



UN Secretariat Item Scan - Barcode - Record Title

Page

5

Date

06/07/2006

Time

11:09:11 AM



S-0981-0002-05-00001

Expanded Number **S-0981-0002-05-00001**

Title **Items-in-General files - miscellaneous publications - (4 files)**

Date Created 01/03/1945

Record Type Archival Item

Container **S-0981-0002: United Nations Conference on International Organization (UNCIO) subject files**

Print Name of Person Submit Image

Signature of Person Submit



UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

M - A
An agency of:—the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, The Philippines, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia; the Danish Legation and the government of the United States of America.

610 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y. • CIRCLE 5-8060

THE UNITED NATIONS

The following countries having signed the DECLARATION BY UNITED NATIONS, either on January 1st and 2nd, 1942 or later where other date is indicated, constitute the UNITED NATIONS;—

- | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. U.S.A. | 25. India |
| 2. United Kingdom | 26. Iran (Sept. 14, 1943) |
| 3. U.S.S.R. | 27. Iraq (Jan. 16, 1943) |
| 4. China | 28. Lebanon (Mar. 28, 1945) |
| 5. France (Jan. 1, 1945) | 29. Liberia (April 10, 1944) |
| 6. Australia | 30. Luxembourg |
| 7. Belgium | 31. Mexico (June 5, 1942) |
| 8. Bolivia (Apr. 27, 1943) | 32. Netherlands |
| 9. Brazil (Feb. 8, 1943) | 33. New Zealand |
| 10. Canada | 34. Nicaragua |
| 11. Chile (Feb. 14, 1945) | 35. Norway |
| 12. Colombia (Jan. 17, 1944) | 36. Panama |
| 13. Costa Rica | 37. Paraguay (Feb. 14, 1945) |
| 14. Cuba | 38. Peru (Feb. 14, 1945) |
| 15. Czechoslovakia | 39. The Philippines (June 14, 1942) |
| 16. Dominican Republic | 40. Poland |
| 17. Ecuador (Feb. 14, 1945) | 41. Saudi Arabia (not yet signed) |
| 18. Egypt (Feb. 28, 1945) | 42. Syria (March 28, 1945) |
| 19. El Salvador | 43. South Africa |
| 20. Ethiopia (July 28, 1942) | 44. Turkey (Feb. 28, 1945) |
| 21. Greece | 45. Uruguay (Feb. 24, 1945) |
| 22. Guatemala | 46. Venezuela (Feb. 20, 1945) |
| 23. Haiti | 47. Yugoslavia |
| 24. Honduras | |

Representatives of one other country should be added to this list, for they were fighting on the common team against the common enemies:

Denmark

The King and Government of Denmark having been held under duress in the homeland, the Danish Minister in Washington signified the adherence of all Danes in the free world to the common cause.

March 30, 1945

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

M-B
An agency of:—the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, The Philippines, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia; the Danish Legation and the government of the United States of America.

610 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y. • CIRCLE 5-8060

UNITED NATIONS

Population and Area

COUNTRIES	POPULATION	AREA (SQUARE MILES)
AUSTRALIA (1942)	7,196,622*	2,974,581
BELGIUM (1930)	8,092,004	11,755
BOLIVIA (1935)	3,336,296*	506,792*
BRAZIL (1940)	41,356,605	3,275,510
CANADA (1941)	11,506,655	3,466,556
CHILE (1940)	5,023,539	286,322
CHINA (1936) (excluding Manchuria)	422,707,868*	2,903,475*
COLOMBIA (1942)	9,523,200	439,997*
COSTA RICA (1943)	689,354*	23,000*
CUBA (1938)	4,227,587	44,164
CZECHOSLOVAKIA (1930)	14,729,536	54,244
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC (1942)	1,826,407	19,332
ECUADOR (1942)	3,085,871	275,936*
EGYPT (1942)	17,287,000*	386,198
EL SALVADOR (1941)	1,829,816*	13,176
ETHIOPIA (194 -?)	9,500,000*	347,490
GREAT BRITAIN (1931)	44,937,444	89,041
GREECE (1928)	6,204,684	50,147
GUATEMALA (1940)	3,284,269	45,452

* estimated figures

HAITI (1936)	3,000,000*	10,204
HONDURAS (1940)	1,105,504	44,275
INDIA (1931)	388,997,955	1,581,410
IRAN (193 -?)	10,000,000*	628,000*
IRAQ (1935)	3,560,456	116,600
LEBANON (1935)	862,618	3,600
LIBERIA (193 -?)	1,500,000*	43,000*
LUXEMBOURG (1935)	296,913	999
MEXICO (1940)	19,473,741	763,944
NETHERLANDS (1938)	8,728,569	12,712
NEW ZEALAND (1936)	1,573,810	103,723
NICARAGUA (1941)	1,013,946*	57,143
NORWAY (1930)	2,814,194	124,556
PANAMA (1940)	631,549	28,576
PARAGUAY (1941)	1,040,420*	153,447
PERU (1940)	6,207,927*	482,133
PHILIPPINES (1941)	16,971,100	115,600
POLAND (1939)	34,775,698	150,470
SAUDI ARABIA (194 -?)	7,000,000*	1,003,860
SYRIA (1935)	1,696,638	54,300
TURKEY (1935)	17,830,180 1,266,132	294,416 23,975
UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA (1936)	9,589,898	472,494
U.S.S.R. (1939)	170,467,000	8,173,550

* estimated figures

U.S.A. (1940)	131,669,275	2,977,128
URUGUAY (1941)	2,185,626*	72,153
VENEZUELA (1936)	3,491,159	352,143
YUGOSLAVIA (1931)	13,934,038	95,576

* estimated figures

Figures for Ethiopia and Saudi Arabia from "Britannica, Book of the Year", 1944

Figures for all other countries from "The Statesman's Year-book", 1944

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

M-C
An agency of:—the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, The Philippines, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia; the Danish Legation and the government of the United States of America.

610 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y. • CIRCLE 5-8060

HEADS OF UNITED NATIONS GOVERNMENTS

AUSTRALIA

King George VI
H.R.H. The Duke of Gloucester, Governor-General and
Commander-in-chief
Hon. John Curtin, Prime Minister

BELGIUM

King Leopold III
Achille Van Acker, Prime Minister

BOLIVIA

Major Gualberto Villarroel, President
Gustavo Chacon, Minister for Foreign Affairs

BRAZIL

Dr. Getulio Dornelles Vargas, President
Dr. Leao Velloso, Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs

CANADA

King George VI
The Earl of Athlone, Governor-General
Rt. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King, Prime Minister

CHILE

Juan Antonio Rios, President
Joaquin Fernandez, Minister for Foreign Affairs

CHINA

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, President of the National
Government, President of Executive Council (Yuan)
Dr. T.V. Soong, Minister for Foreign Affairs

COLOMBIA

Alfonso Lopez, President
Albert Lleras Camargo, Minister for Foreign Affairs

COSTA RICA

Dr. Teodor Picado, President
Dr. Julio Acosta, Minister for Foreign Affairs

CUBA

Dr. Ramon Grau San Martin, President
Dr. Gustavo Cuervo Rubio, Minister for Foreign Affairs

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Dr. Edvard Benes, President
Col. Zdenek Fierlinger, Premier

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Rafael L. Trujillo Molina, President
Dr. Manuel Pena Batlle, Minister for Foreign Affairs

ECUADOR

Dr. Jose Maria Velasco Ibarra, President
Dr. Camilo Ponce Enriquez, Minister for Foreign Affairs

EGYPT

H.M. King Faruq I
Mahmoud Fahmy El Nokrashy Pasha, Premier

EL SALVADOR

General Castaneda Castro, President
Dr. Reyes Arrieta Rossi, Minister for Foreign Affairs

ETHIOPIA Haile Selassie, Emperor
Bitwodded Makonnen Idalkachaw, Prime Minister

FRANCE General Charles de Gaulle, President of the Provisional
Government
Georges Bidault, Minister for Foreign Affairs

GREAT BRITAIN King George VI
Winston Churchill, Prime Minister

GREECE Archbishop Damaskinos of Athens, Regent
Admiral Petros Voulgaris, Premier

GUATEMALA Dr. Juan Jose Arevalo, President
Dr. Guillermo Toriello, Minister for Foreign Affairs

HAITI Elie Lescot, President
Gerard Lescot, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs
and Religion

HONDURAS General Tiburcio Carias Andino, President
Silverio Lainez, Minister for Foreign Affairs

INDIA King George VI, Emperor
Field Marshall Viscount Wavell, Viceroy, Governor-General
ASSAM - Sir Mohammed Saadullah
BENGAL - Sir Khwaja Nazimuddin
PUNJAB - Major Malik Khizar Hayat Khan Tiwana
SIED - Sir Ghulam Hussain Hidayatullah
ORISSA - Raja of Parlakimodi

IRAN Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlevi, Sovereign
Morteza Gholi Bayat, Prime Minister

IRAQ King Faisal II, Sovereign
Prince Abdul Ilah, Regent
Hamdi Al Pachachi, Prime Minister

LEBANON Bechara el Khoury, President
Riyad es Solh, Premier

LIBERIA William V.S. Tubman, President
Gabriel L. Dennis, Minister for Foreign Affairs

LUXEMBOURG Grand Duchess Charlotte
Peter Dupong, Premier and Minister of Finance

MEXICO General Manuel Avila Camacho, President
Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, Minister for Foreign Affairs

NETHERLANDS Queen Wilhelmina
Prof. Dr. P.S. Gerbrandy, Prime Minister

NEW ZEALAND King George VI
Air Marshal Sir Cyril Newall, Governor-General
Rt. Hon. Peter Fraser, Prime Minister

NICARAGUA General Anastasio Somoza, President
Dr. Mariano Arguello Vargas, Minister for Foreign Affairs

NORWAY

King Haakon VII
Johan Nygaardsvold, Premier

PANAMA

Ricardo Adolfo de la Guardia, President
Roberto Jimenez, Minister for Foreign Affairs

PARAGUAY

Dr. Don Higinio Morinigo, President
Dr. Don Horacio Chirlani, Minister for Foreign Affairs

PERU

Dr. Manuel Prado, President
Dr. Manuel Gallagher, Minister for Foreign Affairs

PHILIPPINES

Sergio Osmona, President

POLAND

Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, President
Tomasz Arciszewski, Prime Minister

SAUDI ARABIA

King Ibn Saud
Amir Faisal, Minister for Foreign Affairs

SOUTH AFRICA

King George VI
Nicolaas Jacobus De Wet, Acting Governor-General
Field-Marshal Rt. Hon. J.C. Smuts, Prime Minister

SYRIA

Shukri Kuwatty, President
Fares el-Khoury, Premier

TURKEY

Ismet Inonu, President
Sükrü Saracoglu, Prime Minister

U.S.S.R.

Mikhail Kalinin, Chairman of the Presidium of
the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R.
Joseph Vissarionovich Stalin, Chairman of the Council of
People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R. (Premier)
Viacheslav Molotov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs

U.S.A.

Harry S. Truman, President
Edward R. Stettinius, Secretary of State

URUGUAY

Dr. Juan Jose Amezaga, President
Dr. Jose Serrato, Minister for Foreign Affairs

VENEZUELA

General Isaias Medina Angarita, President
Dr. C. Parra Perez, Minister for Foreign Affairs

YUGOSLAVIA

King Peter II
Dr. I. Shubashitch, Prime Minister, Minister for
Foreign Affairs

March 31, 1945

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

M-D
An agency of—the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, The Philippines, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia; the Danish Legation and the government of the United States of America.

610 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y. • CIRCLE 5-8060

UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES TO THE U.S.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

AUSTRALIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Sir Frederick Eggleston, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary,
3120 Cleveland Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None. All business handled through British Consulate.

BELGIUM

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Baron Robert Silvercruys, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
1780 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Baron J. van der Elst
369 Pine St. San Francisco, California

BOLIVIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Don Victor Andrade, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
3012 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Santiago Jordan 821 Market St. San Francisco, California

BRAZIL

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Carlos Martins, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
3000 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Anibal de Savoia Lima, 625 Market St., San Francisco, California

CANADA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Honorable L.B. Pearson, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
1746 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Canadian Trade Commissioner
Associated Realty Bldg. 510 W. 6th St., San Francisco, California

CHILE

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Don Marcial Mora, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
2305 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Juan Pradenas, Consul General,
24 California St., San Francisco, California

CHINA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
"Twin Oaks" 3225 Woodley Road, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Hon. C.T. Feng, Consul General
551 Montgomery St., San Francisco, California

COLOMBIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Alberto Vargas Narino, Charge d'Affaires
1520 Twentieth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco, California

Carlos Ardila
214 Front Street, San Francisco, California

COSTA RICA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Don Francisco de P. Gutierrez, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
2112 S. Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Fernando Soto-Guardia, 112 Market St., San Francisco, California

CUBA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Guillermo Belt, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
2630 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Mariano Escalona, Consul General,
461 Market Street, San Francisco, California

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Vladimir Hurban, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
2349 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Bohus Benes, Consul General,
690 Market St., San Francisco, California

DENMARK

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Henrik de Kauffmann, Envoy Extraordinary & Minister Plenipotentiary
2343 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Axel C.F. Sporon-Fiedler, Consul General,
220 Montgomery St., San Francisco 4, California

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Don Emilio Garcia Godoy, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
4530 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Dr. Jose Enrique Aybar, Consul General,
582 Market St., Room 702, San Francisco, California

ECUADOR

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Galo Plaza, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
2320 Bancroft Place, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Luis Chiriboga, Consul General,
681 Market St., San Francisco, California

EGYPT

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mahmoud Hassan, Envoy Extraordinary & Minister Plenipotentiary
2901 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Mr. Simaika, Consul General,
415 Ross Bldg., San Francisco, California

EL SALVADOR

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Don Roberto Castillo, First Secretary
2400 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Julius Rosoveille, Consul General,
Russ Bldg., San Francisco, California

ETHIOPIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Blatta Ephrem Tewelde Medhen, Envoy Extraordinary & Minister Plenipotentiary
2134 Kalorama Road, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None

FRANCE

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Henri Bonnet, Ambassador Extraordinary & Plenipotentiary
2221 Kalorama Road, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Maurice Obre, Consul General
690 Market St., San Francisco, California

GREAT BRITAIN

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

The Right Honorable the Earl of Halifax, K.G. Ambassador Extraordinary
and Plenipotentiary,
3100 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Sir R.I. Campbell, K.C.M.G., C.B., Envoy Extraordinary & Minister Plenipotentiary
3126 O Street, Washington, D.C.

Mr. H.B. Butler, C.B.E., Envoy Extraordinary & Minister Plenipotentiary
2859 Woodland Drive, Washington, D.C.

Mr. J. H. Magowan, C.M.G., O.B.E., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister
Plenipotentiary, 2010 Cleveland Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Sir George Sansom, K.C.M.G., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary,
6302 Spruce Street, Chevy Chase, Maryland.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

G.A. Fisher, Consul General
310 Sansome St., San Francisco, California

GREECE

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Simon P. Diamantopoulos, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
2221 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Pierre Depasta, Consul General,
1182 Market St., San Francisco, California

GUATEMALA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Don Eugenio Silva Pena, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
1614 Eighteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Francisco Palomo, Consul General,
461 Market St., San Francisco, California

HAITI

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Andre Liautaud, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
4842 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None

HONDURAS

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Dr. Don Julian R. Caceres, Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister
Plenipotentiary, 2611 Woodley Place, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Jose Maria Albir, Consul General, 461 Market St., San Francisco, California

INDIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

The Honorable Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, K.B.E., C.I.E., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, 2700 Macomb Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None

IRAN

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Mohammed Shayesteh, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, 2315 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None

IRAQ

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Ali Jawdat, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, 2941 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

JUGOSLAVIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Dr. Ivan Franges, Charge d'Affaires, Royal Yugoslav Embassy, 2500 Q Street, Washington, N.W., D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None

LIBERIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Miss Carolyn V. Johnson, Consular Representative in New York
25 Beaver Street, New York City

LUXEMBOURG

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Hugues Le Gallais, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, 2200 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None. Affairs handled by Belgian Consulate

MEXICO

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Dr. Don Francisco Castillo Najera, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, 2829 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Senor Don Vicente Sanchez Gavito, Counselor, 4713 Morgan Drive,
Chevy Chase, Maryland

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Alfredo Elias Calles, Consul General, 461 Market St., San Francisco, California

NETHERLANDS

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Dr. A. Loudon, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
2209 Wyoming Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Baron W. van Boetzelaer, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary,
4500 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Mr. B. Kleijn Molekamp, Minister Plenipotentiary, 3416 P Street,
Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Mr. van Woerden, Consul General, Mills Bldg.,
220 Montgomery St., 4, San Francisco, California

NEW ZEALAND

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Carl A. Berendson, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary,
27 Observatory Circle, Washington, D.C..

Representative in San Francisco

Mr. S.B. Pilcher, Honorary Agt. for New Zealand Govt.
230 California Street, San Francisco, California

NICARAGUA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Dr. Don Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa, Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary, 1627 New Hampshire Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Carlos Zeleya, Consul General, 461 Market St., San Francisco, California

NORWAY

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Wilhelm Munthe de Morgenstierne, Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary, 3401 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Jorgen Galbe, Consul General,
244 California St., San Francisco, California

PANAMA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Samuel Lewis, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
2881 Woodland Drive, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Ovidio Sosa, Consul General, 461 Market St.,
322 Shelton Bldg., San Francisco, California

PARAGUAY

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Dr. Don Celso R. Volasquez, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
5500 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Don Roberto Wilkinson, Consul General, 593 Market St.,
San Francisco, California

PERU

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Senor Don Pedro Beltran, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
3001 Garrison Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Mr. Mackhenie, 58 Sutter St., San Francisco, California

PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Carlos P. Romulo, Resident Commissioner to the U.S., 1717 Massachusetts
Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Resident Commissioner in San Francisco

J.C. Dionisio, Suite 1108, 405 Montgomery St., San Francisco 4, California

POLAND

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Jan Ciechanowski, Ambassador Extraordinary & Plenipotentiary,
2640 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Mr. Michal Kwapiszowski, Minister Plenipotentiary, Counselor of Embassy,
2205 California Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

W. Sokolowski, Consul General,
821 Market St., San Francisco, California

SYRIA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Dr. Nazem AP-Koudsi, Minister
Washington, D.C.

TURKEY

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Orhan H. Erol, Counselor of Embassy & Charge d'Affaires
2730 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None

UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Dr. S.F.N. Gie, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary,
3101 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

None

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Mr. Andrei A. Gromyko, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
1125 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Mikhail Vavilov, Consul General, 2563 Divisadero St., San Francisco, California

URUGUAY

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Dr. Juan Carlos Blancos, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
The Mayflower, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Eduardo Dieste, Consul General, 58 Sutter St., San Francisco, California

VENEZUELA

Diplomatic Representative in the U.S.

Dr. Don Diogenes Escalante, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
2443 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C.

Consular Representative in San Francisco

Dr. Rodolfo Moleiro, Consul General, 214 Front St., San Francisco, California

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

An agency of:—the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, The Philippines, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia; the Danish Legation and the government of the United States of America.

610 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y. • CIRCLE 5-8060

UNITED NATIONS

SELECTED READING LIST

- Inter-Allied Meeting held in London at St. James's Palace on June 12, 1941. Report of proceedings...London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1941. (Misc. #1 (1941) Cmd. 6285.)
- Inter-Allied Meeting held in London at St. James's Palace on Sept. 24, 1941. Report of proceedings...London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1941. (Misc. #3 (1941) Cmd. 6315).
- Joint Declaration by the President of the U.S.A. and Mr. Winston Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, known as the Atlantic Charter, Aug. 14, 1941... London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1941. (U.S. #3 (1941) Cmd. 6321).
- Coordination of the Allied war effort. Agreements between the Prime Minister and the President of the U.S.A...London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1942. (Cmd. 6332).
Provides for the setting up of the Munitions Assignment Board, the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board and the Combined Raw Materials Board.
- Agreement between the Governments of the United States of America and the United Kingdom on the principles applying to mutual aid in the prosecution of the war against aggression, Washington, Feb. 23, 1942... H. M. Stat. Off., 1942. (U.S. #1 (1942) Cmd. 6341).
- Declaration by United Nations, Washington, Jan. 1, 1942. Related documents Atlantic Charter...Tripartite Pact signed at Berlin Sept. 27, 1940. London, H. M. Stat. Off., 1942. (Treaty series #5 (1942) Cmd. 6388).
- Exchange of notes between the governments of the United Kingdom and the U.S.A. on the principles applying to Reciprocal Aid in the prosecution of the war against aggression, Washington, Sept. 3, 1942...London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1942. (Treaty series #7 (1942) Cmd. 6389).
- Punishment for War Crimes: the Inter-Allied Declaration signed at St. James's Palace, London, on 13th January 1942, and relative Documents... (London) H.M. Stat. Off., (1942) A document issued by the Inter-Allied Information Committee, London.
- United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, Hot Springs, Virginia, May 18 - June 3, 1943. Final Act and Section Reports. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1943. (Dept. of State Publication 1948, Conference Series, 52) 20¢
- United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Resolutions and Reports adopted by the Council at it's first session, held at Atlantic City, New Jersey, U.S.A., November 10 to December 1, 1943...London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1943. (Misc. #6. (1943) Cmd. 6497).
- First Session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Selected Documents. Atlantic City, New Jersey, November 10-December 1, 1943. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1944. (Dept. of State Publication 2040, Conference Series, 53)
- From Casablanca to Teheran - with Texts of Documents, by Vera Micheles Dean. New York, Foreign Policy Association, Feb. 15, 1944. (Foreign Policy Reports, v. 19, #23)
- United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, U.S.A., July 1 to July 22, 1944. Final Act.. London, H.M. Stat. Off., 1944. (Cmd. 6546)
- United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, July 1 to July 22, 1944. Final Act and Related Documents. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1944 (Dept. of State Publication 2187, Conference Series, 55)
- Punishment for War Crimes (2) Collective notes presented to the Governments of Great Britain, the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. and relative correspondence, London, H.M. Stat. Off., (1943) A document issued by the Inter-Allied Information Committee, London.

