pour in by the hundreds. Some of them the Council can do nothing about, as in the case of the African chieftain who wanted the U.N. to make his mother-in-law "lay off." But the complaints of the Ewe tribe against being cut up, part in the Gold Coast, part in British Togoland and part in French Togoland, and its petition for the formation of a new African country of Eweland--this is the sort of thing to which the Council gives years of investigation and negotiation with all the Africans and the administering powers involved.

When it deals with the non-self-governing territories, however, the U.N. must proceed in a different way. These are, in one form or another, possessions of the colonial powers. Their inhabitants do not have the right of appeal to the Council. All the Council can do is to request members of the U.N. with such possessions to inform the Secretary-General annually on developments. The Secretary-General's analyses and summaries of these reports are published. In this way attention can be called to situations needing correction. But the distribution of these reports affects world opinion.

Sometimes this involves the Council in disputes with powerful nations. The most spectacular of these has been with the Union of South Africa over that nation's refusal to go on reporting on its administration of South West Africa.

That is too long and involved a story to be told here, but the upshot has been that the U.N. has rebuked Dr. Malan's government in South Africa for its procedure in South West Africa, for its treatment of the Indians who live in such numbers in the Union (especially in Natal), and for its apartheid (segregation) policy which denies most rights to the 8,500,000 African natives within its boundaries.

Critics of the U.N. may say that the government of the Union of South Africa pays no attention to these efforts to protect minority rights there. That's the way it looks, and Dr. Malan goes ahead hurling defiance at the U.N. and threatening to withdraw. But South Africa does not withdraw. And the U.N. goes steadily on building up the moral judgment of the rest of the world against South Africa's racial policies.

There are signs that even though Dr. Malan is beginning to feel the pressure. As this is written, it is reported that his government has proposed to meet India and Pakistan in a three-way conference to work out an agreement for better treatment of the Indians in South Africa. He asks that, as a face-saving device, the meeting not be held under U.N. auspices. The U.N., India and Pakistan are willing. They are not interested in face-saving. All they want is human rights and decent treatment for the hapless Indians in South Africa.

There have even been times when the Trusteeship Council has had trouble with the United States. One occurred recently when we announced that since Puerto Rico is now a self-governing commonwealth, with its own constitution, its own elections and its own legislature, we would no longer submit the reports we had been making concerning our administration of that island. This happened just as a considerable portion of the U.N., in its committee which deals with trusteeship matters, was ready to vote for a list of more than 20 "factors" which must be met before a non-self-governing territory is judged to have what the Charter calls "a full measure of self-government."

Since Puerto Rico--which still lacks control of its foreign and military affairs and has certain constitutional acts subject to approval by the U.S. Congress--could not satisfy all these "factors," that would have meant, if the test by "factors" had been adopted, that the U.N. was declaring Puerto Rico not self-governing, and that therefore the United States must continue to send information on this possession.

The United States won that particular tussle in the Trusteeship Committee, though by a narrow margin. Yet the very fact that the powerful United States was challenged as it was, though every delegate knew how generally encouraging the American Administration had been to Puerto Rican aspirations, showed with what watchdog purpose the U.N. is trying to hasten the day when all states and peoples shall be truly free.

In the Service of Mercy

We have seen how the name of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) has been changed to the United Nations Children's Fund. There is significance in that change. It shows that in one important field--the needs of children and their mothers-- the U.N.

no longer must spend all its efforts on disaster relief, but can turn to encouraging the nations to provide long-term measures for child protection and welfare.

This is what the U.N. is trying to do in all the fields where it offers assistance to meet human needs. Help the nations that need help to help themselves, not so much for the moment as for the long pull ahead. This is the core of the U.N.'s philosophy of human service. But there are certain areas of human misery where suffering is so great and need so challenging that the U.N. must postpone long-range programs for deeds of immediate mercy.

One of these areas in which human misery still afflicts appalling numbers is that of the refugees. Someone, having these millions in mind, has called this "The century of the homeless man." Every refugee is a potential center of bitterness and hatred to poison the whole world situation. It has been estimated that between 50 and 60 million people have fled from their homes during the past decade and a half. Great numbers have died on the war-littered roads and great numbers of the survivors are still without a permanent new home or work.