- Crimea Conference Report. New York, Woodrow Wilson Foundation, March, 1945.
- U.S. Dept. of State War documents. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1944.
(Publication 2162) 10¢ (New rev. list being printed)
- Machinery of collaboration between the United Nations, by Payson S. Wild, Jr., New York, Foreign Policy Association, July 1942. (Foreign Policy Reports, v. 18, #8)
- United Nations agreements and documents. Notes on organizations. Bibliographical notes. New York, July 1942. (Bulletin of the Commission to study the organization of peace, v. 2, #7)
- Lend-lease arrangements and United Nations administrative agencies. Notes on organizations. Bibliographical notes on federation. New York, Aug.-Sept. 1942. (Bulletin of the Commission to study the organization of peace, v. 2 #8-9)
- Allied governments in London - War efforts and peace aims, by Winifred N. Hadsel. New York, Foreign Policy Association, Dec. 15, 1942. (Foreign Policy Reports, v. 18, #19)
- Governments and authorities in exile, by F.E. Oppenheimer. In The American Journal of International Law, v. 36 #4, Oct. 1942. pp. 568-595.
Legal aspects, diplomatic status, treaty-making power, foreign policy, legislative power, Allied labor force, etc.
- A permanent United Nations, by Amos J. Peaslee. New York, Putnam, 1943.
- European governments in exile, compiled by Helen Lawrence Scanlon... Washington, D.C. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Library, Revised Jan. 25, 1943. 24 pp.
Memorandum setting forth the organization, personnel, diplomatic activities and publications of the European governments which are now functioning outside their own territories. Contains references also to certain British laws and regulations which especially concern these governments.
- Make this the last war; The future of the United Nations, by Michael Straight. New York Harcourt, Brace, 1943.
- A pattern of world order, by L.G. Woolsey, In American Journal of International Law, v. 36, #4, Oct. 1942, pp. 62-628.
- United Nations: Tasks ahead, by Michael Straight. In The New Republic, Jan. 11, 1943 pp. 41-42.
- Peace-making has begun. I. The United Nations as Trustees. II. A world economic state. By George Soule. In The New Republic, Dec. 28, 1942, pp. 849-851; Jan. 4, 1943, pp. 14-16.
- Mutual aid agreements of the United Nations. In International Labour Review, v. 46 #4, pp. 445-446.
- Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. Third report: The United Nations and the Organization of Peace. New York, Feb. 1943. 36pp.
Fourth report. New York, Nov. 1943-May 1944. Also published in International Conciliation, no. 396, Jan. 1944.
- First year of the United Nations, by Michael Straight. In Free World, Feb. 1943. pp. 103-8.
- The Nations have declared: The documents issued by the United Nations, with comments by Lorna Savage. Toronto, Canadian Institute of International Affairs, July 1944.
- The Chicago Civil Aviation Conference - with texts of Convention on International Civil Aviation and International Air Transport Agreement, by J. Parker Van Zandt. New York, Foreign Policy Association, Feb. 15, 1945. (Foreign Policy Reports, v. 20, 23)
- Bretton Woods Monetary Conference - plans and achievements, by Eleanor Lansing Dulles. New York, Foreign Policy Association, Sept. 1, 1944. (Foreign Policy Reports, v. 20, 12)
- Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, by Ralph E. Turner and Hope Sewell French. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1944. (Dept. of State Publication 2221, Conference Series, 59)
- Conference at Bretton Woods prepares plans for international finance, by John Parke Young. Washington, Govt. Print. Off., 1944. (Dept. of State Publication 2216, Conference Series 57)
- A start toward freedom from want; the story of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture. New York, United Nations Information Office (1943) 10¢
- Helping the people to help themselves; the story of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. New York, United Nations Information Office (1944) 10¢.

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

An agency of:—the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, The Philippines, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia; the Danish Legation and the government of the United States of America.

610 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y. • CIRCLE 5-8060
THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Some notes on background and on United Nations Agreements and Resolutions including reference to the statement: also extracts from relevant speeches by United Nations leaders.

- - - - -

The Atlantic Charter embodies certain United Nations basic principles: around it discussion has ranged widely. Although promulgated almost four years ago, opinions differ as to its status and scope. Some of this division of opinion is due to the general rather than specific nature of the Charter. Much of it arises from a lack of understanding of its origin and development. It is not a statement of War Aims: one of the authors, President Roosevelt, was an official of a country not yet at war. It is not a formal Agreement or Treaty. It is a joint statement of principles, drafted in the names of two great leaders - President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, and its terms were later accepted by the Allies, and finally by all United Nations.

The development of the Charter following its original promulgation from a battleship off the North Atlantic Coast of the United States has followed two main lines. First, it has been embodied by reference in a considerable number of important international documents and resolutions drafted by the United Nations. Second, it has been explained and interpreted by responsible statesmen of the United Nations speaking on behalf of their governments in all parts of the world. Thus, it has become both a part of the treaty law of the world and a part of the philosophical background against which the peace is being planned.

PART I - References in Treaties and Agreements.

Signed at Sea.

The Charter was drafted by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill aboard the H.M.S. Prince of Wales "somewhere in the Atlantic" and issued to the press on August 14, 1941. It was transmitted to Congress on August 21, 1941 and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the form of a message from the President of the United States (Document No. 358, 77th Congress, First Session.)

Confirmed by governments-in-exile.

Six weeks later, on September 26th 1941, in the midst of the great air raids, the governments-in-exile of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia; the representatives of General De Gaulle; and the representative of the government of the USSR, met at St. James' Palace, London, and made known "their adherence to the common principles of policy set forth in that declaration" (Atlantic Charter) and their intention to cooperate in the best of their ability in giving effect to them.

Incorporated in Lend-Lease Agreements.

Next, in Washington it was included in the Lend-Lease Agreement with Great Britain, signed on Feb. 23, 1941. Article 7 of this agreement drawing upon the economic and social principles of the Charter, provides for "agreed action by the United States and the United Kingdom, open to participation by all other countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by appropriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment, and consumption of goods, which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce, and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers, and, in general to the attainment of all the economic objectives set forth in the Joint Declaration made on August 12, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom."

Similar Lend-Lease agreements including reference to the Atlantic Charter have since been signed with many other countries.

I.L.O. Conference

The ILO Conference, held in New York from October 27 to November 6, 1941, adopted the following resolution: "Whereas by the Atlantic Charter the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom have announced eight common principles in the national policies of their respective governments on which they base their hopes for the better future of the world, and, whereas, these principles have been approved by all the allied governments, and, whereas, the fourth and fifth and sixth peace principles are as follows: (See 4,5, and 6th Sections of the Atlantic Charter); the Conference of the International Labor Organization endorses the aforementioned principles of the Atlantic Charter, requests that the fullest use be made of the machinery and experience of the ILO in giving effect to these principles, and pledges the cooperation of the International Labor Office in their implementation (White Paper CMD 6315).

Declaration of the United Nations.

Again in Washington, on January 1, 1942 in the Declaration by United Nations, the signatories subscribed to the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Twenty-six nations signed that declaration at that time; since then the number of signatories has increased to forty-seven.

Pan-American Confirmation

The Charter's next confirmation came from the 21 American Republics whose representatives met at Rio de Janeiro, from January 15-28, 1942. The Conference resolved "to take note of the contents of the Atlantic Charter and to express to the President of the United States of America its satisfaction with the inclusion in that document of principles which constitute a part of the juridical heritage of America in accordance with the convention on rights and duties of states approved at the Seventh International Conference of American States held at Montevideo in 1933."

Two Treaties -- Anglo-Iran-Soviet Treaty of Alliance and Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance.

On January 29, 1942, a treaty of alliance between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union and Iran was signed having in view --

The principles of the Atlantic Charter jointly agreed upon and announced to the world by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom on the 14th August 1941, and endorsed by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the 24th September 1941.

The first appearance of the Charter in a bi-lateral treaty occurs in the Anglo-Russian Treaty of Mutual Assistance, signed in London May 26, 1942. The preamble states: "Desiring, moreover, to give expression to their intention to collaborate closely with one another as well as with other United Nations at the Peace settlement and during the ensuing period of reconstruction on a basis of the principles enunciated in the Declaration made August 14, 1941, by the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, to which the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has adhered....

Four-Nation Declaration

The Charter was similarly introduced in the Joint Four-Nation Declaration signed in Moscow November 1, 1943. The Declaration reads: "The Governments of United States of America, United Kingdom the Soviet Union and China united in their determination, in accordance with the declaration by the United Nations of January 1, 1942, and subsequent declarations to continue hostilities against the Axis powers....."

Teheran Meeting

On December 1, 1943, the leaders of Great Britain, the USSR, and the United States of America, declared in their statement regarding Iran that "they count upon the participation of Iran together with all peace-loving nations in the establishment of international peace, security and prosperity after the war in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter, to which all four governments have continued to subscribe."

Canberra Agreement

Part of the official statement on the Agreement reached between Australia and New Zealand at Canberra, January 21, 1944, reads as follows: "The two

Governments declare that in applying the principles of the Atlantic Charter to the Pacific, the doctrine of trusteeship (already applicable in the case of the mandatory powers) is applicable in broad principle to all colonial territories in the Pacific and elsewhere, and that the main purpose of the trust is the welfare of the native peoples and their social, economic and political development."

Anglo-American Oil Accord

The first draft of the Anglo-American Oil accord (Aug. 8, 1944), which has since been amended, included the following passage:

"The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....recognize: that such supplies (of oil) should be available in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and in order to serve the needs of collective security" (New York Times, August 9, 1944).

Crimea Conference

The official statement of the Crimea Conference (Feb. 11, 1945) in its Declaration on Liberated Europe states: "The establishment of order in Europe and the rebuilding of national economic life must be achieved by processes which will enable the liberated peoples to destroy the last vestiges of Nazism and Fascism and to create democratic institutions of their own choice. This is a principle of the Atlantic Charter - the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live - the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government to those peoples who have been forcibly deprived of them by the aggressor nations." And states that "By this declaration we affirm our faith in the principles of the Atlantic Charter" And once in the section on Unity for Peace as for War: "Only with the continuing and growing cooperation and understanding among our three countries and among all the peace-loving nations can the highest aspiration of humanity be realized - a secure and lasting peace which will, in the words of the Atlantic Charter, afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

Mexico City

Finally the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, which met at Mexico City, (March 8, 1945) resolved: "The Governments of America reaffirm the principles and purposes of the Atlantic Charter."

STATEMENTS BY UNITED NATIONS LEADERS

PART II

on the

"ATLANTIC CHARTER"

AUSTRALIA:

Herbert V. Evatt, Minister for External Affairs, Canberra, September 3, 1942

The name "Atlantic Charter" does not refer only to the Atlantic region or to Powers having interest in the Atlantic. The Charter derives its name from the place where it was signed. The 28 nations which have subscribed to it extend around the globe and the declaration is universal in its scope and application. It follows that the future of the regions of the Pacific and of South-east Asia are to be governed by the broad principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Some consequences of this may properly be suggested. The first principle which must be applied is that of security. Accordingly in keeping with the eighth principle of the Charter there should be established a system generally which will be effective in these Pacific and Asiatic regions as in all other parts of the world. Pending the establishment of such a system, the aggressor must be disarmed. And that aggressor is Japan -- the only Pacific Power which since 1931 has systematically employed its armed forces for the purpose of territorial aggrandizement.

While security comes first, the Charter also refers to the peoples of Southeastern Asia and Southwest Pacific that they shall be able to live out their lives in freedom from want as well as in freedom from fear. These people cannot be excluded from the system of economic collaboration which the United Nations have envisaged. Again it is elementary that future developments of the people of China will no longer be obstructed by such restrictions on their self-respect and their rights of self-government as are involved in the almost exploded doctrine of extraterritoriality. Equally we look forward to the people of India developing into a truly self-governing nation. It is to be hoped that they will soon understand that self-governing British Dominions like Australia are none the less self-governing because they owe allegiance to the King or because they are associated together as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations or because they are resolved to resist the invader to the death.

Herbert V. Evatt, Minister for External Affairs, New York, April 19, 1943.

By subscribing to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations have pinned their faith to a peace which will "afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want."

They also declared that, while they believe in the eventual abandonment of the use of force, aggressor nations must be disarmed pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security.

The name "Atlantic" which was given to this solemn pledge does not refer only to the Atlantic region or to powers having interests in the Atlantic. The Charter merely took its name from the place where it was signed. The nations which have now subscribed to it extend around the globe, and the declaration is universal in its scope and application. It follows that the future of the nations of the Pacific and of south-east Asia are to be given the benefit of the broad principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Some consequences of this may now be suggested. The first principle which must be applied is that of security from aggression, or freedom from fear. Accordingly, in keeping with the eighth principle of the Charter, there should be established a system or systems of general or regional security which will be effective in these Pacific and Asiatic regions as in all other parts of the world. Pending the establishment of such a system, the aggressor should be disarmed. And that aggressor is Japan -- the only Pacific power which since 1931 has systematically employed its armed forces for the purpose of territorial aggrandizement.

But, while security comes first, the Charter also assures to the peoples of south-eastern Asia and the south-west Pacific that they shall be able to live

out their lives in freedom from want. Those peoples cannot be excluded from the list of beneficiaries which the United Nations have envisaged as entitled to "freedom from want." Therefore Australia, as a leading nation of the south-west Pacific zone will have a very special concern in economic, as well as strategic arrangements in that zone.

Herbert V. Evatt, Minister for External Affairs, in the House of Representatives, Canberra, October 14, 1943.

I must say that I regard every word of the Atlantic Charter as of importance, Australia should fight hard to see that its principles are carried into practical effect to the greatest possible extent. If so, other Nazi and Fascist Governments will not be permitted to substitute themselves for the regime of Mussolini or Hitler.

In all apparent difficulties or complications the Atlantic Charter provides us with a sure and certain guide to future policy.....I.....emphasize that Australia has a real concern in the ultimate European settlement, that the broad principles of such settlement are already indicated in the Atlantic Charter, and that special arrangements made as a result of the military exigencies do not and cannot prejudice such final settlement. I think it is our duty to contribute at all times toward the practical achievement of the positive objectives stated by Allied leaders in their declarations. As I have indicated to this House on previous occasions the objectives of the Charter, including Freedom from Fear as well as Freedom from Want, are as applicable to the Pacific as to Europe; but unless we do our utmost to see them translated into actuality in Europe we will have little hope of doing so in the Pacific.

Herbert V. Evatt, Minister of External Affairs, to the Australian House of Representatives, October 14, 1943.

Australia has a real concern in the ultimate European settlement that the broad principles of such settlement are already indicated in the Atlantic Charter and that special arrangements made as a result of the military exigencies do not and cannot prejudice such final settlement. I think it is our duty to contribute at all times towards the practical achievement of the positive objectives stated by the Allied leaders in their declarations. True, the Atlantic Charter is not a treaty. It is something greater. It is a noble expression of objectives. Most remarkable of all, it was made when the United States was not even in a state of war with any of the Axis powers.

As I have indicated to this House on previous occasions, the objectives of the Charter, including freedom from fear as well as freedom from want, are as applicable to the Pacific as to Europe. But unless we do our utmost to see them translated into actuality in Europe we will have little hope of doing so in the Pacific.

John Curtin, Prime Minister, speech to the Australian Labor Party Conference, Canberra, December 14, 1943.

The principles of the Atlantic Charter on which the hopes for a new international order are based are a pledge that national policies will be directed to the betterment of mankind and the creation of a permanent system of general security. These principles of humanity must not remain mere words of encouragement to the war efforts of the people of the United Nations. They must be translated now into plans for the day when Australia shall be called upon to implement them. It would be calamitous to be as unprepared for peace as we were for war. The foundations of the new order, both national and international, must be built while the spirits of the peoples of the United Nations are still at those heights of nobility, comradeship and understanding to which their common ordeals and sacrifices have raised them.

Dr. Herbert V. Evatt, Minister for External Affairs before the Australian Parliament, July 19, 1944.

"It is obvious that the principles set out in the Atlantic Charter are of general application, are not confined to Europe or the Atlantic Countries and cover the Pacific as well as every other part of the post-war world."

The Australian Labor Party at its Federal Conference on December 14, 1943, carried a resolution submitted by Prime Minister John Curtin affirming "that Australia should collaborate with other peace-loving nations in accordance with the provisions of the Atlantic Charter to establish a peace which will confer on all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all may live their lives in freedom from fear and want."

BELGIUM:

Paul Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs, London, September 24, 1941

"The Belgian Government adheres without any reserve to this Charter. The principles embodied in it are wise and constitute an ideal capable of realization."

Paul Spaak, Minister of Foreign Affairs, London, May 18, 1943

I in no way dispute with the great nations what one might call their role of leadership, but that role, which gives them even more responsibilities than rights, cannot be fulfilled by them -- at any rate by those who have accepted the principles of the Atlantic Charter -- except in conformity with the rules of the ideal for which they are fighting. A peace imposed on the small and medium States against their will, or even without their being fully admitted to the discussion of all its conditions, would be the most absurd and fragile peace ever made.

BRAZIL:

President Vargas, Feb. 6, 1943, Rio de Janeiro

Brazil, by its continued actions, in accordance with its foreign policy, has always been a tenacious defender of the principles which are incorporated in the Atlantic Charter and the principles underlying international law."

CHINA:

Quo Tai-chi, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Chungking, August 18, 1941

The Chinese Government and people whole-heartedly welcome and endorse the joint declaration of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on the fundamental aims of the democratic powers in resistance to aggression, and the aspirations of all peaceful and freedom-loving peoples including the peoples in the Axis countries themselves for a real new world order. China feels all the more gratified inasmuch as the Eight-Point Program is essentially in harmony with the principles of the Kuomintang and its founder's advocacy of a "great commonwealth of nations".

Madame Chiang Kai-shek, Chicago, March 22, 1943

We should support the Four Freedoms which epitomize all that we want. We should also support the men who fathered the Atlantic Charter, for we believe that their purpose was not to tantalize the sorely tried, staunch peoples fighting against violence, nor was it promoted by the necessity to meet the dire need of the moment, but because they were convinced that a better world based on those universal principles must come into being.

Chu Chia-hua, Minister of Organization of the Central Kuomintang, Vice President of the Executive Yuan, on the occasion of the sixth anniversary of China's War, Chungking, July 7, 1943.

Since the Atlantic Charter is, according to President Roosevelt's interpretation, applicable to other regions, it should form in prosecution of the war the common aim of all the Allied nations for the realization of which they should fight to the end.

T. F. Tsiang, Director, Political Affairs Department of the Executive Yuan, on Second Anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, Chungking, August 14, 1943.

The Atlantic Charter is a program of peace adopted by the United Nations. What that charter specifically says is, of course, important. But what is behind that Charter? What gives the charter life and reality is still more important. Briefly that charter crystallizes the deep virtues of heart and mind of the generations between the two world wars. The two wars and the world depression taught us that political and economic exploitation between the peoples of the world are both vain and ruinous, that no nation can be healthy or wealthy alone. But there are ways and means for the nations to be healthy and wealthy together and a right endeavor is along the path of internal organization.

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, Chungking, May 31, 1942

China is convinced the principles of the Atlantic Charter were not empty diplomatic phraseology.

In my mind, these principles should be applied not only to America and Europe, but to all peoples and races, so that freedom, justice and equality shall reign throughout the world.

T. V. Soong, former Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs, New Haven, June 9, 1942
T. V. Soong, former Chinese Minister for Foreign Affairs, New Haven, June 9, 1942

"Our second objective is economic justice. Political and economic justice go together; without the one the other cannot flourish. Asia is tired of being regarded only in terms of markets and concessions, or as a source of rubber, tin and oil, or as furnishing human chattels to work the raw materials. The Atlantic Charter first enunciated by Roosevelt and Churchill and later adopted by all the United Nations, may prove to be the Magna Carta of economic justice which must be made a living reality."

Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, New Delhi, February 21, 1942.

The Indian and Chinese peoples should give their united support to the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter and the Joint Declaration of the twenty-six United Nations and ally themselves with the anti-aggression front. The vast majority of world opinion was in full sympathy with India's aspirations for freedom. I hope and believe that Britain without waiting for any demand on the part of the people of India would as speedily as possible give them real political power so that they would be in a position further to develop their spiritual and material strength.

CZECHOSLOVAK GOVERNMENT:

Jan Masaryk, Minister of Foreign Affairs, London, September 24, 1941

"The Czechoslovak government and our people at home are fully confident that the application of the high principles of the Roosevelt, Churchill Declaration will be in accordance with the special circumstances and needs of the different parts of Europe and the world. The Declaration emphasizing the necessity of restoring the sovereign rights and self-government to those who have been forcibly deprived of them, gives us assurance that when victory is achieved, the vital interests and sovereign rights of Czechoslovakia will be restored and safeguarded."

President Edvard Benes, Chicago, May 24, 1943.

The Atlantic Charter is a document of great theoretical and practical political value. It does great honor to its authors. I have no doubt that its main principles will be realized after this war in some form. But its authors and the other Governments which have accepted this program realize two things from the very beginning -- two things which may be considered at the same time as advantages and shortcomings of this important document.

It is a very general program, for it sketches out only main political and moral principles. It will, therefore, be necessary at a given moment to express these theoretical principles in the more concrete form of practical political aims and decisions.

On the other hand, in a certain sense, it is an advantage that this program, signed as early as the end of the first phase of the war, is so universal. Let us recall Wilson's Fourteen Points in the last war. They were promulgated only towards the end of the war and meant to be only general principles, yet in the end they furnished a comparatively complete and detailed picture of the future peace. In this respect the Atlantic Charter is undoubtedly a more cautious document and gives the United Nations greater possibilities of adjusting their political plans to new conditions in accordance with the development of the war. It thereby also makes the war policy more realistic. In view of this fact, in the course of their negotiations with the British and American Governments regarding their association with the Atlantic Charter certain Governments formulated certain reservations from the very beginning.

DENMARK:

Henrik Kauffman, Minister to the United States, Washington, January 2, 1942

The Danish Government in occupied Denmark, from where it had no means of escaping, is under German duress and thus is not free to sign the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942.....

The Danish Nation, though subjugated, now more than ever, believes in the principles and purposes of the Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941. Danes in the free world feel pledged to contribute the best of their efforts in the common struggle for victory over Hitlerism, adhering to the principles of the Declaration of January 1, 1942, as if the Declaration had been signed by a free Danish Government.

EGYPT:

Mahmond Hassan, Minister of Egypt, in Exchange of Communication with Secretary Hull, November 20, 1943.

Egypt is..... glad to be able to contribute its share, and associate in such a system and order as evolved and provided for by the Atlantic Charter, which stands as much for the Orient as for the Occident, and for the new world as for the Old in bringing forward the trend for a modern life of a high order. In this connection, Egypt highly appreciates the decision that no discrimination whatsoever be tolerated, that would divide races and peoples.

GREECE:

Emanuel Tsouderos, Greek President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs, London, September 24, 1941.

"This Declaration officially recognizes that the war aims of the Allied Powers remain on the same level as they have occupied in the consciousness and soul of the free democratic countries of the world since the beginning of the struggle. We are fighting for an ideal, to destroy the violent brutal methods of force used by the aggressor and liberate the peoples of the world."

Philip Dragounis, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Cairo, Aug. 9, 1944.

"Greece cannot play her part as a true and wholehearted friend of the great democracies of the west who are also the ruler of the sea if she is not made really safe in the spirit of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms."

INDIA:

Sir Akbar Hydari, Member of the Viceroy's Council, New Delhi, Nov. 8, 1941

"I have failed to discover any word which specifically says that the Charter did not apply to India..... so far as I have been able to see, Mr. Churchill himself said that the Joint Declaration.... applied to each and every case. At the same time, he added that it did not qualify in any

way the various statements of policy which had been made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India. Above all, Mr. Churchill ended by saying with regard to these declarations about India, that they would be found to be entirely in harmony with the conception of freedom and justice which inspired the Joint Declaration..... on this account I feel that if the Atlantic Charter is a charter of freedom for the whole world, Mr. Churchill would be the last person to take away his own credit, and also Mr. Roosevelt's, in framing such an epoch-making document if he dis-associated India from the principle declared in that Charter".

Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for the Colonies, London, January 2, 1942

"We have already put our names to the Atlantic Charter. This lays down the fundamental principles on which the peace settlement must be based, and I do not think there is anyone..... who dissents from these principles..... His Majesty's Government regards themselves as absolutely pledged to carry out the Atlantic Charter, and all articles of the Charter."

LUXEMBOURG:

Pierre Dupong, Prime Minister, Montreal, April 15, 1942

There is no need to emphasize further, after what has been said how warmly the citizens of the little countries welcome the reaffirmation of the principle that all nations, large or small, must have the right of self-determination. We may only profoundly hope that men imbued with this principle, proclaimed afresh by Churchill and Roosevelt, will be at the helm of the Allied ship of state, when the hour arrives for the peace negotiations.

Joseph Bech, Foreign Minister of Luxembourg, Luxembourg Bulletin, London, September 1943.

"In spite of these academic post-war planners, who so lightly speak of the small states as of some nuisance, entirely out of date our country will rise once more at the Peace Conference and will reappear on the map of Europe. The principles of the Atlantic Charter and the pledge of the great leaders in this struggle for justice, freedom and the rights of all nations, however small, to their own nation-hood, are there to guide what I say."

Pierre Dupong, Prime Minister, at the Metropolitan Opera, New York, February 20, 1943.

The small countries are the most zealous partisans of international understanding. They know by experience that international collaboration is the prerequisite of economic prosperity, social security and peace. The small nations enthusiastically hailed the proclamation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter because a world based on these principles grants them the right to a decent life.

NETHERLANDS:

Queen Wilhelmina, New York, November 17, 1942.

Further amplification was given to our stated common purposes by the adoption of the Atlantic Charter by all the United Nations. I do not need to recall to your minds the tenets of that charter, which has its place in perpetuity, in the history of personal and national rights and duties.

It will be its application which will matter as much as its enunciation and acceptance. Not all of its clauses are equally clear. When it is interpreted in terms of practical measures it will be important to remember that it is an instrument for good. With that touchstone we should never go wrong. So far for our fundamental convictions and aims.

NEW ZEALAND:

Peter Fraser, Prime Minister of New Zealand, August 14, 1941

"I welcome its emphasis on the need for equality of access to those things that are necessary to nations' and peoples' welfare, and particularly its application to both victor and vanquished. Without that approach our hopes of enduring peace will surely be vain. The declaration puts social security in the forefront of agreed aims. We in New Zealand can modestly claim to have gone some distance in applying this ideal within our own Dominion. We naturally welcome its affirmation as to principle of wide application."

Walter Nash, Minister to the United States, Charlottesville, July 11, 1942.

I believe with President Roosevelt that the programme of common purposes implicit in the Atlantic Charter is no vision of a distant millenium but is a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our time and generation.

Walter Nash, Minister to the United States, in Town Hall broadcast, New York, February 1, 1943.

If anyone asks what New Zealand's war aims are, we can point to actual evidence. Our war aims are the implementing of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms throughout the world. We have accepted the Atlantic Charter unreservedly. Up to the capacity of a small nation we intend to do something more than just accept it, we intend to do our utmost to see that it becomes not merely a table of men's hopes, but a real scheme of action which is carried through. We have made great efforts as a country in this war, we will make equally great efforts in the days after the war to secure a thorough application of the Atlantic Charter and to ensure as a result that an organized peaceful world emerges and that this struggle has not been in vain.

Walter Nash, Minister to the United States, before the Church Club, New York, February 1, 1943.

Without reducing our war effort by a fraction we should be preparing now and continuously for the negotiations which will commence on the day of victory. Such issues as State boundaries may be important but they are of major importance only insofar as they are tied in with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms.

NORWAY:

Trygve Lie, Minister of Foreign Affairs, London October 7, 1944.

"The Norwegian Government and the Norwegian people have wholeheartedly welcomed and endorsed the Atlantic Charter because it includes all the fundamental aims of Norwegian policy both at home and in its relations to other countries."

PHILIPPINES:

President Manuel Quezon, Washington, August 9, 1942.

Sometimes I have regretted that the Atlantic Charter is so named. Too many persons have fallen into the error of believing that it applies only to those who live beside the Atlantic Ocean. But that is not the fact. In truth, the Atlantic Charter is a world wide charter. It applies to the nations and the peoples of all the world. It is a charter for Europe and for America, for Africa and for Australia, and let us be clear on this -- it is a charter of freedom for the peoples of Asia and all the Far East.....

The principles of the Atlantic Charter are locked in combat with the principles of MEIN KAMPF and Japanese militarism.

Sergio Osmena, Vice-President, address to American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, April 10, 1943.

...The Atlantic Charter stands as the proclaimed creed of all the United

Nations. This charter was framed on the stormy seas of the Atlantic, but it is a world charter. It cannot be anything less. Thirty-one nations have already subscribed to its declaration of principles, and on this declaration are pinned mankind's hopes for a better world.

...The Atlantic Charter is no new thing. Its democratic principles with the exception, perhaps, of that relating to economic security, were all embodied in the original American pledge of liberty and self-government to the Filipino people. It is in reality a re-statement of the principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence of 1776, drafted right here in this historic city of Philadelphia and proclaimed to the whole world.

Just as America cannot, in the immortal words of Lincoln, survive half slave and half free, neither can this world of ours remain half slave and half free. The Atlantic Charter offers a promise of a happy world to all peoples. It is our political creed today, in this dire moment when totalitarianism threatens to destroy civilization. Let it remain our creed tomorrow when peace comes and let us live up to it forever.

How shall we win the co-operation and good-will of dependent peoples? An important step toward gaining this co-operation and good-will would be the unequivocal application of the principles of the Atlantic Charter to every one of them, without exception. The next step would be to turn these principles into a living reality so that they might be felt by those who doubt their value and efficacy. The dependent peoples must be made to feel that this is not a war to preserve the status quo, which, indeed, cannot be done. They must be made to realize that they have something to gain by a United Nations victory after the war, that such victory will result in their liberation, and not a mere change of masters or a retention of the old one.

President Manuel Quezon, broadcast to the Philippines, Saranac Lake, New York, June 14, 1944.

I do not have to stress the transcendental significance of our having been admitted as signatory to the declaration of the nations fighting Germany and Japan, as an independent government. When I signed it for the Filipino people and subscribed to the principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, I knew that I was expressing our nation's determination never to be cowed by the Japanese invader.

POLAND:

Count Edward Raczynski, Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs, London, September 24, 1941.

"The Roosevelt-Churchill Declaration as it is understood by the Polish Government, places security against another war and the achievement of economic prosperity in the forefront as the principle aims of the new democratic order. These aims are also those of Poland."

President Wladyslaw Raczkiewicz, at the Mansion House, London, April 9, 1943

...In Europe today it is the duty of all nations, large and small, to work together for the security that must be established and maintained. Once the enemy has been defeated and disarmed, the indispensable elements of peace will be the confident collaboration of the peace-loving nations of the European family, and the sanctity of treaties which should offer something stable, something consonant with the spirit of the Atlantic Charter. This brings us to be fundamental Four Freedoms that demand for the individual and his family after the war a dignified and tranquil life, far removed from threat and ambush.

...The postwar solution of the world problems must be based on the Atlantic Charter, so as to form a modern Magna Carta Libertatum for all the nations of the world .

Tadeusz Romer, Minister for Foreign Affairs, at a meeting of the Polish National Council, London, September 13, 1943.

....All that we can say is that the main tenets of the ideology solemnly accepted by the fighting nations are to be found in the Atlantic Charter.

A mere glance at this document should prove sufficient to remove all chance of misunderstanding regarding the possible existence of two alternatives for the development of the political situation in Europe, the one being the division of our continent into spheres of influence of the principal powers, and the other, a system under which Europe would form one whole under the joint guidance of all interested parties. For our part we refuse this choice of alternatives, just as we always refused to admit the possibility of ultimate defeat in this war. We regard the division of Europe into zones of influence as manifestly contrary to the Atlantic Charter, as well as to the principles for the defense of which we are all fighting, namely, the establishment of a truly democratic regime in international life. It is inconceivable that any of the United Nations should be subjected to the influence of any other power, and I am convinced that all important elements in their various governments would agree in rejecting any such idea.

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Prime Minister, at a luncheon in Poland's honor, organized by the National Defense and Public Interest Committee, London, November 11, 1943.

The declarations of the Moscow Conference and the resolution of the United States Senate were rightly based on conclusions drawn from the experience of this war as regards the need for international collaboration. These decisions bring closer the realization of President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, of the Atlantic Charter.

Jan Ciechanowski, Ambassador to the United States, at Fordham University, New York, April 23, 1944.

We appear to be passing through a dangerous period of this world war. There is now a growing tendency to belittle the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, those most beautiful and constructive war aims expressed by the President of the United States, -- allegedly because they are merely broad statements of principles and not precise codes of law. But is it possible to build any sound code of law which would not be clearly based upon these principles? Can we apply policing forces if they are not to act in the name and for the enforcement of principles?

Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, Prime Minister, London, August 31, 1944

"As we approach the end of this war...the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms have somehow lost in value in favor of power politics."

Jan Stanczyk, Minister of Labor and Social Welfare, at the International Labor Organization Conference, Philadelphia, April 25, 1944.

We want to believe that we are on the threshold of an era of lasting peace and international co-operation. We want to believe that we are at the threshold of a world which will safeguard the liberties of all peoples, and ensure a system of social justice and security based on prosperity and adequate standard of living.....

Until now the Atlantic Charter, promulgated by the leaders of two democratic states, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, is the only Magna Carta of the present war. It was solemnly reaffirmed by the United Nations.

For the International Labor Office to continue to exist as a living and creative organization, its adherence to a system of international co-operation based on the tried and tested principles of democracy is vital. Within such a framework, all nations, great and small, would have equal rights, all would conform to the first three points of the Atlantic Charter.

"Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other."

"They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

"They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

These are fundamentals. Unless they are accepted as such and translated into fact, the freedom of nations and peace itself cannot exist. We must be alive to the fact that democracy in the internal life of a nation is doomed, in the long run, when the peace and freedom of the community of nations is threatened. Each one of us realizes that permanent general welfare rests on democracy--that social justice rarely survives in a vacuum. It is inextricably intertwined with the social and political development of the nation and of the world of nations. Peace is indivisible.

All nations, I think, welcome the collaboration of the Great Powers in this war. In time of peace, such collaboration, within the framework of a common international organization, based on the co-operation and mutual respect of all, could result in a stable reconstruction of the world. A conception of international order, based on spheres of influence among the Great Powers, cannot and must not supersede the democratic principles of the Atlantic Charter. Freedom has but one definition for great nations and for small -- and we can accept no substitute. Freedom, like peace, is indivisible.

The Atlantic Charter is a milestone on the road to a world based on the indivisibility of peace and freedom. Its guiding principles in the realm of economic and social order were restated by President Roosevelt in his welcome to us, read by Miss Perkins, the distinguished Secretary of Labor of the United States.

"We know that the conditions of lasting peace can be secured only through soundly organized economic institutions, fortified by human labor and social standards, regular employment and adequate income for all the people."

UNITED KINGDOM

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister, London, September 9, 1941

No words are needed to emphasize the future promise held out to the world by such a Joint Declaration by the United States and Great Britain. I need only draw attention for instance, to the phrase in Paragraph 6, "after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny" to show the profound and vital character of the solemn agreement into which we have jointly entered. Questions have been asked, and will no doubt be asked as to exactly what is implied by this or that point, and explanations have been invited. It is a wise rule that when two parties have agreed to a statement, one of them shall not, thereafter, without consultation with the other, seek to put special or strained interpretations upon this or that passage. I propose, therefore, to speak today only in an exclusive sense.

First, the Joint Declaration does not try to explain how the broad principles proclaimed by it are to be applied to each and every case, which will have to be dealt with when the war comes to an end. It would not be wise for us, at this moment, to be drawn into laborious discussions on how it is to fit all the manifold problems with which we shall be faced after the war. Secondly, the Joint Declaration does not qualify in any way the various statements of policy which have been made from time to time about the development of constitutional government in India, Burma, or other parts of the British Empire. We are pledged by the Declaration of August 1940 to help India to obtain free and equal partnership in the British Commonwealth with ourselves, subject, of course, to the fulfillment of obligations arising from our long connection with India and our responsibilities to its many creeds, races and interests. Burma also is covered by our considered policy of establishing Burmese self-government and by the measures already in progress. At the Atlantic meeting we had in mind, primarily, the restoration of the sovereignty, self-government, and national life of the States and nations of Europe now under the Nazi yoke, and the principles governing any alterations in the territorial boundaries which may have to be made. So that is quite a separate problem from the progressive evolution of self-governing institutions in the regions and peoples which owe allegiance to the British Crown. We have made declarations on these matters which are complete in themselves, free from ambiguity and related to the conditions and circumstances of the territories and peoples affected. They will be found to be entirely in harmony with the high conception of freedom and justice which inspired the Joint Declaration.

Clement R. Attlee, Lord Privy Seal, at the International Labor Conference, New York, October 29, 1941.

First of all I would remind this Conference that the clauses of the .

(Atlantic) Charter form a coherent body of principles which are not separate but complementary. If, as I believe, it is a necessary condition for establishment of continuing peace that its economic foundations should be well and truly laid, it is equally true this cannot be secured unless the fear of aggression is removed. It is certain that until the crushing burden of armaments throughout the world is lifted from the backs of the people, they cannot enjoy the maximum social well-being which is possible. We cannot build the City of our desire under the constant menace of aggression. Freedom from fear and freedom from want must be sought together.

Viscount Cranborne, Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, London, November 18, 1941.

.....The actual application of those principles (The Atlantic Charter), as Article 5 itself stresses, are not for one nation alone but for collaboration between all nations. Their incorporation into an international postwar structure will clearly be a matter for the general examination of those who have to be concerned in making the peace.....

Arthur Greenwood, Minister without Portfolio, London, November 25, 1941.

The Atlantic Charter, in my view, represents a testament which will be comparable with any of the greatest political, constitutional, social and economic documents ever put before the world. Within the eight clauses of the Charter is not a simple plan, not a detailed programme, but beacons for the future. It is not without significance that every Ally alongside whom we fight now has given its adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Clement R. Attlee, Secretary of State for Dominion Affairs, London, June 4, 1942.

The Atlantic Charter remains the basis of His Majesty's Government's policy..

Viscount Simon, Lord Chancellor, London, August 5, 1942.

.....the Atlantic Charter and the Anglo-Soviet Treaty, are of course international documents; and, while that certainly does not absolve either the Government or the legislature or the people of this country from trying to form concrete resolutions about the topic, it does make it excessively dangerous to advance, without pre-arrangement, explanations and propositions that perhaps might be challenged.

I think it will probably be a general feeling -- that these two documents, the Atlantic Charter and the Anglo-Soviet Agreement, belong to that small class of documents which have the penetration and the power which partake of the nature of positive, masterly action. Whenever a collection of international documents is made in the future, going right back to the beginning of time, I doubt very much whether there will be any document which is recognized as having the possibilities of more permanent influence and importance than the Atlantic Charter and the Anglo-Soviet Agreement.....

Viscount Cranborne, Lord Privy Seal, House of Lords, London, April 15, 1943.

...The Atlantic Charter, the Articles of which, as is stated in the Preamble, represent the common principles governing the policy of the signatories. The principles of political and economic security for small nations as well as great, and the use of national forces not merely for the aggrandisement of individual States but for the furtherance of peace and prosperity for all, find a place in that justly famous document, which has received the adherence of all the United Nations. I can give .. an absolute assurance that His Majesty's Government for their part intend to do their utmost, both in the spirit and in the letter, to implement its provisions.

Viscount Cranborne, Lord Privy Seal, House of Lords, June 3, 1943.

As your Lordships are aware, the Atlantic Charter was a bilateral declaration of intentions to which a large number of other nations subsequently subscribed. It is therefore manifestly impossible for His Majesty's Government who are only one party to this agreed statement to put without consultation with the others any special interpretation upon any particular passage. Moreover, it seems to me most undesirable to do so. The Atlantic Charter does not seek

to explain how the broad principles proclaimed by it are to be applied to each and every case which will have to be dealt with when the war comes to an end. At this moment, when it is impossible to say in what circumstances they will fail to be applied, it would be most unwise to enter into discussions as to exactly how this or that Article is to be interpreted.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister, reply to a question in the House of Commons, July 14, 1943.

The so-called Atlantic Charter, indeed, the well called Atlantic Charter, was not a treaty requiring ratification or any formal endorsement of a constitutional character on the other side of the Atlantic. It was a statement of certain broad views and principles which are our common guide in our forward march.

Clement Attlee, Deputy Prime Minister, reply to a question in the House of Commons, July 15, 1943.