Where have these refugees come from? From every place where war has raged. Numbers fled from the Baltic republics when the Russians swept over them early in World War II. Numbers are survivors of the Nazi concentration camps in Germany and Austria. More than 10 million were of German ancestry, and for that were expelled from countries in which their families had lived, often for as long as two or three centuries. These prefer to speak of themselves as "expellees" rather than refugees, but they are just as homeless and desperate.

(In West Germany today, one person in every five is an expellee. They are forced to live in the homes of the West Germans, where the personal relationships are steadily worsening by the over-crowding. Few of them have been able to find more than temporary work or temporary housing, for an already heavily populated and highly industrialized region such as West Germany cannot take in 10 million additional inhabitants except on a temporary basis. West German authorities are worried about what could happen if these 10 million expellees united in a political party behind some rabble-rousing demagogue. The rest of the world has reason to worry likewise.)

Numbers of the refugees are to be found in Asia. Eight hundred thousand Arabs who formerly lived in what is now Israel barely keep alive in the refugee camps which surround that country. There are refugees in Pakistan and in India, miserable souls who fled for their lives during the religious massacres which took place when the partition went into effect. There are thousands of Chinese refugees in Hongkong, on Formosa and scattered in teeming Malaysia and Indonesia. The little Republic of Korea is packed and running over with refugees who have fled southward from the communist tyranny in the north.

Starting in 1947, for nearly five years the United Nations dealt with the refugee problem through its International Refugee Organization. During that period it resettled more than a million families of displaced persons and refugees in new homes, repatriated approximately 73,000

to their former homelands and gave some form of assistance to over 1,600,000. In addition it gave important information and other technical assistance to the programs of separate nations and of unofficial organizations for helping refugees and D.P.'s.

Two years ago, however, the U.N. voted to supersede the IRO with the office of a U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. A decision taken by the General Assembly in October of this year indicates that the U.N. intends to keep this commissioner and his staff at work trying to get the refugees resettled until there are no more. Dr. G.J. van Heuven Goedhart, of the Netherlands, who became the first high commissioner in 1951, has done such a satisfactory job that he was re-elected for a five-year term.

The U.N. refugee commissioner does not work directly to transfer homeless families to countries where they can find room and employment. Instead, he works to see that the immediate needs of these helpless ones are met where they now are, that their human rights are protected, and that where possible they are absorbed into the industries and communities where fate has already driven them. Since migration is a matter every nation wants to control for itself, and in such ways as to insure that the interests of its own inhabitants do not suffer, the U.N. carefully keeps out of any actual legislative measures to transfer refugees and D.P.'s from one country to another.

What the U.N.'s commission can and does do is to study the extent and nature of the refugee problem at all times, and see that all the nations know all about it; to make studies of areas where it is thought additional population is needed and report on the possibilities in such places; and to try to get the refugees who still live in the more than 200 camps scattered about Europe integrated into the life of the countries where they have taken refuge. Incidentally, this work seems so important for peace and is being so well done that a private U.S. philanthropy, the Ford Foundation, has given the high commissioner \$2.9 million to help along the work of his agency.

Not all the misery, however, is in Europe, although the attention of the U.N. refugee commissioner is largely confined to refugees on that continent. (One important exception to this: he is also responsible for helping the 300,000 Chinese refugees in Hongkong.) But a special organization, the U.N. Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, has been set up to try to lighten the miseries of the 880,000 Arab refugees who surround Israel.

This is not the place to discuss why these Arabs are refugees, or why, after almost five years, they still live in the camps and caves and overcrowded villages where they have no possible way of earning their own livelihood. The brutal fact is that these homeless ones are where they are, living under conditions so appalling that every American traveler who sees them comes back shaken at the sight of such misery. If, as is often and truly said, the Middle East is one vast dynamite-dump, where a single spark could set off a world conflict, the bitterness of these Arab refugees is an ever-present menace to peace.

The U.N.'s agency for Palestine refugees cannot solve the problem of their future. That is one of the subjects which will have to be worked out by negotiation

between Israel and the Arab states to which the refugees fled. Such negotiations, when they can be arranged, will take place under the auspices of another agency of the U.N.