Nothing in the Atlantic Charter would, in the opinion of His Majesty's Government, preclude the United Nations from taking any steps that may seem good to them to "afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries." The point referred to by my hon. Friend will naturally be borne in mind in company with many others in any discussions on how best to give effect to Article VII of the Charter.

Note: The question to which this is a reply was as follows:

Mr. Nunn asked the Prime Minister whether the Atlantic Charter will preclude the United States of America and Great Britain from continuing to hold certain strategic points, formerly in Axis hands, the retention of which would seem to be vitally necessary for maintaining the future peace of the world?

Viscount Cranborne, Lord Privy Seal, in the House of Lords, July 22, 1943.

...When the Allied countries are liberated it will be the aim of the United Nations, and in particular of His Majesty's Government for whom alone I can speak with authority, to apply the principles enshrined in the Atlantic Charter and to re-establish Governments representative of the wishes of the peoples concerned....

Lord Snell, Deputy Leader of the House of Lords, in the House of Lords, December 1, 1943.

...The policy of His Majesty's Government is at the earliest possible moment to restore sovereign rights and self-government to all those nations who have been outraged by merciless invasion. In doing so they are but following out the third Article of the Atlantic Charter, which reads:

"they respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

....We desire to see that at the earliest possible moment these afflicted nations shall be given the opportunity of exercising the rights which will have been restored to them.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister, in the House of Commons, March 22, 1944.

It is evident that, as the changing phases of the war succeed one another, some further clarification will be required of the position under the document which has become honorably known as the Atlantic Charter, and that this must be a subject for renewed consultation between the principal Allies. I am not prepared to embark upon this subject at question time today further than to state that the Atlantic Charter stands as a declaration of the spirit and purpose in which its signatories are waging this war -- not without success -- and that it implies no pact or bargain with our enemies.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister, House of Commons, May 24, 1944.

The Atlantic Charter remains a guiding signpost, expressing a vast body of opinion amongst all the Powers now fighting together against tyranny. The Atlantic Charter in no way binds us about the future of Germany, nor is it a bargain or contract with our enemies. It has no quality of an offer to our enemy. It was no offer to the Germans to surrender. If it had been an offer, that offer was rejected. But the principle of unconditional surrender, which has also been promulgated, will be adhered to as far as Nazi Germany and Japan are concerned, and that principle itself wipes away the danger of anything like Mr. Wilson's Fourteen Points being brought up by the Germans after their defeat, claiming that they surrendered in consideration of them."

Anthony Eden, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, House of Commons, February 23, 1944.

"What I am about to say does not mean that we wish to try to claim some strained or unilateral interpretation for the Atlantic Charter. All the right Hon. Gentleman the Prime Minister intended to convey, as indeed he clearly said, was that Germany would not, as a matter of right, be able to claim to benefit from the Atlantic Charter in such a way as to preclude the victorious Powers from making territorial adjustments at her expense. There are certain parts of the Atlantic Charter which refer in set terms to victor and vanquished alike. Article 4 does so. But we cannot admit that Germany can claim, as a matter of right on her part, whatever our obligation, that any part of the Charter applies to her."

VENEZUELA:

Dr. Diogenes Escalante, Ambassador to the United States, Washington, February 20, 1945.

Venezuela will continue to cooperate faithfully with the United Nations, by every means within its power, in the common effort to obtain the victory and a new order of things which will consecrate the principles of the Atlantic Charter and guarantee to nations and to men the right to live free and in peace."

UNITED STATES

President Franklin D. Roosevelt to Congress, Washington, August 2, 1941.

Finally, the declaration of principles at this time presents a goal which is worth while for our type of civilization to seek. It is so clear cut that it is difficult to oppose in any major particular without automatically admitting a willingness to accept compromise with Nazism: or to agree to a world peace which would give to Nazism domination over large numbers of conquered nations. Inevitably such a peace would be a gift to Nazism to take breath-armed breath -- for a second war to extend the control over Europe and Asia to the American Hemisphere itself.

It is perhaps unnecessary for me to call attention once more to the utter lack of validity of the spoken or written word of the Nazi government.

It is also unnecessary for me to point out that the declaration of principles includes of necessity the world need for freedom of religion and freedom of information. No society of the world organized under the announced principles could survive without these freedoms which are a part of the whole freedom for which we strive.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, Washington, August 14, 1941:

"The declaration is a statement of basic principles and fundamental ideas and policies that are universal in their practical application. These heretofore have been generally accepted by all civilized nations, and were being strongly supported until certain countries decided to launch a universal movement to destroy the whole structure of civilized relations between nations and to establish a system of rule based largely on barbarism and savagery."

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, Washington, November 11, 1941 .

Those high objectives set forth in the Charter of the Atlantic must be realized. They must be realized, quite apart from every other consideration, because of the fact that the individual interest of every man and woman in the United States will be advanced consonantly with the measure in which the world where they live is governed by right and by justice, and the measure in which peace prevails.

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, Washington, May 30, 1942.

The age of imperialism is ended. The right of a people to their freedom must be recognized, as the civilized world long since recognized the right of an individual to his personal freedom. The principles of the Atlantic Charter must be guaranteed to the world as a whole -- in all oceans and in all continents.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, August 14, 1942.

A year ago today you and I, as representatives of two free nations, sat down and subscribed to a declaration of principles common to our peoples. We based, and continue to base, our hopes for a better future for the world on the realization of these principles.

A year ago today the nations resisting a common, barbaric foe were units or small groups, fighting for their existence.

Now, these nations and groups of nations in all the continents of the earth have united. They have formed a great union of humanity, dedicated to the realization of that common program of purposes and principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter, through world wide victory over their common enemies.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, February 23, 1942.

We of the United Nations are agreed on certain broad principles in the kind of peace we seek. The Atlantic Charter applies not only to the parts of the world that border the Atlantic but to the whole world; disarmament of aggressors, self-determination of nations and peoples, and the four freedoms -- freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, Washington, December 17, 1942.

With the victory won and freedom restored to those who have lost it or who are seeking it, there would then arise under point three of the Atlantic Charter the fullest opportunity for each people to select their leaders and their forms of government. These two central points of the world situation have been expressed heretofore by myself and others.

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, in letter to Professor Ralph Barton Perry, Chairman, Harvard Group, American Defense, Cambridge, Massachusetts, April 2, 1943.

....We will aid, to the full extent of our ability, any group which is fighting the common enemy. But that aid will not be in such form as to prejudice a people's basic right, stated in the Atlantic Charter, to choose its own form of government.

John G. Winant, U.S. Ambassador in London, May 20, 1943.

"Perhaps the first authoritative statement on the future during the present war was the Atlantic Charter ... These two documents (the Charter and the Lend-Lease Agreement) set forth general principles of conduct and policy that must be implemented politically, economically and socially. The skill with which this is done and the faith that underlies these principles and policies will in large measure determine the world in which we shall find ourselves when the soldiers have left the battlefields and when sea and sky have ceased to be area of combat."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, July 14, 1943.

"One of our war aims, as set forth in the Atlantic Charter, is to restore the mastery of their destinies to the peoples now under the invader's yoke. There must be no doubt, anywhere, of the unalterable determination of the United Nations to restore to the oppressed peoples their full and sacred rights.

Henry A. Wallace, Vice-President, before the United Automobile Workers, C.I.O., Detroit, Michigan, July 25, 1943.

The Atlantic Charter provides the broad base of general principles to safeguard our decisions. It is a Charter of Faith that must be worked out to endure; and the American people intend that it shall work and that it shall endure.

Shouldering our responsibilities for enlightenment, abundant production and world co-operation, we can begin now our apprenticeship to work peace.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, address, Ottawa, Canada, August 25, 1943.

I am everlastingly angry only at those who assert vociferously that the Four Freedoms and the Atlantic Charter are nonsense because they are unattainable. If those people had lived a century and a half ago they would have sneered and said that the Declaration of Independence was utter piffle. If they had lived nearly a thousand years ago they would have laughed uproariously at the ideals of Magna Carta. And if they had lived several thousand years ago they would have derided Moses when he came from the Mountain with the Ten Commandments.

We concede that these great teachings are not perfectly lived up to today, but I would rather be a builder than a wrecker, hoping always that the structure of life is growing -- not dying.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, statement on second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, Washington, August 14, 1943.

Today, on the second anniversary of the signing of the Atlantic Charter, I would cite particularly two of its purposes and principles on which we base our "hopes for a better future for the world."

First--respect for the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live. When the Atlantic Charter was first signed there were those who said that this was impossible of achievement. And yet, today, as the forces of liberation march on, the right of self-determination is becoming once more a living reality.

Second--world-wide collaboration with the object of security, for all; of improved labor standards, economic adjustment and social security.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, February 12, 1943.

It is one of our war aims, as expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that the conquered populations of today be again the masters of their destiny. There must be no doubt anywhere that it is the unalterable purpose of the United Nations to restore to conquered peoples their sacred rights....The right of self-determination included in the Atlantic Charter does not carry with it the right of any government to commit wholesale murder or the right to make slaves of its own people or of any other peoples of the world.

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the opening of the United Nations Exhibition, Rockefeller Plaza, New York, February 12, 1943.

In Article 8 (of the Atlantic Charter) they are given the assurance that in the world of the future peace will be maintained by peace-loving nations, just as the law-abiding members of any community see to it that a police force maintains law and order in their own neighborhood. It is formally stipulated that "Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider

and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential."

In Articles 2 and 3 there are set forth the very foundations essential to the maintenance of individual liberty and democracy in international society. The assurance is given that the United Nations "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned," and that "they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

In Articles 4 and 5 the peoples of the world are given the commitment that the United Nations will further the enjoyment by all states of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity, and that they will stimulate the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Washington, February 23, 1942.

"We of the United Nations are agreed on certain broad principles in the kind of peace we seek. The Atlantic Charter applies not only to the parts of the world that border the Atlantic but to the whole world: disarmament of aggressors, self-determination of nations and peoples, and the four freedoms-- freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear."

Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, Toronto, Canada, February 26, 1943.

What the people of the United States are striving for, I am persuaded, is exactly what the people of Canada are striving for. They seek the attainment of the noble objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter. They seek to achieve these ends, not because of any altruistic motives, not through the dictates of any theoretical idealism, but rather because they believe that the attainment of these objectives will be in their own self-interest -- and I believe that in my own country we have learned through the bitter experience of the past quarter of a century that the most practical form of self-interest is enlightened self-interest.

We have seen beyond the shadow of any doubt that a policy of international co-operation which far too many told us 24 years ago was a policy of suicidal sentimentality, was in fact a policy of advantageous hard-headed realism.

Most of us have learned a great truth that is beginning to dawn upon the consciousness of many peoples in all parts of the globe, and that is that the real self-interest of one nation coincides with the permanent, with the ultimate, self-interests of other nations.

Joseph Grew, Under Secretary of State, New York, Jan. 17, 1945

"I think the Charter covers a great deal in the way of justice, Democracy, and good will towards men. As the President said recently, it is true that the statement of principles in the Atlantic Charter does not provide rules of easy application to each and everyone of this war-torn tangled situation. But it is a good and useful thing -- it is an essential thing -- to have principles towards which we can aim. And we shall not hesitate to use our influence -- and to use it now -- to secure so far as is humanly possible the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter."

USSR:

Ivan Maisky, Soviet Ambassador in London, September 24, 1941.

"Considering that the practical application of these principles will necessarily adapt itself to the circumstances, needs and historic peculiarities of particular countries, the Soviet Government can state that a consistent application of those principles will secure the most energetic support on the part of the government and peoples of the Soviet Union."

CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

POSTWAR TRENDS IN THE UNITED STATES
During the Period March 10 - 30, 1945

United Press

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report No. 38

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

YALTA CONFERENCE	Page 1
SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE	3
INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE	8
GENERAL POLICIES	9

UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS	12
REPARATIONS COMMISSION	12
INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON REFUGEES	12
UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION	12

ECONOMICS AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION

FINANCE	13
TRADE AND CARTELS	15
OIL	16
LEND-LEASE	16

COMMUNICATIONS

AVIATION	16
SHIPPING	16
RADIO AND CABLE SERVICES	17

SOCIAL AND CIVIC PROBLEMS

JEWISH QUESTION	17
HUMAN RIGHTS	18
FREE INTERCHANGE OF NEWS	18

MISCELLANEOUS

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING IN THE U.S.	18
--	----

GERMANY

19

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC OPINION	20
---------------------------	----

JAPAN

21

- 0 -

These notes are prepared twice a month for the information of the Committee for Information on Postwar Reconstruction and the Board of the United Nations Information Office and are intended only for official use. They do not claim to cover the whole field of postwar problems, but only to give general indications. Analyses of comment in newspapers, on the radio and in the majority of periodicals appearing in this report are based largely on surveys made by member agencies. Thus, the survey covers approximately 165 American newspapers, including foreign language newspapers, about a dozen radio commentators, and some 45 magazines and pamphlets.

- 0 -

For the purpose of conserving space, sources and terms which recur frequently are indicated by the symbols listed below.

INDEX OF SYMBOLS

AP Associated Press	MBS Mutual Broadcasting System
CSM Christian Science Monitor	NBC National Broadcasting Co. (Red Network)
DM New York Daily Mirror	Blue National Broadcasting Co. (Blue Network)
HT New York Herald Tribune	CBS Columbia Broadcasting System
NYP New York Post	TANO Twohey Analysis of Newspaper opinion
NYT New York Times	
PM PM	
UP United Press	D. Democrat
WSJ Wall Street Journal	R. Republican

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE
610 Fifth Avenue, New York 20

CONFIDENTIAL - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

POSTWAR TRENDS IN THE UNITED STATES

During the Period March 10 - 30, 1945

Report No. 38

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ORGANIZATION

YALTA CONFERENCE

A good deal of discussion took place concerning the voting formula agreed upon at the Yalta conference. Replying to a question from newspaper correspondents, the State Department said (NYT 3/17): "The department has never attempted to emphasize or minimize any aspect of the voting procedure.

"In cases brought before the Council, under Chapter VIII-A (for investigation of disputes) and the second sentence of Paragraph 1 of Chapter VIII-C (concerning regional adjustments) of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal, decisions of the Council require unanimity of the permanent members as well as a total majority of seven members, with the proviso that no party to the dispute will be entitled to vote.

"Such recommendations and other decisions of the Council are bound to have the greatest weight when they are made by a unanimous vote of the permanent members of the Council not party to the dispute and the concurrence of the required number of other members necessary for the majority of seven.

"The department feels that in particular the unity of policy and attitude among the permanent members on matters concerning the organization would be one of the strongest means of making the organization effective in its operation."

In a subsequent statement (NYT 3/25) Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, affirmed that no one nation could prevent discussion of any dispute or situation that might arise. "It is only when the question arises as to what, if any, decision or action the Security Council should take," Mr. Grew said, "that the provisions covering voting procedure agreed upon at Yalta could come into action." Mr. Grew's statement revealed, according to Lansing Warren, staff correspondent of the New York Times, that "the compromise adopted at the Crimea conference was proposed by the United States Government and left the inference that the United States would not in itself be disposed to support a more extensive engagement on the use of force."

The discussions received a fresh fillip when the White House issued the following announcement (NYT 3/30):

"Soviet representatives at the Yalta Conference indicated their desire to raise at the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations the question of representation for the Ukrainian Soviet Republic and the White Russian Republic in the assembly of the proposed United Nations organization.

"The American and British representatives at the Yalta Conference were requested by the Soviet representatives to support this proposal when submitted to the conference of the United Nations at San Francisco. They agreed to do so, but the American representatives stated that if the United Nations organization agreed to let the Soviet republics have three votes, the United States would ask for three votes also.

"The British and Soviet representatives stated that they would have no objection to the United States and its possessions having three votes in the Assembly if it is so desired.

"These conversations at Yalta related to the submission of a question to the San Francisco conference where the ultimate decision will be made."

The White House announcement was reported by Bert Andrews (HT 3/30) to have "provoked an immediate split" in the United States delegation to the coming San Francisco conference and to have given rise to a number of questions such as the following: "Why was the news so long withheld? Was it revealed in advance to France and China, who, with the United States, Great Britain and Russia, will make up the big five of the security organization? What attitude will now be taken by the smaller nations, which had been told, up to today, that all nations, large and small, would have one vote each in the assembly?

Will the newly announced decision endanger the chances of success of the San Francisco meeting? Were any other secret understandings reached at Yalta?"

Opposite reactions were reported from two leading members of the United States delegation to the San Francisco conference, Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg (R., Michigan) and Representative Sol Bloom (D., New York). Senator Vandenberg stated (HT 3/30) that he would "deeply disagree" with any voting proposal which would destroy the promised "sovereign equality" of nations in the peace league's assembly as previously proposed at Dumbarton Oaks." Representative Bloom took the view, (HT 3/30) on the other hand, that "in general, we are entitled to get what is proposed in the understanding, and I can't see why it shouldn't be done." A middle-of-the-road position was adopted by Senator J. W. Fullbright (D., Arkansas), one of the foremost proponents of the need for world collaboration to insure permanent peace. He said he could see nothing particularly wrong with the proposal as announced but "exploded" (HT 3/30) as follows: "Why in the world couldn't they have announced it at the same time as they announced the other results of Yalta? I don't like this kind of secret dealing. That doesn't mean that I think the idea is out of line. But I think it's high time they were being frank about it; high time they were laying all the cards on the table."

At a luncheon at the National Republic Club in New York Senator H. Alexander Smith (R., New Jersey) said (HT 3/11) that the Yalta conference was an important step but failed in the manner of its settlement of the Polish boundary dispute, although such settlement might turn out to be the best possible compromise. "The reason why the disposition of the Polish boundary dispute has shocked people in this country," he said, "is because it was a decision by a great power acting unilaterally - a decision made apparently at the expense of a weaker power, one of our allies. The important point is that decisions of this kind should be made by the United Nations acting together with ultimate justice as their objective and with the rule of might ones and for all abandoned. By the hard road of suffering the United States sees now that it can no longer live alone and should no longer live alone. We will emerge from this war the most powerful and most influential nation in the world. We cannot ignore the responsibilities of leadership that will be ours."

Speaking at a Foreign Policy Association luncheon in Philadelphia (HT 3/11) Senator Joseph C. Ball (R., Minnesota) said that although not everyone was satisfied with the Polish settlement at the Yalta conference it was better to have it settled by three nations than one. "Most Americans think that the agreement on Poland violates the Atlantic Charter," he said, "but it is the best settlement we could reach with Russia, and, if we are to build an international peace organization we must have agreement with Russia." He termed "realistic and practical" the compromises reached on voting procedure for the world security council.

In an address before the Foreign Policy Association in New York Senator Alben W. Barkley (D., Kentucky) Democratic floor leader in the Senate, said that the Yalta agreement on voting procedure "is as much a protection to the U.S. as to any other nation. That agreement," he said, "dissipates the argument that our nation would be subject to the will of other nations without the power of vote where our vital interests of a military or economic standpoint will be involved."

Senator Styles Bridges (R., New Hampshire) denounced the Big Three decisions on Poland (HT 3/25) and called for adoption of Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg's proposal to open such settlements to review by the international organization which will be created at San Francisco. Senator Bridges, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, issued a statement after conferring with leaders of the Co-ordinating Committee of American Polish Organizations in the East, which claims to represent 150 organizations in eight states, and is reported to be "bitterly opposed to the Soviet-sponsored Lublin government in Warsaw." Asserting that the treatment of Poland at Yalta was not a compromise but a sacrifice of principles for which the United States entered the war, Senator Bridges said that America was looked to for moral and ethical leadership "and if we don't stand fast on these things, we're dealing a body blow to the future before we even start on a world organization." The Senator said he was wholeheartedly for international co-operation and for adequate machinery to organize and enforce the peace but that the attainment of these ends depended on "the sovereign equality of all nations and full justice for all nations." Despite Great Britain's pledge to defend the integrity of Poland, he said, "the plain meaning of the Yalta decision on Poland is that interests of the big powers are to be served first and that justice for the small nations will have to make second best adjustment to power politics."

6 Declaring that President Roosevelt's report to Congress on the Crimean Conference opened "the battle for America", Earl Browder, General Secretary of the Communist Political Association, in a report to the National Committee of the Association, said (NYT 3/11) that "the American people must be aroused and organized in support of the Crimea decisions in such overwhelming numbers that the

potential opposition within Congress will not dare to show itself." "There is no doubt," he said, "that the Crimea Conference has brought a wider national unity than has hitherto existed, far wider than that which re-elected the President last November."

Press Comment. An analysis of newspaper comment for the week ending March 10 (TANO) indicated that opposition had strengthened substantially on the Yalta compromise over voting procedure as compared to reaction on the overall peace program. However, the analysis pointed out, "the approving majority (73%) is of overwhelming proportions and no real threat to the plan appears to be indicated by the volume of disapproval. As long as support stays over a 67%, 68% level past experience suggests the peace plans will be in no danger." Support for the Administration's general program for world cooperation was said to be holding at the same high level (74%) accorded the original Yalta communique and President Roosevelt's subsequent report to Congress. The volume of comment "is large, with an overwhelming majority of the press giving the Administration full cooperation." (TANO). Support of a world organization dropped drastically to 52%, according to the same source, during the following week. "At the same time", the report said, "the opposition seems to be sniping at world organization rather than gathering for a real attack. Overall the decline in support appears attributable to a wearing off of the first flush of emotional enthusiasm, lack of official stimulation which would engender approval, and perhaps the Romanian situation" (TANO).

A report issued by the Office of War Information, dated March 16, and based on a survey of 271 editorials, said that "the enthusiasm of the initial reaction to the Crimean agreements has largely given way to a mood of solemn reflection that the fate of the United States and of the world rests in no small degree on this country's willingness to tolerate compromise and to participate fully in joint action for world peace."

The Yalta decisions received a good deal of attention from the foreign language press, the German and Polish papers taking a generally critical line, while the agreement was well received by Czech press, except for the separatist papers.

SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Administration

Asserting that the four sponsoring nations were looking forward to the San Francisco Conference with high hopes, Joseph C. Grew, Under-Secretary of State, warned at a dinner organized by the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick (NYT 3/18) that the success of the conference would depend largely upon a clear understanding of its purpose. This purpose, he said, would be "to draft the charter of the United Nations - that is, to establish machinery to maintain the future peace and security of the world, as outlined in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals." The one mistake that should be avoided at all costs, Mr. Grew continued, was thinking that the machinery itself would solve our problems. He said he believed most Americans were eager to cooperate in a world partnership, but warned that there must be "an overwhelming unity of purpose - so strong that it overshadows all other considerations." "Partners may not always grow to love each other," he added, "but they have certainly got to understand each other, and that applies to other peoples as much as to ourselves."

Speaking (NYT 3/11) of the San Francisco conference upon his return from the Crimea and Mexico City conferences, Secretary of State Stettinius said: "It will be a turning point in the history of the world and America." He said it looked upon the framing of the charter of the world reorganization to be accomplished there as 'heavy and sacred a duty' as the framing of the Constitutional Convention in 1787. He added: "We have first to write the charter and after that we shall have the task of making the new organization really work--the task of creating over the years those political economic and social conditions essential to lasting peace."

It was announced (NYT 3/28) that jurists representing the United Nations invited to the San Francisco Conference would meet in Washington April 9 to draft the statute for the International Court of Justice which was provided under the charter adopted at Dumbarton Oaks. The State Department said that if the work were not completed before the conference opened April 25, the committee would continue its activities in San Francisco. The main task before the jurists would be the decision as to whether the statute will be a modified form of the existing statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague or whether it will be an entirely new statute, using the old statute as a basis. State Department experts were said to have been examining the Permanent Court statute for some time and to have discussed suggestions made by leading American jurists and organizations such as the American Bar Association. They were understood to feel that with some amendments the statute offered a tested and workable instrument permitting rapid creation of the court. The principal amendment suggested by American legal specialists was reported to be "a revision of the statute to eliminate all reference to the League of Nations, with which the World Court was affiliated, and

to substitute the United Nations organization. It is contended, too, than an essential amendment would be to introduce into the statute a provision for its own amendment."

U. S. Delegation

President Roosevelt was reported (HT 3/24) to have assured United States delegates that they would have "much freedom of action to chart this country's course." Delegates attending a conference with the President were said to have come away with the impression that Mr. Roosevelt "intends to leave largely to them the evolution of this country's program at the conference. This was with the understanding that they will work within the general framework of the Dumbarton Oaks preliminary formula." The Big Three security agreements made at Yalta were said to be regarded by the President as projected solutions of pressing security problems which are open to modification if it becomes apparent such action is necessary to bring about conference harmony.

Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg (R., Michigan), who accepted the invitation to serve on the American delegation only after personal correspondence with the President assuring him of freedom of action, announced (NYT 3/13) that he was asking "the armed forces" to advise him on his duties. He said that he advocated direct representation of the armed forces at the final peace conference.

Senator Vandenberg was later reported (NYT 3/19) to have filed with the State Department some personal suggestions for amending the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. The nature of these proposed amendments was not disclosed but it was thought that they might be judged by his declaration, made on accepting the Presidential appointment, when he said that his chief dubiety concerning the Dumbarton Oaks formula resided in the fact that "except in its brief chapter on the world court, it does not once mention 'justice' as a guiding objective or rule of conduct." "In my opinion", Senator Vandenberg was quoted as having said at that time, "no permanent peace is possible without a constant, conscious mandate to seek and maintain justice as the basis of peace. I shall have concrete proposals to submit along these lines. It will be my prayer that the San Francisco conference may be successful in promoting dependable peace, with organized justice in a free world of free men. Civilization cannot survive World War III." Another despatch (AP 3/18) predicted that Senator Vandenberg's proposals would provide, among other things, for review of war-time political decisions threatening future peace. It quoted the Senator as having declared: "The San Francisco conference will have the tremendous responsibility of deciding whether peace-keeping is to be confined to the status quo which the peace-makers dictate, or whether the new peace league shall have jurisdiction broad enough to explore and recommend correction of errors and injustices in the peace itself which could again threaten ultimate war."

Discussing Senator Vandenberg's attitude, Harold Lavine (PM 3/20) said that, since he was the acknowledged leader of the Senate "reservationists", it might "determine the whole future course of U.S. foreign policy." According to this commentator, three different theories were held on the subject. One group believed that Senator Vandenberg would return from San Francisco with his amendments rejected and that he would then fight U.S. participation in the world security organization on the grounds that it would mean guaranteeing an unjust peace. Another group believed that he would vote for world organization no matter what happened at San Francisco. Still another group believed that the Senator was concerned primarily with the 1948 Presidential election. "If his ideas win at San Francisco, the Republicans can then say the peace is their doing, as much as Franklin Delano Roosevelt's. If the ideas lose, they can attack the Administration for having sold out 'justice'."

A warning not to expect the millennium immediately from the San Francisco conference was voiced by Dean Virginia Gildersleeve of Barnard College, sole American woman delegate to the conference, at a dinner given in her honor in New York (NYT 3/23). "The conference," she said, "can only lay the foundations and design the machinery for future cooperation between nations." Miss Gildersleeve spoke of "that wide and deep tide of interest and determination and hope that runs through our country as our people look towards San Francisco" and stressed the determination of the American people "to help create a world organization and to be one of its loyal members."

It was reported (NYT 3/20) that the technical staff to be sent to the San Francisco Conference by the Administration would be headed by Leo Pasvolksy, special assistant to Secretary of State Stettinius, and that the advisers probably would include John Foster Dulles, chairman of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of Churches in America, and a special foreign affairs assistant to Governor Thomas E. Dewey, Republican candidate in the 1944 Presidential campaign. In predicting Mr. Pasvolksy's appointment James B. Reston wrote (NYT 3/20): "It is increasingly clear here that, on the question of world security organization, Mr. Pasvolksy is playing a leading if not a decisive role in the deliberations of the United States Government and it was therefore expected that he would play an important part at San Francisco, as he did at the recent inter-

American conference at Mexico City." Mr. Dulles rejected (NYT 3/22) the suggestion that he attend the conference as an attache to the official American delegation. He set forth his position in a letter to Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg, leading Republican member of the delegation, which stated: "It is my preference to have no official status at San Francisco. For several years now I have, in various unofficial capacities, worked for the creation of a world organization dedicated to securing a just and durable peace. I think that if I continue in that way it will best serve the great cause we all have at heart." In an address before a luncheon meeting of the Foreign Policy Association in New York (CSM 3/17) Mr. Dulles warned that "the peace will not be won except by those who dare." The first concern of the San Francisco conference, he emphasized, "must be to keep alive the still fragile reality of co-operation between the great powers." "In the effort to improve on Dumbarton Oaks," he added, "we must not destroy what we have." Mr. Dulles went on record as favoring provisions for amending the charter, liberalizing it "by taking away the perpetual right of veto" given each of the "Big Five" in order to avoid "a straitjacket." He also urged that the proposed security council be guided by an ethical standard to give it "soul" and that member states not be required to use force to sustain a condition found to be unjust." Likelihood that the Dumbarton Oaks agreement will be amended from time to time is quite remote, he declared. With each of the five permanent members granted perpetual veto power, "It will be easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for an amendment to go through the Dumbarton Oaks formula." Nevertheless, he emphasized, "peace, like war, requires the people to go on taking risks. . . . Peace requires the victors to trust others to the extent of permitting change without the unanimous consent of any named group. That means taking a chance on the fairness and decency of the group as a whole. The 'Big Five' are going to force all other nations to take that chance. Unless they take it themselves, they will not build a durable structure of peace." In a subsequent speech at a United Nations rally in Washington (AP 3/26) Mr. Dulles described the Dumbarton Oaks security plan as no more than a step towards organized world peace. The development of actually working machinery, he said, is a matter for the years and the evolution of international law. Mr. Dulles supported the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, however, as having value for the purpose of bringing the nations together in the fellowship from which that law could develop.

Congress.

Attempts to forecast Senate voting on the world security proposals yielded contradictory results. Roscoe Drummond (CSM 3/13) quoted a "high Administration official" as stating that "there will not be 20 Senate votes against Dumbarton Oaks." The probable line-up was given as: For ratification, 69; against ratification, 14; doubtful, 12. "On the basis of this estimate - an estimate by one who has intimate association with Congress," Mr. Drummond declared, "Senate ratification of the forthcoming United Nations charter is certain, and the United States, which remained aloof from World Peace I, is ready to become a full participant in World Peace II. Two conditions should probably be attached to this confident forecast. One is that no grave difficulties develop at San Francisco to cause division among the United Nations. The other is that the American delegation avoid making any serious political blunders during the course of the conference itself. The outlook is reasonably secure on both points." On the other hand, the Union for Democratic Action's Congressional Newsletter (3/15) gave the following as "the best available breakdown of Senate sentiment for and against world organization": For (strong as horse-radish), 17; For (strong enough), 28; Doubtful (but leaning toward world organization), 17; Doubtful (but leaning toward isolation), 8; Votes for, but talks against, world co-operation, 1; Against (and for isolation), 20; Have voted isolationist, have recently been talking for world co-operation, 5. "Such a breakdown," the Newsletter pointed out, "doesn't yield the clear two-thirds majority needed for Treaty ratification. And, with the Senate Judiciary's vote not to act on any proposed Constitutional amendments until after the war, there's no hope of changing the two-thirds rule. World peace is NOT in the bag; it is still to be won in the Senate, where it was lost 25 years ago." A poll of the U.S. Senate conducted by PM (3/18) revealed that "President Roosevelt faces a major struggle to obtain a two-thirds Senate majority permitting American entrance into the new world security council planned at Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta." The survey gives unmistakable evidence that the battle of the peace is not yet won." The question submitted in this poll was: "Would you, on the basis of information now available, vote for or against U.S. entrance into the new world security council to be established at the San Francisco Conference." Eighty-seven responses were obtained and the overall results were: Unequivocally "yes", 40; Probably "yes", 4; "No", 0; "Reservationists", 34. Grouping the "Yes" and "Probably" returns together, PM estimated that President Roosevelt still needed to win 11 more supporters to reach the figure of 64 needed for ratification. The newspaper emphasized, however, that those tabulated as "reservationists" could not be construed as a solid, diehard, conservative tea. Their comments reflected wide variations of intensity and approach.

At a luncheon meeting of the Foreign Policy Association in New York CSM 3/17) Senator Alben W. Barkley (D., Kentucky), Democratic floor leader in the Senate, said there was "an unbroken line of progress and of determination from Dumbarton Oaks to Yalta and to San Francisco, together with intervening stations such as Quebec, Teheran and Malta, which we cannot afford to break."

The San Francisco Conference should consider carefully the future of mandated areas and the consequences of a closed door policy in the Near East, Senator Ralph O. Brewster (R., Maine) said at a dinner in New York sponsored by the New Zionist Organization of America (NYT 3/19). "The Palestine issue not only affects the question of an equitable peace," Senator Brewster said, "but touches on the future of mandated territories. It will have to be one of the tasks of the coming San Francisco Conference to consider and decide, unencumbered by previous secret arrangements, the future of mandated areas and the form of international supervision over areas which, because of the primitive character of their population, may need such supervision."

Approval of the Dumbarton Oaks proposal at the San Francisco Conference was predicted (PM 3/28) by Senator Harold H. Burton (R., Ohio) at the 25th anniversary observance of the League of Women Voters in New York. The Senator pointed out that in addition to approval of Dumbarton Oaks, changing of the two-thirds Senate rule needed for treaty ratifications would be necessary if international security and peace were to be maintained. He suggested a majority vote of both Senate and House in place of the two-thirds Senate rule.

Speaking at the same function Senator Tom Connally (D. Texas), delegate to the San Francisco Conference and chairman of the Senate Foreign relations Committee, declared that the United States "must be a member of any international instrumentality to preserve the peace of the world. Without our membership it must fail."

Churches.

An appeal to observe Sunday, April 22, as a special Day of Prayer for the success of the San Francisco Conference was issued (HT 3/27) by the official heads of 34 national church bodies. It stated: "The conference may well be a turning point in the history of our time. The success of this conference can offer reasonable hope for the development of a just and durable peace. Its failure would mark a long step toward a third world war. Our churches are profoundly concerned in the outcome of these deliberations. Basic conditions of human welfare and basic Christian purposes are at stake." Among the signers were Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; Commander Harold Stassen, president of the International Council of Religious Education; Mrs. Harper Sibley, president of the United Council of Church Women; Dr. Robert M. Hopkins, chairman of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America; Dr. Douglas Horton, chairman of the American Committee for the World Council of Churches; and Dr. Herman N. Morse, president of the Home Missions Council of North America. The other signers included the heads of 25 Protestant denominations and of three branches of the Eastern Orthodox Church - the Russian, the Syrian and the Ukrainian.

Support for the principles enunciated at the Dumbarton Oaks conference was voiced by several church groups. In announcing its endorsement the Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Church urged (UP 3/12) the United States to abandon its "dangerous policy of political isolation." A report of the Social Service commission approved by the conference said that any isolationist policy should be replaced by one of international agreement. The "day has come when there must be no exploitation of any people on earth", the report said. It declared that the unconditional-surrender formula adopted by the United Nations must not mean "unconcern for the wishes of conquered people or unilateral action in disposing of their fate. The House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, through letters read by rectors in churches, urged (AP 3/14) parishes throughout the country to support the Dumbarton Oaks principles. The letter said the conference was the "first step toward a just and durable peace." "Thoughtful people," it continued, "are agreed that the peace for which we pray. . . cannot be achieved and maintained without a union or concert of nations organized under law and backed by force. . . The Dumbarton Oaks proposals. . . offer a forward-looking plan representing the widest area of agreement yet achieved by four great powers on a general organization making for world stabilization. . . ."

Labor.

The four weeks preceding the San Francisco Conference were designated "United Nations Month" within the Congress of Industrial Organizations by President Philip Murray in a letter to all CIO affiliates. All CIO locals and members were urged to undertake during this period studies and discussions of the London World Trade Union Conference, the Bretton Woods Agreement, Dumbarton Oaks, the Crimea Conference, the San Francisco meeting and similar world security conferences and proposals, Mr. Murray said. "It will be up to Congress, particularly the Senate, to ratify the San Francisco decisions, and it will be up to the American people to

insist that they do so," he wrote. Mr. Murray also urged CIO members to ask members of Congress to vote for the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreement without amendments.

A place for labor at the San Francisco conference, and eventually at the peace table itself, was demanded (NYP 3/16) in a statement issued by the AFL's International Labor Relations Committee. "We believe," the committee asserted, "... that American labor unions have an obligation to participate in the framing of the peace as advisors to the national delegation of the U.S. We also believe that labor of all other countries should have like recognition at the peace table. We believe that American labor should be accorded representation in an advisory capacity to our delegates to the San Francisco meeting.

Other National Organizations

Americans United for World Organization released (CSM 3/12) and sent to President Roosevelt a compilation showing the "state of public sentiment in the United States in favor of a strong and democratic world organization based on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals" as shown by the attitude of 34 of the largest national organizations, the major political parties and Congress itself.

An open letter to the President described the actions of these leading groups as representing "an overwhelming majority of the articulate opinion" of the country.

The same letter, also sent to members of Congress and to the American delegation to the United Nations conference at San Francisco expressed the opinion that the American people, united as they are on this question, would "tolerate no unreasonable dallying" once the results of the San Francisco conference are before the Congress.

According to the statement, American sentiment demands not only security from war but a forceful reassertion of the Atlantic Charter and provision in the San Francisco agreements for future amendment and improvement of "the democratic and humane aspects" of the proposed world agency.

Replies received from 500 present and past members of the armed forces, polled as to whether they would fight again to preserve the peace if such action should be initiated by a United Nations Security Council, showed that 95 per cent approved such a proposal, it was announced (NYT 3/27) by Charles G. Bolte, chairman of the American Veterans Committee, in New York.

In a letter to the editor of the New York Times (3/28) W. A. Hunton, Educational director, Council on African Affairs, wrote: "It is, in my opinion, dangerous to think in terms of America having bases for its protection, Britain having bases for its protection, etc. The only genuine protection which America or any other country can have against aggression is in a system of military security resting upon the joint consent and joint action of the major Allied powers."

Recognition of the need for compromise in reaching an international accord at the San Francisco Conference was urged in a statement issued (NYT 3/23) by the National Peace Conference after six of the 25 voting members of the conference had cast ballots against it. The conference, headed by John Paul Jones, Minister of the Union Church of Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, has approximately forty constituent members, all national organizations whose programs include an interest in international affairs and the post-war world. In issuing the statement on the conference's position, Dr. Jones declared that the six votes cast against it were "in part accounted for by scruples regarding the place of compromise in ethical thought, and represent opposition to the acceptance of the concept of the inevitability of compromise at San Francisco." The formal statement advocated in part, "a sense of world citizenship" and "recognition in advance that agreements at San Francisco will inevitably involve compromise, and that the initial world organization will be imperfect and incomplete."

It was announced (UP 3/28) that the women's division of the Democratic National Committee, had scheduled nearly 1500 meetings during April to study the Dumbarton Oaks proposals that will be placed before the San Francisco conference. To these meetings the women's division was to distribute thousands of handbills containing this statement: "Remember that the choice is not between the proposed world organization and some other one. The choice is between the proposed one and none. If Dumbarton Oaks is discarded we must begin to prepare for World War III.

A committee representing Italian-American organizations with a total membership of nearly 2,000,000, appealed (NYP 3/30) to President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Stettinius urging that the United States Government should take the initiative in having the sponsoring countries invite the Italian Government to participate in the San Francisco conference. The committee was headed by Luigi Antonini, president of the Italian-American Labor Council, and included Justice Ferdinand Pecora of the Supreme Court and Samuel Shore, vice president of the Liberal party. The appeal declared that failure to invite Italy "will tend to

vitate the many efforts which the American Government has been making for the establishment of a world security organization" and would be "an act of flagrant injustice against a people with whom our country has had many bonds of friendship." Approval of the appeal was voiced also by the Labor League for Human Rights, the war relief arm of the American Federation of Labor; Columbian Republican League; Jewish Labor Committee and the American Labor Conference on International Affairs, headed by William Green, president of the AFL.

Miscellaneous

In a series of four articles written at the request of the North American Newspaper Alliance and published in the New York Times (3/25, 3/26, 3/27, 3/28) Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, discussed the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the prospects of the San Francisco conference. Mr. Hoover pointed out that the Dumbarton Oaks proposals were in most ways patterned upon the League of Nations. The league was a partial success and its failures presented vivid experience which it would be folly to ignore. In the light of those experiences, there were some important additions which "should be infused into the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and thereby greatly strengthen this chart of peace." The suggested additions were:

1. Positive standards of the political rights of men and nations and the establishment of a world committee to promote these political rights, this committee to rank with the economic and social committees already proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks plan.
2. Provision for revision of onerous treaties between nations at, say, ten-year intervals in order to assure that the peace settlements are dynamic and not static.
3. Regional organization of the organization to preserve peace in three areas, Asia, Europe and the Western Hemisphere, the regional organizations to be subject to the Security Council.
4. Absolute disarmament of the enemy powers.
5. Immediate relative disarmament of the United Nations and the establishment of maximum limit of armies, navies and air power among them.
6. The authority to use force should not be given to the American delegate on the Security Council, but that power should be relegated to the President of the United States with the provision that he be bound by the majority of the joint Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the House as to whether a vote to employ American force shall be submitted to Congress as a whole.
7. Take enough time in formulating the charter of peace to do it right.

Thomas F. Reynolds claimed (PM 3/14) to have learned "on the highest authority" that the Crimea Conference "worked out a plan to solve the control over strategic Pacific and Oriental islands and continental bases by a system of United Nations 'trusteeships' to be granted by the projected world security organization." It was said to be the intention of the great powers to ask world sanction for such machinery in the charter for a world security organization which would be devised at the San Francisco Conference.