Meanwhile, however, the refugee agency can see that the refugees don't starve. It does this by providing a basic ration of about 1,500 calories a day, with the addition of 1,200 grams of dry skim milk every month as a supplement for 380,000 refugee children and nursing mothers, and 1,200 grams of dry whole milk for 20,000 infants and hospital patients. And in some of the refugee centers where it looks as though these wretched ones would have to live for a long time, mud-and-rubble housing is being provided to take the place of the tents which so far have provided the only shelter. In Gaza alone, for example, about 60,000 have thus been given passably decent living quarters.

Then there's the story of Korea--a story which deserves five or six times the space we have available. How many Americans realize that by the time the North Korean Communists had made their first drive south, and the U.N. forces under General MacArthur had made their counter-drive north, and the Chinese armies drove across the Yalu to establish the line near the 38th parallel where the fighting stabilized until the truce was signed, there were more civilian displaced persons in Korea than there were in Europe during World War II?

Through the U.N. Civil Assistance Command and then through the U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency, the U.N. has worked to save the Korean people from starvation and epidemics. Now it is tackling the problem of rebuilding an almost completely ruined country. This requires everything from providing seeds and fertilizer to building bridges and restoring roads. It is a job staggering in extent, but the U.N. throws itself into it, knowing that if it is not done, Korea for decades to come will be a breeding-spot for the trouble that comes out of human misery.

"They Say..." But What Are the Facts?

This survey has touched only high spots in the performance and problems of the United Nations. Many important aspects of its operations have not been mentioned. But with our space almost used up, perhaps Mr. and Mrs. Average American would like us to deal with some of the charges which are constantly being leveled against the U.N. Are they true, or aren't they? Consider ten of the most frequently heard allegations.

"The U.N. is a nest of Communist spies." True or false? We will let Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., head of the U.S. delegation and former Republican senator from Massachusetts, answer. Says Mr. Lodge: "It is not a nest of Communist spies, for the simple reason that there is nothing to spy on at the United Nations. No member nation sends any secret or confidential material to the U.N. ... The Soviet Union has not even bothered to fill its quota of employees at the U.N., and no American citizen employed by the U.N. has ever been prosecuted for espionage."

"The U.N. dragged the United States into the Korean war." It would be closer to the truth to say that the United States dragged the U.N. into that war. (Although that wouldn't be true, either.) But it was the United

States which asked the U.N. to act after the North Korean Communists had crossed the 38th parallel, invading the Republic of Korea. The U.S.A. had ordered its armed forces into action in South Korea before the U.N. adopted the resolution, introduced by the U.S., calling for collective action by U.N. members against the aggressor.

"The U.N. can send American boys to fight and die anywhere in the world." On the contrary, the U.N. cannot send the troops of any nation to fight anywhere. All it can do is ask its member-nations, in case of aggression, to send their forces to repel the aggression. The decision as to whether they do so or not is entirely up to each nation. In Korea, for example, the troops of the 16 nations which fought there under the U.N. command were all volunteered by their nations. The nations which did not want to volunteer units of their armed forces, did not do so.

"The U.N. can set aside or supersede our American laws with U.N. treaties, and it can interfere in the internal affairs of the United States." Any treaty proposed by the U.N. must be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate and signed by the President before it becomes effective in the United States. The U.S. Supreme Court has declared (in *Askura vs. City of Seattle*) that "the treaty power does not extend as far as to authorize what the Constitution forbids." As was said earlier, the Charter of the U.N. clearly states: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."

"The U.N. is controlled by the Russians." Look at the U.N. roll-calls and you will get the answer to this one. Russia has never won a major roll-call. On the overwhelming majority of issues before the U.N., the best Russia has been able to do is to muster 5 votes out of the 60 in the General Assembly and in each of the U.N.'s principal committees.

Sometimes this charge is varied to "UNESCO is used by the Russians to spread communist poison through our schools and in other ways." Let Paul G. Hoffman, chairman of the board of the Studebaker Corporation, comment: "The quickest reply to this charge is to point out that UNESCO's educational policies and belief in free inquiry are so directly opposed to Soviet views that Russia has refused to join the agency. Further, she forced her satellites, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, to resign from UNESCO on the ground that it is a 'tool of U.S. policy.'"