Discussing the Dumbarton Oaks proposals at a discussion meeting sponsored by the women's division of the Democratic National Committee and the Women's National Democratic Club (CSM 3/16) Dean Harriet Elliott of Woman's College, University of North Carolina, said "it is important to understand that every nation will be subject to the discipline of the United Nations if they threaten the peace of the world." Defending the compromises that emerged from the conference and from Yalta, she declared, "It should not be difficult for Americans to understand that compromises may be essential in any new political venture." It is a well known fact that every man in the constitutional convention left Philadelphia disappointed because some special provision which he advocated had not been adopted."

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE ON PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE

Reporting to the Senate (HT 3/13) on their mission as representatives of the United States at the Mexico City Conference, Senators Tom Connally (D., Texas) and Warren R. Austin (R., Vermont) declared that the Act of Chapultepec providing for the use of force to prevent or halt aggression in the Americas had set a pattern for the world security organization to be established at the San Francisco Conference. They emphasized that the Chapultepec agreement

was within the framework of the Dumbarton Oaks plan. Senator Austin cited a provision in the Dumbarton Oaks program specifying that the new world organization would not bar regional security arrangements such as the Act of Chapultepec. He also asserted that should the San Francisco Conference fail, the decisions reached at Mexico City would "take care of" peace in the Western Hemisphere.

Comment.

The AFL Committee on International Labor Relations praised (NYT 3/17) the work of the Mexico City Conference, at which the AFL was represented in a statement which said: "The conference has provided a basis of equitable treatment for all to assure economic growth of each nation and to bring about rising levels of living to the peoples of every participating nation."

"The rights of workers to join together in unions and to bargain collectively with employers is endorsed in the tenth principle set forth in the economic charter of the Americas, which the twenty American nations pledged appropriate steps to realize the objectives set forth in the International Labor Organization's Declaration of Philadelphia."

The Inter-American conference held in Mexico City was of the utmost importance to farmers of the Middle West, James Patton, president of the National Farmer's Union, said in a letter to the Prairie Farmer (3/17). He cited the following reasons:

1. This hemisphere is our house, so to speak, and from a military security standpoint we must have the best understanding and closest cooperation among the countries of the Western Hemisphere. (2). The best potential markets all of us (nations) in this hemisphere have is among ourselves. Our economies are complementary to a great degree. (3). In terms of world organization and lasting peace, the countries of the Americas must present a United front at all times."

A "round-up" by PM (3/25) produced the following opinions on the results of the Mexico City Conference: "Mexico City reveals that a regional system can be planned so as to fit into and strengthen the world organization." - Edward C. Cartor, secretary-general, Institute of Pacific Relations. "The United States was able, in a large measure to recoup its position of leadership in the Western Hemisphere." - Olive Holmes, research assistant, Foreign Policy Association, who attended the conference. "The conference provided a potential economic charter for the Western Hemisphere." - Bruce Bliven, editor, New Republic. "As I see it, three vitally important facts emerge. First, Fascism and fascist aggressions, such as the attack Argentina has been preparing against Uruguay, will not be met by one nation but by the combined might of the Americas. Second, the Economic Charter lays the foundation for a Western Hemisphere from which the hunger that has afflicted large areas and their peoples will be banished by mutual effort. Third, the American nations go on record for an international system of guarantees for human rights." Laura Vicray, managing editor, Free World. "I'd say that it accomplished one important thing - that the American nations got together and decided that if any one of them, especially Argentina, which was not invited to the meeting, attack any other they would consider it an attack on all." - Ray Josephs, author of Argentine Diary. "The American nations agreed to stand together in this hemisphere against Fascism. Also, the conference highlighted the necessity for making arrangements whereby the American nations buy and sell each other's products. This is important in view of the major economic crisis expected after the war." - J. King Gordon, managing editor, The Nation.

GENERAL POLICIES

Administration

Returning from the Crimea and Mexico City conferences, Secretary of State Stettinius said (NYT 3/11): "From now on we Americans - (for our own sake) - must share in the responsibility of establishing and maintaining peace everywhere in the world. I do not for one moment under-estimate the difficulties, nor should any American underestimate them." Secretary Stettinius said that the next step ahead was the United Nations conference at San Francisco on April 25 and "after that the task of making the new organization really work." He told correspondents that he returned from two notable Allied conferences with the conviction that "the United States should cooperate with its Allies to win the battle for establishment of peace and its maintenance in the future."

He warned: "How durable and secure the peace will be after victory will depend upon whether we can work together with the other United Nations even more closely and successfully than we have in this war. We have no other choice except economic disasters and another war far more terrible. From now on, we Americans must share--for our own sake--in the responsibility of establishing and maintaining peace everywhere in the world."

"All the labors of this trip", Secretary Stettinius continued, "have been towards the same end - establishing the basis of a lasting peace in which Americans and others can live in the assurance of greater security and freedom of wider opportunities. It is literally true today that we Americans are the neighbors - next-door neighbors - of every other people on earth."

A comprehensive program for dealing with liberated areas of the world was set forth by the State Department (NYT 3/18) through its weekly broadcast over NBC when the problem was discussed by Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of public relations, Charles P. Taft, Special Assistant on War-time Economic Affairs, and James Clement Dunn, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of European Affairs. Summing up the discussion, Mr. MacLeish said: "We have a direct responsibility and a direct interest in the liberated countries, east and west. Specifically, we have a responsibility in common with our allies to see to it that the peoples of these countries have not only food but an opportunity to live under government of their own choosing. Further, we realize that our own economic welfare depends on helping the countries which have been in the direct path of war to get back on their feet. And, finally, we intend to stay on the job, this time, until our responsibilities have been fulfilled. We do not intend simply to drive the Nazis and the Japanese out of the occupied countries and then secede from the world. We are part of the world and we propose to stay with it until we are sure that we have won what we are fighting for, a just and durable peace." Mr. Taft stressed that the policy applied to the Far East as well as to Europe. "If we want to produce the sort of world our boys are fighting for," he said, "we must insist that the Asiatic countries and colonies, as well as the European countries, get shipping and supplies to carry on, and a fair break when the fighting is over as well. The great areas and populations of the Far East have further to go than the West. They offer one of the greatest opportunities for an expanded world trade and higher standard of living. So it is in our interest to help them all we can. So far as the Netherlands Indies are concerned," he explained, "the Dutch are taking care of that entirely and expect to pay for it. Apart from China, we probably won't have as much of a problem everywhere out there as we have in Europe. The whole region of southwest Asia may not be liberated as soon, for one thing."

The speakers praised the Dumbarton Oaks security plan and the decisions of the Yalta Conference, saying that we now have cooperation between the great powers, which was "absolutely essential to the success of the international organization" for peace. Mr. Dunn suggested a date for the next world war in the event that the security organization should not prevail. "We could pretend to withdraw from the world, as we did to some extent after World War I," he said. "But we would probably have to come out of our hermit's cave again anyhow, along about 1970, and fight another war--and next time we would be the first to be attacked." Mr. Dunn rejected talk of spheres of influence, particularly with respect to Russia. "The Yalta declaration should have cleared up that point completely," he said. "The British and Soviet Governments, with the United States and France, if she agrees, are pledged to consult with each other constantly in every part of liberated Europe."

"Most of this talk of power politics and spheres of influence stems from the military situation. By the very course of events, the Russian armies have been operating in Eastern Europe and the Anglo-American combined armies in Italy and Western Europe, and that has given rise to the question whether certain countries are going to have a predominance of influence in certain areas."

The State Department's policy toward Germany and Japan was set forth in a broadcast by officials over NBC as "inflexibly one of unconditional surrender, punishment of their war criminals, and rendering them militarily impotent for the future" (NYT 3/25). The discussion was carried on in the weekly series of broadcasts on "Building the Peace" by James C. Dunn and Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretaries of State, and Robert Murphy, U.S. Political Adviser on German Affairs with Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in Europe. Summing up the view expressed during the broadcast, Mr. MacLeish said: "First, we are definitely committed to the policy of unconditional surrender. We believe that nazism can only really be destroyed and the war really won on that basis. We believe the great majority of the American people feel the same way. Secondly, it is not our purpose to destroy the people of Germany but only the gangs who have misgoverned, mismanaged and misled them. That means that we propose to punish--and really to punish--the guilty war leaders and their tools and agents."

Third, our whole policy for the occupation of Germany is a policy aimed at stamping out Nazi controls at every point. We don't know how long it will be necessary to occupy Germany in order to undo the evil work which has been done there, but we propose to stay with the job until it is finished. We believe, however, that something more than the destruction of the physical power of Germany to make war will be required. We feel that the German people must themselves change their point of view about their relation to the rest of the world. This we think is one of the toughest problems with which we are faced. It is tough because it is part of the larger problem of the future reintegration of the German people into the community of mankind." The attitude presented with respect to Germany was similar to that set forth toward Japan but more precise statements were made concerning the Reich because, it was pointed out, "plans for the treatment of Japan, like the end of the Japanese war itself, are still in the future." The speakers emphasized that "our stand on unconditional surrender applies to Japan as well as Germany."

In a speech telephoned from Washington to the annual dinner of the American Labor Party in New York, Harold L. Ickes stressed (NYT 3/16) that the security of America hinged upon the kind of peace that was written. He declared that "we will not tolerate this time a peace written by sentimental zanyies with the unwanted and scarcely realized aid of crafty power politicians." To be effective, he said, "it is essential that any peace have potential force behind it," and while he did not want a "vindictive peace," neither was a "soft peace" desirable. He added: "I hope that this country, which would be most likely to fail in this regard will keep its international mollycoddles at home during the peace negotiations - that is, unless we want a tissue-paper peace that a light summer zephyr would rend and shred."

Congress

Milton R. Young, newly appointed Senator from North Dakota, said (PM 3/12) that he favored "some sort of world organization for the preservation of peace" and would be "ardent" in support of any program seeking to create such an organization. Senator Young, who is a Republican and a farmer, said he believed any effective peace organization must be backed by a well-officered, well-manned and well-equipped army and navy and with air forces adequate to meet any situation."

In his first formal address to the Senate (NYT 3/29) Senator J. William Fulbright (D., Arkansas) challenged it to take a positive position on how to prevent future wars or "if it feels itself inadequate to this task" to let the House share in helping it to make up its mind. Senator Fulbright argued that the country could not afford to entrust the formulation of foreign policy solely to "a few polished and cultured gentlemen in the dark and dignified recesses of the State Department. The recent Mexico City Conference was one of the few occasions in the country's history, he added, when the constitutional provision for Senate "advice as well as consent" on treaty-making was invoked. Following the principle, he continued, the Senate should proceed very soon to exercise the same authority in advising the Administration how it feels about "the great decisions" which must soon be made. Such discussion, he held, should clear up "a common belief, perhaps a myth," that the American people are anti-British, anti-Russian and anti-Jewish, and feel that American statesmen always lose out to superior cleverness of foreigners in any international agreements." Certain interests and newspapers are continually promoting these "myths" and "narrow prejudices," he said. Earlier dissemination of such "myths" he asserted, was largely responsible for the failure of the Senate to approve the League of Nations and for current assertions that the Senate could not be relied upon to support future efforts for world security. "Another myth," he said, was that "America is being asked to join a world peace-keeping program merely out of charity." "If there is any reason for doing this," he said, "it is for our national self-interest. We have more to lose from chaos and more to gain from the pursuits of peace than any other people."

Labor

Plans for the formation and meeting of a new world labor organization in Paris in September were discussed (NYT 3/11) at the opening session of a three-day meeting of the national executive board of the Congress of Industrial Organizations in the Hotel Commodore.

In a statement issued by its International Labor Relations Committee the AFL warned the United States (NYT 3/16) against dictation by "any international trade union gathering in the conduct of our foreign relations." The statement referred to the recent World Trade Union Conference in London, in which it refused to participate, and explained that the AFL had accepted the responsibilities of membership in the International Federation of Trade Unions which restricted membership to a "single free trade union organization from each country." The invitation to attend the London conference was declined, the statement said, "because the British Trades Union Congress had no right to

supersede the authority of the IFTU in convening a world conference and because the invitations were addressed to some organizations which are not free trade unions, to others which are Government dominated to many which are dual in character, destruction in purpose and which fail to recognize the need of domestic trade union unity."

The most striking defect of the conference, the statement said, was the lack of unity in its composition. "The labor organizations of the Soviet Union," it said, "for example, can hardly be described as performing the same function as labor unions in representative democracies practicing the system of individual initiative, private ownership and freedom of speech, press, worship and association."

A "New Charter for Labor and Management" signed by Presidents William Green of the AFL, Philip Murray of CIO and Eric Johnston of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States (NYT 3/29) contained the following provisions: An expanding economy at home will be stimulated by a vastly increased foreign trade. Arrangements must therefore be perfected to afford the devastated or undeveloped nations reasonable assistance to encourage the rebuilding and development of sound economic systems. International trade cannot expand through subsidized competition among the nations for diminishing markets, but can be achieved only through expanding world markets and the elimination of any arbitrary and unreasonable practices.

An enduring peace must be secured. This calls for the establishment of an international security organization, with full participation by all the United Nations, capable of preventing aggression and assuring lasting peace."

UNITED NATIONS AND OTHER INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

President Roosevelt recommended to Congress (LP 3/26) that it approve the constitution of a United Nations food and agricultural organization and authorize active American participation. In the course of his message the President said: "The United Nations have already made much progress in setting up an organization for international security. But our collaboration for peace must be on a broader basis than security alone. We must strive to correct the conditions that predispose people toward war or make them the ready tools and victims of aggressors. We shall need also to work together as nations toward achieving freedom from want. Our participation in the Food and Agriculture Organization will be an essential step in this collaboration."

REPARATIONS COMMISSION

It was announced (NYT 3/13) by Secretary of State Stettinius that Isador Lubin, statistician to the Combined Chiefs of Staff, had been appointed to represent the United States on the Reparations Commission which would meet in Moscow to determine reparations in kind for German damages in Europe. The creation of this commission, Secretary Stettinius said, was the "first step in implementation of the decision taken at Yalta to exact reparation in kind for the destruction wrought by the Germans, and that it would "consider the extent and methods for exacting compensation."

INTER-GOVERNMENTAL COMMITTEE ON REFUGEES

Earl G. Harrison was appointed (PM 3/16) to succeed Myron C. Taylor as U.S. representative on the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees. Mr. Harrison, former Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, was expected to go to his new post in London immediately.

UNITED NATIONS WAR CRIMES COMMISSION

A charge that Congress and the people had been kept in the dark on the United Nations' policy towards war criminals and the activities of the United Nations War Crimes Commission was made (NYT 3/23) to the House Foreign Affairs Committee by Representative Emanuel Celler (D., New York). Mr. Celler asserted that it was not only the right but the duty of the legislative body to "play an important part in the question of Axis criminals." Appearing as the first witness as the committee began hearings on his own joint resolution proposing that a commission be appointed by the President to cooperate with the Allied War Crimes Commission, Mr. Celler warned that "the whole program or lack of program for the punishment of Axis criminals will remain a dark secret just as it was after the last war unless Congress steps in." Representative Daniel J. Flood (D., Pennsylvania) said he thought the whole question had been improperly handled. "No United Nations leader or group of leaders ought to back away from the problem," he declared. "There is an atmosphere of evasion about the whole issue."

ECONOMICS AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORGANIZATION

FINANCE

Testimony both for and against the Bretton Woods proposals was heard by the House Banking and Currency Committee. One of the principal witnesses was Dr. Harry D. White, assistant secretary of the Treasury, who urged (NYT 3/14) that early approval of the proposals was more urgent than a world security organization because there is little likelihood of hostilities occurring soon after an armistice while "the economic dangers will be in our laps the moment the war stops." Referring to the difficulties involving the international institutions projected at Bretton Woods, Dr. White said that "with the greatest expedition on the part of Congress they could not start operating for many months, or maybe a year or two." In an appraisal of the Alternate recommendations of the American Bankers' Association (See Report No. 36) he said that their adoption would "definitely wreck" the whole Bretton Woods program. Discussing the bankers' proposal to scrap the proposed International Monetary Fund, Dr. White said the fund was an essential counterpart of the proposed Bank for Reconstruction and Development, since its existence would make some of the member countries better risks for the bank's operations. Supporting testimony was also given by Fred M. Vinson, Federal Loan Administrator, who was vice chairman of the U.S. delegation at the Bretton Woods conference. Mr. Vinson described the conference as "a model of democratic action" and stated that the existence of the proposed fund and bank would have averted the present war. Edward E. Brown, president of the First National Bank of Chicago and the only banker on the Bretton Woods delegation, said in reply to questions directed to him as a former member of the post-war monetary committee of the American Bankers Association that the recent statement of the A.B.A. did not represent, "by any manner of means, unanimous opposition on the part of all of the members of the A.B.A. Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Under Secretary of Commerce, told the committee that the Bretton Woods proposals represented an important attempt "to create an international monetary system" which would incorporate "the best and most practical features of the international gold standard." He said he felt that the critics of the proposed international monetary fund "had seriously erred," dismissing all of the proffered alternatives as "essentially negative rather than positive in character." William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of economic matters, said that "there is not one single element of Santa Claus philosophy" in the Bretton Woods proposals. W. Randolph Burgess, president of the American Bankers Association warned of "very grave dangers" in the proposals but pointed to the recommendations of the Committee for Economic Development (See below) as offering a possible compromise. "The greatest danger in this thing, we being a material people," he said, "is that we might start by being Uncle Sucker and end up by being Uncle Shylock." While suggesting that the CED proposal might offer an ultimate compromise, Mr. Burgess emphasized that it would be better to make the more thorough-going revisions proposed by the A.B.A. The association's proposal, he explained, would dispense with the projected \$8,800,000,000 Monetary Fund, substituting a department for currency stabilization in the \$9,100,000,000 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. Leon Fraser, former head of the World War I Bank for International Settlement and president of the First National Bank of New York, warned (WSJ 3/23) that the Bretton Woods proposal for an International Stabilization Fund probably would break down unless the fund were continuously supplied from the United States. He joined Mr. Burgess in recommending that the fund be scrapped and its currency stabilization functions consolidated into a monetary department of the proposed World Bank of Reconstruction and Development. Mr. Fraser told the committee that the World Bank was "based on constructive financial principles" but termed the Fund in its approach to current stabilization "premature and theoretical and a fundamental misstep." W.L. Hemingway, president of the Mercantile Commerce Bank and Trust Company of St. Louis, suggested that the legislation be deferred until after the San Francisco conference had set up the proposed International Social and Economic Council, provided in the Dumbarton Oaks instrument, and then let that body decide how to handle the problem of financial and monetary organization. Mr. Hemingway, who is chairman of the AEA's advisory committee on Special Activities, warned the committee that the monetary fund would amount to "an economic superstate."

It was reported (NYT 3/24) that the Administration had abandoned its original hope of enacting the Bretton Woods legislation before the opening of the San Francisco Conference on April 25.

Among official spokesmen who made statements in support of the Bretton Woods proposals was Henry Morgenthau, jr., Secretary of the Treasury, who warned in an address prepared for a meeting of the Foreign Policy Association and the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association (NYT 3/12) that unless the agreement became operative "the strides toward peace and security at Dumbarton Oaks, at Mexico City and at Yalta, as well as the further steps that will be taken at San Francisco, may end only in frustration." Speaking at the Opera Victory Rally sponsored by the Metropolitan Opera Guild, William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State in charge of economic affairs, similarly

declared (NYT 3/18) that "the most elaborate political and military arrangements for the preservation of physical peace will soon disintegrate in an atmosphere of bitterness created by international economic warfare." In San Francisco, Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, asserted that the Bretton Woods monetary program formed an "absolutely essential counterpart" to the Dumbarton Oaks proposals for a world security organization.

Senator Claude Pepper (D., Florida) charged at a dinner of the New York State Council of the International Association of Machinists in New York (NYT 3/24) that big bankers in New York "are already trying to scuttle Bretton Woods" and asserted that "the only hope of the people is that labor leadership will overcome these forces." Senator Pepper described the bankers as prime movers of "selfish and narrow-minded interests who will try to wreck every aspect of the United Nations program which affects their pocketbooks."

Support for the Bretton Woods proposals was forthcoming both from business and labor groups. The Committee for Economic Development, a national postwar planning association, backed by some 2,000 business firms and individuals, declared its support of the legislation (NYT 3/20). Endorsement was subject to a qualification that the proposed International Bank be "strengthened" by empowering it to make "stabilization loans" in the event that such are needed to prevent a "freezing" of the machinery of the companion International Monetary Fund. It was learned from "responsible officials" that there probably would be no objection to the qualification and it was thought that the CED position might thus represent "the ultimate compromise between the more vigorous criticisms offered by the American Bankers Association and those who want the Bretton Woods agreements approved "without changing a comma." Through its board of directors the National Foreign Trade Council also went on record (NYT 3/21) as favoring adoption of the proposals. This action was taken, the council announced, despite the reservations held by many individual members with respect to technical and other shortcomings in the proposals and despite the reluctance the council felt in passing judgment on a single measure which "lacks co-ordination and integration with a broader pattern." Expressing a belief that the Bretton Woods agreements "do provide a fair basis for effective financial collaboration among the United Nations as a counterpart of collective security in the political sphere," the heads of eleven leading Philadelphia banks informed Congress (NYT 3/23) of their approval of the plan.