"The U.N. is promoting formation of a world government in which the United States will lose its independence." This ignores the fact that the U.N. is made up of 60 separate independent nations, each intent on preserving its own independence. If you doubt it, follow U.N. debates closely for a while and see how quick the member-nations, small as well as large, are to protest when any proposal is made which they fear might in the smallest degree strip them of their sovereignty. As a matter of fact, the service to world peace of the U.N. probably would be improved if its member-nations were not so jealous of their freedom of independent action.

"God is not mentioned in the U.N. Charter and U.N. meetings are not opened with prayer. The U.N. is a godless, atheistic organization." So? Here's what the Presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Henry Knox Sherrill, says about that: "Men and women of many faiths are involved

in the work of the U.N. The basis of Christianity is love, not compulsion. We cannot expect them to observe religious practices other than their own. The silent prayer which opens each meeting of the General Assembly is as far as it is possible to go at this time." The Constitution of the United States does not name God. Is the U.S. atheistic?

"U.N. employees are immune to our American laws. Moreover, they pay no income taxes." No U.N. employee working in the United States has the slightest immunity; if he breaks our laws he may be arrested and punished just like the rest of us. What the objectors must be thinking of is the diplomatic immunity of members of delegations. This is like the immunity of all embassy staffs--our own embassies abroad as well as the embassies other nations send here. As for taxes, the U.N. deducts from the salary of every employee a sum approximately equal to what his U.S. income tax would be on that salary. This is turned into the general budget of the U.N. and used to reduce the contribution of the nation from which he comes by that amount. These assessments on U.N. employees--the equivalent of taxes--now total over \$7 million a year.

"The costs of the U.N. are too high and the United States pays all the bills." Is that so? Listen to Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., chairman of the Firestone Tire and Rubber Company: "The United States does not pay all the bills. As a matter of fact, we pay less than one-third of them. Our share of the 1953 total assessment of \$79,254,170 is \$25,433,373. This is 32.54 per cent of the total amount. In 1954 this is to be reduced to 30 per cent. The difference of \$53,820,797 is paid by other member countries. ... Our assessment for the United Nations and its specialized agencies averages 16 cents for each person in the United States. ... The United Nations spends in the United States. ... salaries, services and other needs about \$30 million, which is more than our total contribution. It is interesting to note that the entire budget of the United Nations would not buy one battleship and that our share would hardly pay for one destroyer."⁹

Finally, here's the objection which some people apparently think clinches the argument for the uselessness of the United Nations: "The U.N. does nothing but talk. It's a debating society, not an effective agency for building and preserving peace. The delegates talk and talk and talk --and get nowhere." There is a lot of talk at the U.N. That's true. But this study has shown that many things have been accomplished--a surprising number of things when account is taken of the brevity of the record and the difficulties of the world situation the U.N. has been forced to face. Yet suppose there were nothing much but talk at the U.N., and that a good deal was foolish, wild talk indulged in mainly for propaganda purposes. Isn't it better to have the nations go on talking than to have them start shooting? Isn't a debating society to be preferred to World War III--the First Atomic War? If the mothers and fathers of America will think this over we are confident that they will say, "Thank God the U.N. keeps the nations talking!"

No one claims that the United Nations is beyond criticism. Those who know it best are frequently its most searching critics. In this study we have pointed out a considerable number of its failures and weaknesses. But it is one thing to criticize the U.N. for actual faults within its structure or its actions, and quite another to scatter

about wild accusations which have no basis in fact.

There is altogether too much of this spreading of baseless defamation of the U.N. The charges we have quoted above in the italicized sentences are illustrations. Those who spread them are irresponsible for two reasons: (1) they evidently have not bothered to check on the truth, and (2) they do not pause to reflect on the consequences if the people's faith is so undermined that this international organization to maintain peace collapses. Playing fast and loose with the truth here is playing with the lives of our children and our children's children.

U.N.--Snare or Shield?

We have tried to give a picture of the United Nations--what it is and how it works. It has been an inadequate picture, for it is impossible to talk about all the things the U.N. does in so brief a compass. But we have tried to make this picture, though drawn in bold strokes, a balanced one, and in this way a true one. The bad has been shown along with the good; the U.N.'s failures as well as its successes.

Now it is time to answer the question asked at the start: The U.N.--is it a snare or a shield? As an American citizen, free to do your own thinking and reach your own conclusions, you will answer this question for yourself. We hope you have found this study a help in making up your mind. As for ourselves, after watching the U.N. closely from the day of its birth we say without hesitation that we believe it is a shield.

We see in the U.N. a shield to the peace of the world. It shields peace because it offers the nations a peaceful alternative to demands and ultimatums and threats of war. It shields peace because it musters the constructive, cooperative help of the nations to solve those human problems of hunger and poverty and lack of opportunity which create the misery and mass discontent out of which wars come. It shields peace because it is opening a way to freedom and self-government for subjugated peoples who never before had any other way to liberty than armed revolt.

When it thus shields world peace, the U.N. shields the peace of America. When it shields the peace of America it shields American homes--your home, your children, your grandchildren.

We do not think that the U.N. provides a military shield for America. We know this is the only kind of shield some Americans care about, and that their interest in the U.N. is therefore confined to what the U.N. can do to guarantee collective military security. In this study we have admitted that we do not believe the U.N. can guarantee security of this kind: Some friends of the U.N. will disagree, or they will argue that if the U.N. does not provide military security today, some day it may. Our conclusion is otherwise, and we frankly acknowledge it. If the U.N.'s shield has to be a military shield, then we do not think it is any good.

But that, as we see it, is not the problem of peace in today's world. The problem of peace is the problem of learning to live together--all kinds of nations, with all kinds of governments and political beliefs, all kinds of peoples at all kinds of social and intellectual levels. Can

we find ways to compose our political differences, or hold them in abeyance, while a common effort goes forward to do away with human misery, subjugation and the wrath provoked by injustice? If this can be done, then peace is no empty dream. The United Nations, we have become convinced, is the way by which this requirement of learning to live together and work together is most likely to be achieved.

It is not the military clauses in the U.N. Charter to which we look for a shield. It is to the stipulation that in disputes between nations there must first be "negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." Part of our hope for the future usefulness of the U.N. grows out of the fact, plain to anyone who has watched the way the U.N. has developed so far, that its Security Council, where the big powers were supposed to flourish a big stick, has been losing in importance while its General Assembly, where all the nations meet in counsel, has as steadily been gaining.

Moreover, we believe it a fact of promise that the agencies of the U.N. which have nothing to do with armed forces and staff plans--the Economic and Social Council, with all its humanitarian and specialized agencies; the Trusteeship Council; the International Court of Justice--are constantly increasing their ability to help ease the tensions of mankind.

There are Americans who say, "Why not have done with all this international nonsense? Why let ourselves get tied up with all these other nations, most of which are out to bleed us or gyp us? Why not face this rough, tough, brutal, envious world as it is, not as dreamers wish it were? We are powerful and nearly self-sufficient--more powerful and more nearly self-sufficient than any other nation in history. Then why don't we go it alone?"

One answer is that we can't. Not in the kind of world this really is. Fifty years ago, perhaps only 25 years ago, we could--or we could try. Not in today's jet-propelled world! The greatest protection we can have is to sit in a common council where we and the other nations are constantly face to face, and where we bring our differences into the open and discuss them in the presence of the whole family of nations.

This may be a noisy process at times, and at times an aggravating one, as a British delegate termed it not long ago. But it is the safest way to handle issues of conflicting national policies so far known to man. Surely it is safer than hurling ultimatums back and forth, threatening to follow them with atomic and hydrogen bombs!