The American Labor Conference on International Affairs, under the chairmanship of William Green, president of the AFL, made public a report (NYT 3/23) urging Congressional approval of the Bretton Woods agreements on the ground that they would facilitate full employment at home and would promote world peace. It took issue with the American Bankers Association, saying they were trying to have the fund dropped or postponed.

The Catholic Association for World Peace said (AP 3/23) that acceptance of the Bretton Woods proposals was necessary to a revival and expansion of world trade. The projected international bank and monetary fund were described as a "joint acknowledgment of moral responsibility for dealing with a potent source of world economic injustice. . ."

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in a report of its finance committee approved by the Board of Directors, endorsed (NYT 3/26) participation by the United States in the projected International Bank but urged that Congress defer action on the companion Monetary Fund proposal of the Bretton Woods Conference. The report cited "widely differing interpretations of the fund plan in the United States and the United Kingdom" and stressed the danger of signing an agreement "which each thinks means something different."

In its current issue of the Guaranty Survey (WSJ 3/27) the Guaranty Trust Co. stated that the International Monetary Fund would do little or nothing to promote true currency stabilization and might have exactly the opposite effect. "Much more effective as a means of providing such credit as may be needed to promote exchange availability and finance rehabilitation would be the proposed International Bank for Reconstruction and Development," the Survey declared.

B.C. Forbes, president of the Investors Fairplay League, told the Engineers Club of Philadelphia (HT 3/29) that the Bretton Woods program "reflects the irresponsible attitude of the Administration regarding squandering of American financial resources."

Press Comment. Secretary Morgenthau's call for passage of the Bretton Woods plan was unfavorably viewed in 59% of the comment analyzed by one report (TANO) during the week ending March 13, while 38%

the monetary fund, and reject unsound features. The approving minority lauded Mr. Morgenthau's clear presentation of facts, called for passage of the plan before the San Francisco Conference, and deprecated American Bankers Association opposition as rooted in dislike of new methods or as ably countered by the Independent Bankers Association representing small bankers. An Office of War Information survey, dated March 23 and based on a study of 134 editorials, stated that editors continued to be sharply divided on the International Monetary Fund, opponents exceeding supporters in a ratio of about 4 to 3.

TRADE AND CARTELS

Authority for reductions of 50 per cent below the present tariff rates in reciprocal trade agreements were proposed to Congress (NYT 3/27) in a message from President Roosevelt requesting a renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. The President said that this step, with other legislation, such as the Bretton Woods accord, the Chicago aviation treaty and the proposed food organization, was essential as a "kit of tools" for the new world of international co-operation and to prevent the return to economic warfare. An informal poll of Senatorial sentiment showed (NYT 3/28) that the principal opposition to renewal of the legislation arose over the issue of legislative versus executive power with little disposition to return to the old system of general tariff acts. Chairman Robert L. Doughton (D., North Carolina) of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Chairman Walter F. George (D., Georgia), of the Senate Finance Committee, who will direct the measure through Congress, both stated (NYT 3/28) they expected stronger opposition this time than heretofore. The most vocal Congressional opposition was said (NYT 3/28) to come from members like Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney (D., Wyoming) who "direct their fire against the 'blanket' authority, within pre-determined limits, granted by Congress to the Executive to alter existing tariffs."

American industrial interests have "in numerous instances", already carried on secret international negotiations looking toward resumption of cartel agreements after the war, Attorney General Francis Biddle charged in his annual report to Congress (PM 3/19). Cartel accords "foster domestic monopolies," Mr. Biddle said, because powerful American concerns, in return for the commitment of a foreign company to stay out of the American market, agree not to sell in forbidden foreign areas and also pledge "to keep domestic competitors from selling abroad." "The purpose and effect of such agreements is to raise domestic prices, thus curtailing consumer purchasing power, and to eliminate competitors," he declared. "When these international and domestic agreements concern the newer technological processes, as is likely to be the case when patents are involved, they stand in the way of the future development of small enterprise, necessarily restricted by the war, and the reconversion to peacetime use of Government-owned plants." Stressing the need for increasingly vigorous enforcement of the anti-trust laws, Mr. Biddle said these laws are "the principal legal mechanism for maintenance of a free and competitive enterprise system in this country."

In a speech at a Liberal Party dinner in New York (NYT 3/24) Mr. Biddle said, "I realize that competition is threatened. I know that there are large segments of our industry where it has disappeared. I am conscious that much thinking in Europe is against the competitive theory. Yet I dread what will become of a world where cartelization is accepted; where enormously increased regulation by the government necessarily follows, so that eventually this individual's choice of work, even his choice of where to work will be directed."

In an attack against "private, Government-controlled and super-State cartels" (NYT 3/29) J. Howard Pew, president of the Sun Oil Company, suggested that lend-lease materials which are surplus at the end of the war, and the Bretton Woods monetary agreements, be used as protective devices if there is any attempt "to strong-arm" the United States into cartel arrangements. In ratifying the Bretton Woods proposals Congress could attach a reservation that no part of the sums provided by the United States may be used by any enterprise participating in cartel arrangements, Mr. Pew told a meeting of the National Conference of Business Paper Editors in New York. Mr. Pew suggested that, in addition, Congress could enact legislation making it unlawful for Americans to lend money to foreign enterprises in cartels. He said that "few voices today are openly raised in defense of the so-called private cartel, but more believe in Government-controlled agreements." He characterized the Anglo-American Petroleum Agreement as typical of the "super-State cartel," a type "far more reprehensible and detrimental to the public welfare than private cartels entered into by individual companies, bad as they are."

OIL

The proposed British-American oil agreement, revised in accordance with recommendations by the industry in the U.S., "will go far toward furnishing a satisfactory pattern for other agreements of international interest," W. Alton Jones, president of Cities Service Co., advised stockholders (HT 3/20) in a message accompanying the organization's annual report. Mr. Jones declared that the company does not regard the proposed agreement as stifling to private initiative "through inflexible government control of the oil industry, but rather as an earnest and necessary effort to secure a working understanding among nations under which the United States petroleum industry can continue its independence as a free enterprise both at home and abroad." It was reported by the Journal of Commerce (3/21) that the revised version of the pact to be presented to the President's Oil Committee by the State Department would retain the anti-trust provision requested by the industry.

LEND-LEASE

After a "brief and relatively calm debate" (NYT 3/14), the House voted, 354 to 28, to extend the Lend-Lease Act for another year, but directed the Administration not to use the program for "post-war relief, rehabilitation or reconstruction." The threatened attack upon the measure was averted by the Democrats' acceptance of the limitation amendment insisted upon by a Republic minority of five in the Foreign Affairs Committee. Representative John M. Vorys (R., Ohio), leader of the committee minority, told the House that the approved amendment specifying that lend-lease was not a post-war instrument was of "great significance," adding: "It shows complete agreement between the executive and both parties in Congress that our post-war plans and policies will be submitted to Congress."

COMMUNICATIONS

AVIATION

President Roosevelt sent to the Senate (AP 3/12) the International Aviation Treaty establishing an Aviation Council and affirming each country's control of the air above it. Simultaneously several Republican senators, including Senator Ralph O. Brewster (R., Maine), who was a delegate to the Chicago conference, indicated that they would fight to force withdrawal of the interim agreements signed along with the treaty. Ratification of the treaty was urged in testimony before a Senate Foreign Relations sub-committee by William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State (NYT 3/20), and by Robert A. Lovett and Artemus L. Gates, respectively Assistant Secretaries of the War and Navy departments (AP 3/23). Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, warned the sub-committee (PM 3/27) that two executive agreements, which he said had been left out of the treaty, gave away sovereign rights, hacked through the tariff wall and threatened to wreck American agriculture, industry and national defense as well as aviation.

The Senate Commerce Committee's aviation subcommittee began hearings on a bill by Senator Pat McCarran (D., Nevada) to set up an agency known as the All-American Flag Line, Inc. which would have a monopoly of operating rights to foreign countries. The proposal was strongly endorsed by William A. Patterson, president of United Air Lines (WSJ 3/23) and was approved in principle by Juan T. Trippe, president of Pan American Air Lines (3/28). In a letter to Chairman Bailey of the Senate Commerce Committee, Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson (WSJ 3/24) said it was the opinion of the War Department, on the other hand, that "multiple U.S. ownership and operation, if reasonably regulated, will not only make for maximum expansion of our foreign air transport system but will also tend to produce stronger, more efficient and aggressive operations generally and thus better equip our carriers to maintain the overall competitive position of the country." Senator Bailey (D., N. Carolina) himself attacked the McCarran proposal (UP 3/22) as one which "uproots the power of the President" and won't stand the test of Congress." The line would have \$200,000,000 voting stock, Senator Bailey pointed out, stressing that Pan American would be entitled to 25 per cent. He noted also that the Class B, non-voting stock would be sold only to United States international carriers, and, except for a small amount which would go to American Export Airlines, would be owned entirely by Pan American.

SHIPPING

Supporting Vice Admiral Emory S. Land's proposal that a "shipping reserve" of substantial size be held on "inactive duty" against another national shipping emergency, Frank J. Taylor, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, declared (NYT 3/11) that these vessels must be set aside for the same reason that ammunition, cannon and rifles are carefully stored by the

armed forces. He added that the existence of a well-maintained surplus fleet might help to discourage future enemies.

In an article in Ships, a publication of the Shipbuilders Council of America, Almon E. Roth, president of the National Federation of American Shipping, urged (NYT 3/28) that the maintenance of an adequate post-war merchant marine would be an important factor in the expansion of American trade for the reconstruction of a war-torn world; and would provide the means whereby American producers could seek a "10,000,000,000 market."

RADIO AND CABLE SERVICES

Consolidation of all the international communications services of the 13 companies operating from the U.S. in the foreign field into one privately owned corporate entity was advocated (NYT 3/20) by James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, before a Senate Interstate Commerce sub-committee which opened hearings on the proposed merger. The plan called for the establishment of a national enterprise for the consolidation of all radio and cable services, including radio-telegraph and radio-telephone, with specifically limited Government supervision and control of its otherwise independent management and supervision. Senator Burton K. Wheeler (D. Montana), chairman of the sub-committee, asserted (NYT 3/25) that post-war consolidation of the overseas services of communications companies operating in foreign fields might be desirable, but that over any such unified system the Government if in any degree responsible for its operation, should have complete control.

He made the statement at the conclusion of the argument presented by Paul A. Porter, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in favor of unification but against the inclusion, as advocated by the Navy Department, of Government officials on the board of the proposed unified company. Subsequently Senator Wheeler declared (AP 3/25) that facilities for bringing news to the American press should operate independently of any post-war international communications monopoly. Preservation of Press Wireless, Inc., he said, was essential to American policy in the field of communications. He asserted that he was opposed to the Navy proposal but would favor government ownership of a private monopoly if the Government had to subsidize the monopoly. "I am doubtful in my own mind," he added, "whether we should turn over the Government's wartime investment of \$250,000,000 in communications facilities abroad to a private monopoly".

SOCIAL AND CIVIC PROBLEMS

JEWISH QUESTION

A delegation claiming to represent 5,000 Protestant clergymen called at the White House (International News Service 3/14) to enlist President Roosevelt's aid in opening Palestine in time to save Jewish survivors from "fascist terror." The petition presented by the group declared that "there can be no just peace for the world until there is a just peace for the Jews." Similar pleas were made to the British and Soviet embassies.

If a Jewish National Home is ever to be established in Palestine, immediate political action by the U.S. is imperative, it was agreed by Senator Robert A. Taft (R., Ohio) and Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, at a testimonial dinner to Dr. Silver in New York (DM 3/22). Senator Taft, co-author of a Senate resolution calling for a Palestine Commonwealth, said any arrangements made at the peace table would be virtually irrevocable. Dr. Silver said future world peace will be affected because if the Jewish people remain without status or national home, "against its own will and without any deliberate action on its part, it will become a focus of political tension, conflict and distress which may endanger the peace of the whole Middle East."

At a dinner in New York sponsored by the New Zionist Organization of America (NYT 3/19) Col. John Henry Patterson, commander of the Jewish Legion in World War 1, scored the British Government's administration in Palestine. He said British foreign policy was controlled by "a group of die-hard bureaucrats in key positions whose hatred for the Jews is equalled only by their greed for territory and lack of all morality in the attainment of their ends." He called on the State Department of this country to "stop following the policies of the British Foreign Office."

Speaking at a dinner in New York sponsored by the New Zionist Organization of America (NYT 3/19) Senator Edward C. Johnson (D., Colorado) criticized the recent talks of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Premier Stalin at Yalta because of failure to give the Jewish people a definite promise of a solution of the Palestine problem. "I listened with sorrow when the President said in his report to Congress that he had learned more about the Jewish

question in five minutes' talk with Ibn Saud than he could learn otherwise," said Senator Johnson. "This unfortunate remark dramatizes the spirit in which the whole subject of Palestine has been approached by those who would shape the world of tomorrow."

HUMAN RIGHTS

President Roosevelt was reported (NYT 3/21) to have expressed "sympathy and interest" in proposals for three commissions to be set up in the world organization by the San Francisco Conference, to deal with the questions of human rights, migrations and statelessness. The proposals were submitted to the President by ex-Justice Joseph M. Proskauer, formerly of the New York Supreme Court, and Jacob Blaustein, chairman, representing the American Jewish Committee. They announced that their organization had drawn up an interim report and specimen bill of rights which they would present to each individual member of the American delegation to the San Francisco meeting. Plans were being discussed with the State Department to place the proposal before the conference and obtain its incorporation in the structure of the United Nations organization.

FREE INTERCHANGE OF NEWS

In a letter to Joseph Leib, vice commander of the Vincent B. Costello Post of the American Legion (AP 3/17) Secretary of State Stettinius said: "The whole question of freedom of information has been under study in the Department of State for some time. It is our view that the acceptance by the United Nations of the principle of free access to and free exchange of information would be an important contribution toward establishing a permanent peace."

Recalling that the inter-American conference at Mexico City adopted a resolution calling for free exchange of information, the Secretary added:

"I think you will agree that the acceptance of the principles urged by the United States delegation at this conference is a long step forward."

Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, said in London (AP 3/27) that the agency planned to operate in Europe as long as both the Japanese and European conflicts lasted, but after the war "we are counting on the press associations to do the news job."

Mr. Davis said that the OWI planned to take part in the re-education of Germany after the war with "hard facts," but discounted the possibility that an official American Government news agency would be set up after the war. He said, however, that there was a plan for the State Department to absorb some of the OWI's information activities, such as gathering texts of speeches and official documents, in peacetime.

In addressing the House (NYT 3/13) Representative Daniel J. Flood (D., Pennsylvania) called on the San Francisco conferees to insert a world-wide "freedom-of-the-press" provision in any agreement to which they might subscribe. He said that in his opinion "availability of news and free communications" would be essential to a lasting peace.

The National Opinion Research Center, University of Denver, Colorado, put the following question to a nation-wide cross-section of adults: "After the war, do you think all newspaper reporters should be free to report everything they see going on in foreign countries, or do you think the governments of those countries should have a right to keep some reports from being sent out?" The results were: Reporters should be free to report what they see, 69%; Governments should have the right of censorship, 25%; Undecided, 100% (Opinion News 3/20). Of the suggestions recorded, the idea that censorship and secrecy of news may make wars more likely appeared most often. Of those who commented on the point that governments should have the right to censor news dispatches, the most common reaction was that all governments, including that of the United States, had a right to decide what news they wanted published.

MISCELLANEOUS

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING IN THE U.S.

Miss Dorothy Detzer, national secretary of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and veteran Washington peace leader, appealed to President Roosevelt (CSM 3/12) to settle the seething compulsory peacetime military training issue by getting conscription abolished around the world."

Miss Detzer was said to have drawn up her memorandum to the White House "because of her anxiety that the President's endorsement of postwar military training in the United States last Jan. 6 will lead to endless international rivalry in the establishment of permanent military organizations after the war." It was reported that Miss Detzer had "not received much encouragement in her effort at conscription abolition thus far, but she is hopeful of interesting Congress to the extent that it may pass a resolution urging the President to act." Miss Detzer was said to have found that her chief stumbling block was "doubtfulness of Russian willingness to adhere to a conscription abolition convention."

The Philadelphia Conference of the Methodist Church went on record (UP 3/12) as declaring that anything more than an Army and Navy recruited on a voluntary basis in the immediate post-war era would invite future wars from the present Axis nations.

GERMANY

Reporting on the Yalta Conference in Congress on March 1st, the President stated, "We did make it clear at this conference just what unconditional surrender does mean for Germany."

"It means the temporary control of Germany by Great Britain, Russia, France and the United States. Each of these nations will occupy and control a separate zone of Germany - and the administration of the four zones will be co-ordinated in Berlin by a control council composed of representatives of the four nations. "Unconditional surrender also means the end of Nazism and of the Nazi party - and all of its barbaric laws and institutions. It means the termination of all militaristic influence in the public, private and cultural life of Germany. It means for the Nazi war criminals a punishment that is speedy and just and severe. It means the complete disarmament of Germany; the destruction of its militarism and its military equipment; the end of its production of armament; the dispersal of all of its armed forces; the permanent dismemberment of the German general staff which has so often shattered the peace of the world. It means that Germany will have to make reparations in kind for the damage which it has done to the innocent victims of its aggression. By compelling reparations in kind - in plants and machinery and rolling stock and raw materials - we shall avoid the mistake made after the last war of demanding reparations in the form of money which Germany could never pay. We do not want the German people to starve or to become a burden on the rest of the world."

"Our objective in handling Germany is simple - it is to secure the peace of the future world. Too much experience has shown that that objective is impossible if Germany is allowed to retain any ability to wage aggressive war."

"That objective will not harm the German people. On the contrary, it will protect them from a repetition of the fate which the general staff and Kaiserism imposed on them before, and which Hitlerism is now imposing upon them again a hundred fold. It will be removing a cancer from the German body, which for generations has produced only misery and pain for the whole world."

Former President Herbert Hoover stated in one of a series of articles published for the North American Newspaper Alliance Inc., March 28th, that "Three years ago Mr. Gibson and I proposed that the enemy states must be completely disarmed and kept disarmed for an entire generation. We pointed out one of the great errors of the Treaty of Versailles in which Germany was permitted to retain a professional army of 100,000 men, supposedly for purposes of maintaining internal order. She was permitted to have a navy limited only in tonnage and types of ships."

"We stated that this leeway perpetuated her professional armies and navies. It perpetuated the warrior caste and all its traditions. It afforded a skeleton army and navy of skilled men ready for quick expansion. It insured the continuity of the general staff with its military skill, brains and ambitions. It perpetuated their know-how to make war. Repeated experience with the warrior caste of these nations in their intimidations, aggressions, blitzes, and attacks without even declaration of war should be enough for the world in this particular. We must make a better job of it this time. We should require total dissolution of the military establishments of all enemy nations and the substitution, for purposes of civic order, of a constabulary of the police type, excluding the whole officer and military caste from such organization. And we should prohibit the manufacture of arms of any kind. We could thus assure the disappearance of them and their know-how from the world. And if this were done, an occupying force of men of the United Nations of a hundred thousand men in Germany and a hundred thousand in Japan would suffice. But it will need to be kept there for a generation."

Rep. Gore (d., Tennessee), who recently returned from military service in Germany, predicted in Congress on March 19th that half of the population of Germany after the war will crowd into the third of Germany to be under American control in the post-war years. He suggested in his speech furthermore that "as permanent security against future German aggression, Germany be occupied permanently after the war, and the German nation be broken up as a unified political and military entity."

James B. Conant, President of Harvard University, is the author of an article in Life (Apr. 2nd) in which he states "I submit that if we begin our approach to the problem of the disarmament of Germany and Japan by saying what must be done because of economic repercussions, we have already decided against the proposition we are considering - against the proposition that effective disarmament of our enemies is an absolute first condition for world peace... To those who say that Europe will be in chaos for a decade without the rebuilding of industrial Germany, I would reply: which is worse, the scene you depict or a third world war?"

The author's special proposals for controlling German industry are taken largely from the Brookings Institute publication, "The Control of Germany and Japan," by Moulton and Marlio. He cited, for example, "the excellent suggestion that Germany's main source of electrical power be located beyond her borders." In general, Dr. Conant's thesis is that German industry must be so weakened that it cannot be used for rearmament. "It would take a number of years to rebuild the industrial strength of a nation once that strength has been destroyed." Under this plan he points out, military occupation of Germany could stop eventually, and control be taken over by "a corps of technical ^{men} responsible to an international organization." He stresses the importance of thorough inspection and regular reports to the organization.

ADDITIONAL PUBLIC OPINION

Fortune for March contained a lengthy poll conducted by Elmo Roper on the treatment of Germany after victory. First, a comparison was made between public opinion in the U.S. regarding the treatment of Germany in January 1944 and March 1945.