There's another thing these "go-it-alone" Americans never seem to consider. When a big nation gets too big, and seems to enjoy ordering others around at its own sweet will, in the course of time it builds up such an accumulation of envy and hatred against itself that a day will come when almost certainly some of the others will unite to pull it down. Edmund Burke, the English statesman, saw that 160 years ago. In a passage which Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau quotes in his Politics among Nations, and Justin Wroe Nixon picked up to quote again in his fine booklet, The United Nations and Our Religious Heritage, Burke warned his countrymen:

"I must fairly say that I dread our own power and our own ambition. I dread our being too much dreaded. ... We may say that we shall not abuse this astonishing and hitherto unheard-of power. But every other nation will think we shall abuse it. ... Sooner or later this state of things must produce a combination against us which may end in our ruin."10

If the go-it-aloners in Great Britain needed that warning in 1793, how much more is it needed by the go-it-aloners in the United States today!

One of the most thought-provoking sights in today's harried world is to be seen these days at the headquarters of the United Nations in New York. It is not the striking buildings, the soaring, glass-walled home of the U.N. Secretariat and the great domed hall in which the General Assembly and the U.N. councils and committees and commissions hold their meetings. These were designed by a company of foremost architects recruited from all over the world, and as they stand in their massive beauty beside the East river they challenge the eye in that city of eye-challenging skyscrapers.

But the impressive sight is not the U.N. buildings. It is, rather, the long lines of people--ordinary people, drawn from every nation, people like ourselves--who form day after day to visit this place where the nations meet in council. About 20,000 of them every week pay a dollar each to be guided through the buildings. Nearly twice as many, when the Assembly is in session, come as absorbed, tense observers at the meetings which may be in progress. They queue up before the doors open in the morning. The long lines are still waiting there seeking admission when darkness falls. No other tourist attraction in New York draws half as many visitors.

Why do they come, day after day, these thousands on thousands? Not simply to look at buildings. There are other more impressive buildings in New York. And not simply to be able to go home and say that they have "done" another sight tourists are supposed to see. But the reason for these seemingly endless lines, we are convinced after watching this phenomenon and talking to some who have helped to make it, is the deep though often inarticulate longing of the world's ordinary people for peace. They want peace for their nations and for the world. And they come to see whether in the U.N. war is being warded off and peace shielded.

We think they come to the right place. We think that most of them go away convinced that this U.N. they have seen in action, young and struggling and handicapped as it is, is in truth a shield against the ominous forces working to produce world tragedy.

As you study the working of the United Nations, as you ponder what the alternatives to this organization of the nations would be, we believe that you too will see in it such a shield. And you will, we trust, accept as one of the responsibilities of your citizenship an obligation to see that in your community, wherever your personal influence can reach, this great venture for peace and international cooperation receives the support it merits. To evade that obligation is to surrender the future to chaos.

"I must fairly say that I dread our own power and
ambition. I dread our being too much dreaded. ...
I say that we shall not abuse this astonishing and
unheard-of power. But every other nation will
... Sooner or later this state of
affairs must produce a combination against us which may end
our ruin."

If the go-it-aloners in Great Britain needed that
much more is it needed by the go-it-
aloners in the United States today?

One of the most thought-provoking sights in today's
world is to be seen these days at the headquarters
of the United Nations in New York. It is not the striking
buildings, the soaring, glass-walled home of the General
Assembly and the U.N. Councils and committees and commissions
which are designed by a company of
foremost architects recruited from all over the world, and
as they stand in their massive beauty beside the East river
they challenge the eye in that city of eye-challenging
skyscrapers.

But the impressive sight is not the U.N. buildings.
It is, rather, the long lines of people--ordinary people,
drawn from every nation, people like ourselves--who form
day after day to visit this place where the nations meet in
council. About 20,000 of them every week pay a dollar each
to be guided through the buildings. Nearly twice as many,
when the Assembly is in session, come as absorbed, tense
observers at the meetings which may be in progress. They
queue up before the doors open in the morning. The long
lines are still waiting there seeking admission when darkness
falls. No other tourist attraction in New York draws half
as many visitors.

Why do they come, day after day, these thousands
on thousands? Not simply to look at buildings. There are
other more impressive buildings in New York. And not simply
to be able to go home and say that they have "done" another
right tourist are supposed to see. But the reason for
these seemingly endless lines, we are convinced after watching
this phenomenon and talking to some who have helped to make
it, is the deep though often instinctive longing of the
world's ordinary people for peace. They want peace for their
nations and for the world. And they come to see whether in
the U.N. war is being warded off and peace shielded.

We think they come to the right place. We think
that most of them go away convinced that this U.N. they have
seen in action, young and struggling and handicapped as it
is, is in truth a shield against the ominous forces working
to produce world tragedy.

As you study the working of the United Nations, as
you ponder what the alternatives to this organization of the
nations would be, we believe that you too will see in it
such a shield. And you will, we trust, accept as one of the
responsibilities of your citizenship an obligation to see
that in your community, wherever your personal influence can
reach, this great venture for peace and international co-
operation receives the support it merits. To evade that
obligation is to surrender the future to chaos.

NOTES

1. The quotations in this paragraph are from The Assault on the U.N., by Alexander Uhl, published by the Public Affairs Institute, 312 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E., Washington 3, D.C. This 35-page pamphlet is filled with other quotations of the same tenor.
2. The Cross and the Flag is the magazine edited by Gerald L.K. Smith, leader of the Christian Nationalist Crusade. The quotation is from its December 1952 issue and is reproduced from the important book, Apostles of Discord, by Ralph Lord Roy (Beacon Press, 1953).
3. The quotations are from editorials in the Chicago Tribune of Oct. 28, 29, 30, 1953--days when this study was in process of preparation.
4. The text of the Atlantic Charter may be found in many books of reference, as for example Charter of the United Nations: Commentary and Documents, by Leland M. Goodrich and Edvard Hambro (World Peace Foundation, Boston, 1946).
5. United Nations and World Community, by A.H. Feller. (Little, Brown and Company, 1952.)
6. The Churches and the United Nations, by Walter W. Van Kirk. (Distributed through the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; 1952.)
7. "What Shall We Do with the U.N.?" by John Foster Dulles. (The Christian Century, Sept. 3, 1947.)
8. World Against War. An Account of the U.N. Technical Assistance Programme for Economic Development. (United Nations Publication, Geneva, Switzerland, 1953.)
9. The quotations from Senator Lodge, Paul G. Hoffman, Bishop Sherrill and Mr. Firestone are from an article, "The Eight Biggest Lies About the United Nations," by Arthur D. Morse, in the Redbook Magazine for October 1953.
10. Quoted from The United Nations and Our Religious Heritage, by Justin Wroe Nixon. (The Church Peace Union, New York, 1953.)

LIBRARY E A / BIBLIOTHÈQUE A E

3 5036 01046081 7

NOTES

1. The quotations in this paragraph are from The Assault on the U.N., by Alexander Uhl, published by the Public Affairs Institute, 312 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E., Washington D.C. This 32-page pamphlet is filled with other quotations of the same tenor.
2. The Cross and the Flag is the magazine edited by Gerald L.K. Smith, leader of the Christian Nationalist Crusade. The quotation is from its December 1952 issue and is reproduced from the important book, Apostles of Discord, by Ralph Lord Hoy (Beacon Press, 1953).
3. The quotations are from editorials in the Chicago Tribune of Oct. 28, 29, 30, 1953--days when this study was in process of preparation.
4. The rest of the Atlantic Charter may be found in many books of reference, as for example Charter of the United Nations: Commentary and Documents, by Leland M. Goodrich and Edward Hambro (World Peace Foundation, Boston, 1946).
5. United Nations and World Community, by A.H. Feller. (Little, Brown and Company, 1952.)
6. The Churches and the United Nations, by Walter W. Van Kirk. (Distributed through the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; 1952.)
7. "What Shall We Do with the U.N.?" by John Foster Dulles. (The Christian Century, Sept. 3, 1947.)
8. World Against War. An Account of the U.N. Technical Assistance Programme for Economic Development. (United Nations Publication, Geneva, Switzerland, 1953.)
9. The quotations from Senator Lodge, Paul G. Hoffman, Bishop Sherill and Mr. Firestone are from an article, "The Right Biggest Lies About the United Nations," by Arthur D. Morse, in the Redbook Magazine for October 1953.
10. Quoted from The United Nations and Our Relations Herein, by Justin Wise Nixon. (The Church Peace Union, New York, 1953.)