"We have listed a number of things here that might be done with Germany when we are victorious. Do you think the United Nations should or should not--

	January 1944 Survey		This survey	
	Should	Should Not	Should	Should not
Abolish the Nazi party	87.9%	3.2%	93.0%	1.8%
Completely demobilize the German army and keep them from having any army again	77.2%	13.0%	84.7%	9.3%
Govern Germany with an occupation force for several years	73.2%	11.4%	85.5%	6.3%
Break Germany up into smaller states	29.5%	40.5%	40.5%	33.7%
Prevent the Germans from rebuilding their steel, chemical and automotive industries	30.9%	52.8%	43.0%	41.0%
Make German labor rebuild devastated areas in other countries at the rate usually paid prisoners of war	46.1%	31.9%	62.4%	21.8%

In his syndicated column of March 22nd, Walter Lippmann stated that we are witnessing the disintegration of Germany as a national state, and he goes on. "Then since Germany cannot be built up again as she was unless we deliberately finance her - which we shall not do - and since Europe will still need Germany but not the old Germany, the Germans will be given the opportunity, and no doubt assistance, in building up a different Germany."

In his syndicated column of March 24th he expressed the opinion that Germany within herself lacks the means to restore her former industrial system, which has to be "drastically altered." He puts the question thereafter whether German economy should be restored by American credits like in the 1920s, in order to make Germany productive enough to export reparations, or if the industrial development of the rest of Europe should be taken as "our objective," so that Germany would be compelled and induced to develop an economic system which is not an industrially dominant part of European economy. Mr. Lippmann sees as the evolution of Allied policy to build up Europe before Germany will be built up again, so that Europe shall not again be economically dependent

upon Germany, and he goes on: "The institutional structure will have been so broken down everywhere, and in many parts so pulverized, that we cannot yet imagine how Germany is to be governed by the Allies, and how from the ruin a German political society is to be constructed again."

Look magazine of March 20th contained an article by Major George Fielding Eliot in which he expressed the opinion that it seems likely that there may be no armistice day to mark the end of the war against the Nazis, but that "for years there will be the grim and bloody task of beating down the dwindling but ferocious resistance of desperation and fanaticism."

In his broadcast over the Blue Network on March 25th, Walter Winchell drew attention to Major Gen. John Frederick Charles Fuller, British Army retired, and associated with a New York magazine, the Fascist Quarterly, to which in 1935 Major Gen. Fuller contributed articles together with Alfred Rosenberg.

JAPAN

Little press comment was noted during the period under review but a new book by Wilfred Fleisher, formerly Tokyo correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "What To Do With Japan" (Doubleday, Doran, \$2.00) was widely reviewed. Summarising its essentials in the Saturday Review of Literature (3/17), T.A. Bisson, Research Associate of the International Secretariat, Institute of Pacific Relations, said that the program developed by Mr. Fleisher "combines a series of stringent postwar controls with a minimum of basic changes in Japan's social and political structure."

"How Should We Deal With a Defeated Japan?" was the subject of a debate organized by America's Town Meeting of the Air and broadcast over the Blue Network on March 15. Among the speakers were Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, formerly Commander-in-chief of the U.S. Asiatic Fleet, Otto Tolischus, former New York Times correspondent in Tokyo and Mr. Wilfred Fleisher. A verbatim account of the discussion appeared in Town Meeting, a bulletin published by America's Town Meeting of the Air.

There was a good deal of discussion on the question of Pacific Island bases. Broadcasting over the Mutual system (3/14) Cecil Brown, radio commentator, predicted that at the San Francisco Conference "a proposal will be made that former Japanese territories should be administered by two or more powers that serve as trustees." An Associated Press dispatch from Washington (3/14) also referred to a similar proposal which, the dispatch said, apparently was discussed at Yalta. Another Associated Press dispatch from Washington (3/24) quoted the Army and Navy Journal as saying that "no one doubts" that the U.S. will retain unilateral control of mandated islands captured from Japan, despite any proposals for international trusteeship. Among the periodicals which carried articles on the subject were the Saturday Evening Post ("Our Dubious Empire", William L. Warden, 3/17) and the American Magazine "Naval Bases we Must Keep After The War" John Janney, March).

Another book which attracted a good deal of attention was "Solution in Asia" by Owen Lattimore (Little, Brown, \$2.00). Reviewing it for the New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Review, A.T. Steele, formerly Far Eastern correspondent of the Chicago Daily News, wrote: "American thinking about Japan both before and after Pearl Harbor comes in for acid treatment from Mr. Lattimore's critical pen. He considers it likely that the Japanese people will overturn the imperial throne unless we prevent it, and thinks that 'we would make the worst possible mistake in trying to use for our own purposes either the present emperor or a successor nominated by us.' For, if Hirohito is retained in apparent power and authority, Japanese militarists working underground will be able to persuade the people that the old system still exists and can be restored in full."

D. 11. 11
+ II 4

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

MANDATED AREAS
AND THE
UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Revised Issue

BACKGROUND INFORMATION RE: PROBLEMS OF TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY

Discussions in San Francisco of the chapter of the United Nations Charter concerning the setting up of a trusteeship system for dependent territories, reveal a problem with regard to how a territory, at present administered by a trustee power under a mandate granted after the last war, can legally be brought within the jurisdiction of the Charter. Attached are extracts from relevant documents-----the Versailles Treaty, the Treaty of Lausanne, the Covenant of the League of Nations, and certain records discussing the question of "title" to the territories, etc.

The working paper on which Delegates of the United Nations are working, outlines certain principles of administration of dependent peoples under an International trusteeship system. It does not, and could not state the areas for which these principles should apply, but it indicates that it is intended to cover three categories of territories:

1. Lands now held under mandates (unless members of the United Nations)
2. Lands which may be detached from enemy states as a result of this war.
3. Lands which may be voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration.

Before any actual territory can, however, be brought within the jurisdiction of the Charter, some legal arrangements would have to be made with regard to title and responsibility. In the case of lands which may be detached from enemy states as a result of this war, those states would legally have to surrender their title, in the case of any future lands voluntarily placed under the system those holding present titles have the authority to take action, but in the case of those territories taken from ex-enemy states following the first world war it is problematic who can take action on their behalf.

Those territories "not yet able to stand alone" were ceded to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, ⁽¹⁾ who appointed certain powers to administer them under mandates as trustees accountable to the League of Nations. Four views, at least, are held, as to where title rests to act for these territories. Some say that it still rests with the Principal Allied and Associated Powers to whom the territories were ceded, others say it rests with the powers appointed as administrators, still others say it rests with the League of Nations to which the administrators were accountable, and finally, others say it rests with the people themselves in the dependencies concerned.

In connection with the last named, a statement of ideals associated with the name of Lord Lugard might well be recalled, that there is a "dual mandate" and that the territories should be administered and developed both for the benefit of the indigenous inhabitants and for the world as a whole.

The following extracts from relevant documents give, briefly, the background facts of the problem -- the origin of the mandate system, and various grounds for determining where rests title to these dependent territories.

Origin of the Mandates System

Under the Treaty of Versailles, Germany surrendered to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers (Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the United States) title to certain dependent areas in Africa and the Pacific, and by the Treaty of Lausanne, Turkey surrendered, amongst other areas, certain territories in Asia Minor, such as Syria, Lebanon and Iraq.

Thus Articles 118 and 119 of the Versailles Treaty read:

"In territory outside her European frontiers as fixed by the present Treaty, Germany renounces all rights, titles and privileges whatever in or over territory which belonged to her or to her allies, and all rights, titles and privileges whatever their origin which she held as against the Allied and Associated Powers."

"Germany hereby undertakes to recognize and to conform to the measures which may be taken now or in the future by the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, in agreement where necessary with third Powers, in order to carry the above stipulation into effect."

"In particular, Germany declares her acceptance of the following Articles relating to certain special subjects." (text continues with Section 1: German Colonies etc.)

Article 119: "Germany renounces in favor of the Principal Allied and Associated Powers all her rights and titles over her overseas possessions."

1) Specifically, only Germany surrendered her rights and titles over her overseas possessions to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers, as will be seen from Art. 119 of the Versailles Treaty quoted in a following paragraph. As regards Turkey, it was not stated in Article 16 of the Lausanne Treaty in favor of whom she renounced her rights and title.

And the Treaty of Lausanne in part reads:

Article 16: "Turkey hereby renounces all rights and title whatsoever over or respecting the territories situated outside the frontiers laid down in the present Treaty and the islands other than those over which her sovereignty is recognized by the said Treaty, the future of those territories and islands being settled or to be settled by the parties concerned.

"The provisions of the present Article do not prejudice any special arrangements arising from neighborly relations which have been or may be concluded between Turkey and any limitrophe countries."

The Covenant of the League in Article 22 laid down the principles of the mandatory system.

Article 22: 1. "To those colonies and territories which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world, there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this Covenant.

2. "The best method of giving practical effect to this principle is that the tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility, and who are willing to accept it, and that this tutelage should be exercised by them as Mandatories on behalf of the League.

3. "The character of the mandate must differ according to the stage of the development of the people, the geographical situation of the territory, its economic conditions and other similar circumstances.

4. "Certain communities formerly belonging to the Turkish Empire have reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of the Mandatory.

5. "Other peoples, especially those of Central Africa, are at such a stage that the Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion, subject only to the maintenance of public order and morals, the prohibition of abuses such as the slave trade, the arms traffic and the liquor traffic, and the prevention of the establishment of fortifications or military and naval bases and of military training of the natives for other than police purposes and the defense of territory, and will also secure equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of other Members of the League.

6. "There are territories, such as Southwest Africa and certain of the South Pacific islands, which, owing to the sparseness of their population, or their small size, or their remoteness from the centers of civilization, or their geographical contiguity to the territory of the Mandatory, and other circumstances, can be best administered under the laws of the Mandatory as integral portions of its territory, subject to the safeguards above mentioned in the interests of the indigenous population.

7. "In every case of mandate, the Mandatory shall render to the Council an annual report in reference to the territory committed to its charge.

8. "The degree of authority, control, or administration to be exercised by the Mandatory shall, if not previously agreed upon by Members of the League, be explicitly defined in each case by the Council.

9. A permanent Commission shall be constituted to receive and examine the annual reports of the Mandatories and to advise the Council on all matters relating to the observance of the mandates.

It will be seen that Article 22 of the Covenant divides mandates into three types later designated as "A", "B", and "C" mandates according to whether they fall under Section 4, 5 or 6 above recorded.

Title to the Mandated Territories

It is difficult to say exactly with whom title rests to the mandated territories, categories "B" and "C", i.e. territories not able to stand on their own feet and which for indefinite periods were placed under the administration of mandate powers. It is clear that (1) the defeated Powers surrendered their title to the Five Principal Allied Powers,¹⁾ (2) that those Powers then allocated the mandates which were defined and confirmed by the Council of the League of Nations.

It may be pointed out that as far as "C" mandates were concerned, Article 22 of the Covenant provided that they could be "best administered under the laws of the mandatory as integral portions of its territory." This phrase has been variously interpreted, Field Marshal Smuts holding, for example, that this meant that actual sovereignty resided in the mandatory power, while others have contested this interpretation.

The following two extracts give a picture of some of the divergent views on the question: the first is an extract from the official record of the League of Nations, the second is an authoritative appraisal of the views of various international jurists.

As example of official statements, M. W. Rappard, Director of the Mandates Section of the League of Nations, in his report in 1921 said in part:

"During the war the colonial problem presented itself very clearly. The enemy states, former sovereigns of the territories which were to be subsequently placed under Mandates, had been accused of mal-administration and abuses of every kind. A hope of freedom had been kindled in the populations of these territories. It was impossible, therefore, once the peace was signed, to return to the status quo ante, such a solution could not have been adopted, for practical reasons, while annexation pure and simple would have been in contradiction with the principles which secured the victory to the Allies. The Mandatory System formed a kind of compromise between the proposition advanced by the advocates of annexation, and the proposition put forward by those who wished to entrust the colonial territories to an international administration.

"From these facts certain general principles might be deduced.

1) Any consideration of the problem of legal title to mandated territories will also have to take into account the fact that the five Principal Allied and Associated Powers include Italy and Japan, which during the present war were enemy states. In the measure that the Principal Allied and Associated Powers of the last war may be regarded as having any rights in respect of the mandated territories, Italy and Japan are precisely in the same position as Great Britain, France and the United States. Such countries do not lose those rights merely by the fact of becoming enemy states or even by the fact of being defeated. Their rights may be considered to exist until they have been extinguished, e.g. in peace treaties with Italy and Japan.

"The Mandatory Powers had assumed a responsibility similar to that of a guardian with respect to his ward. The interests of the natives were therefore of primary importance, and the rights of all the Members of the League of Nations must always be respected. It was in order to complete the League of Nations by a work of pacification that these colonies were entrusted to certain Powers, subject to their securing equal opportunities for the trade and commerce of all the members of the League, and subject also, to their being responsible to the League. Great moderation was exercised in this respect: the Mandatory Powers were only obliged to submit to the Council a single annual report on their administration."

M. Rappard then proceeded to analyze Art. 22

"What then had been done since the Covenant entered into force? A question of principle had been settled regarding the competence of the Supreme Council and of the Council of the League, respectively. The former German possessions had not been handed over - in virtue of the Treaties - to the League of Nations, but to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers. As to the former Turkish possessions, the Treaty of Sevres, which had not yet been ratified, laid down that these should be ceded to the Principal Allied Powers. It was the Supreme Council, therefore, which had disposed of these territories and which had divided them between the so-called Mandatory Powers. This took place at Versailles and at San Remo....."

M. Rappardpointed out that the allocation of the territories was an accomplished fact which did not concern the League of Nations, nor consequently the Commission. The allocation of the mandated territories had been made by the Supreme Council, and it was for the Council of the League of Nations to determine the manner in which Art. 22, was to be applied. (L.O.N. Permanent Mandates Commission. Minutes of the First Session, held in Geneva, Oct. 4-8, 1921. C.416. M.296. 1921. VI.)

With regard to views of international jurists, Professor Quincy Wright in his book "Mandates under the League of Nations" (1930 Chicago University Press) says in part:

"No less than ten theories of the location of sovereignty have been offered, though many of these have a close-enough affiliation with others to admit of a grouping under four heads, which attribute sovereignty to

- a) the Principal Allied (and Associated) Powers
- b) the mandatories
- c) the mandated communities
- d) the League.....

"Our examination of about fifty juristic discussions of the mandates system though affording clear evidence that no doctrine as to the location of sovereignty has been generally accepted does indicate some tendencies. Jurists are inclined to divide on national lines. Americans and Englishmen have often attributed sovereignty to the Principal Allied and Associated Powers though the latter have frequently favored the mandatories. Theories of divided and suspended sovereignty, frequently influenced by the analogy of trusteeship, have been especially prominent among the Anglo-Saxons. Germans and Austrians, impressed by the phrase "mandate in behalf of the League" have nearly always attributed sovereignty to the League, while French jurists, greatly influenced by the analogy of "tutelage", have been inclined to regard the mandated communities themselves as sovereign, though a few French writers are to be found in every group. Italians, like the Anglo-Saxons, have tended to attribute sovereignty to the Principal Powers or to the mandatories. The latter opinion has very seldom been maintained in juristic writings from other non-mandatory nationalities, though publicists of a cynical disposition have done so, especially Americans.

"Theories that attribute sovereignty in full or in part to the League of Nations are supported by the largest number of jurists distributed over the largest number of nationalities, and have steadily gained in adherents. Juristic writings from 1924 to 1928 have more often accorded sovereignty to the League of Nations than those from 1920 to 1924. Second in number of adherents is the theory vesting at least "virtual" sovereignty in the mandated communities themselves, and this also has increased in relative popularity as the years have passed.

"The theory attributing sovereignty to the Principal Powers has continued to find supporters, and they are distributed among a large number of nationalities.

"While at first jurists, especially of the Mandatory Powers, inclined to attribute sovereignty to the mandatories, the definite position against this theory taken officially by the League and the Mandatory Governments has made it hardly tenable and few have asserted it in recent years. Those that have, consider it a qualified sovereignty which does not amount to "annexation" of the territories or partial sovereignty shared with the League or with the native communities....."

1)

LIST OF LEAGUE MANDATES IN 1939

ASIA

Territories subject to an "A" Mandate:

The Lebanon)	under the Mandate of France.
Syria		
Palestine)	under the Mandate of the United Kingdom.
Trans-Jordan		

AFRICA

Territories subject to a "B" Mandate:

Togoland)	under the Mandate of the United Kingdom.
The Cameroons		
Tanganyika		
Togoland)	under the Mandate of France.
The Cameroons		
Ruanda-Urundi)	Under the Mandate of Belgium.

Territory subject to a "C" Mandate:

South West Africa under the Mandate of the Union of South Africa.

THE PACIFIC

Territories under a "C" Mandate:

The Marianas, Caroline, and Marshall Islands, under the Mandate of Japan.

New Guinea (north-eastern part), New Ireland, New Britain and the Solomon Islands, under the Mandate of Australia.

Nauru, under the Mandate of the British Empire exercised through Australia.

Western Samoa, under the Mandate of New Zealand.

1)

Essential Facts about the League of Nations; Tenth edition, revised (Geneva: Information Section, 1939)

UNITED NATIONS INFORMATION OFFICE

An agency of—the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, France, Great Britain, Greece, India, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, The Philippines, Poland, South Africa and Yugoslavia; the Danish Legation and the government of the United States of America.

610 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 20, N. Y.

CIRCLE 5-8060

AFTER SIGNING A CHARTER

*Yemen
Macao*

Some notes on problems of the interim period from the date of agreement upon a Charter until the formation of a World Organization: comparisons with 1919.

Before the UNCIO Conference at San Francisco closes, a charter for the general United Nations organization will be signed, but some time will elapse before that document is ratified and the organization will come into formal existence. In the meanwhile, questions will arise such as the formation of a preparatory staff, arrangements for a permanent Secretariat, custody of the archives of the present Conference, and selection of a seat for the new organization etc. In this connection some parallels with what happened after World War I may be useful.

On April 28th 1919, the Peace Conference at Paris unanimously adopted a draft Covenant for the League of Nations, but it was not until nearly 260 days later, on January 10th, 1920, that the Covenant came into force. A special commission of the Peace Conference, under the chairmanship of President Wilson, had prepared this draft Covenant of the League. While no general conference of nations was called to discuss the Covenant, as is the case for the United Nations Charter today, some opportunity was given to the public to express views and suggest changes through the publication of the Draft Covenant of February 14th. Their views were reflected to a certain extent, in the various amendments, approved by the Conference on April 28th, 1919.

The League Covenant, though it did not become operative until the following January, made provision for an immediate start by naming, in an annex, the first Secretary-General, Sir James Eric Drummond.

Sir Eric Drummond, as secretary to Mr. (afterwards Lord) Balfour of the British Delegation, had for some time worked in a preparatory committee including officials of several delegations at the Peace Conference, who had met regularly while the Covenant was being drafted and had worked out detailed plans for organization and staff.

The site for the League, Geneva, was also named in the Covenant. Lausanne, Geneva, Aix-la-Chapelle, Constantinople, Vienna and The Hague had previously been mentioned. The Belgian representative, Mr. Hymans, had conveyed "the great desire of the Belgian Government and a large number of Belgian organizations that Brussels should be the seat of the League." President Wilson however was strongly in favor of Geneva as the site, and when submitted to a vote, at one of the working commissions, in Paris, on April 11th, 1919, the site at Geneva was supported by USA, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Serbia, Greece, Roumania, and Brazil, and the selection of Brussels for the site was supported by France, Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, and Portugal. The decision thus fell in favor of Geneva.

Creation of the Secretariat

Sir Eric Drummond was named the first Secretary-General of the League, in an annex to the draft Covenant adopted on April 28th, 1919. He was authorized to start immediately the work of organizing the League of Nations. In an interview granted to a Central News representative on May 30th, 1919, he made the following statement:

"The League has no official or legal existence until the Treaty of Peace is signed and ratified. An examination of the terms of the Treaty will show, however, that as soon as its provisions become effective, certain duties at once will devolve upon the League....

It is, therefore, clearly necessary to make general provisions for the immediate and effective action of the League. To this purpose I am selecting the personnel of the Secretariat. Any scheme of organization must be approved by the Committee appointed by the Plenary Conference, and all appointments ratified by the Council. We are working out plans for a truly international Secretariat. Its members will have an international character of mind. They must divest themselves of national preconceptions. Its members are not to be appointed by or to be regarded as the representatives of their respective nations. When important national interests are involved, it will be found essential that Prime Ministers and Foreign Secretaries should attend meetings of the Council and Assembly.

The Secretariat must show an entirely impartial aspect. There must be one guiding principle, that of securing really first-rate men and women interested heart and soul in the success of the League. Their quick response is the finest augury for the League's success."

The first formal approval of the plans for the organization is contained in a report presented by the British Representative, Mr. A. J. Balfour, and adopted by the Council of the League of Nations, meeting in Rome, May 19th, 1920. Extracts from this report run as follows:

"The Secretary-General of the League was appointed by the Treaty of Versailles...."

Soon after the appointment was thus made by treaty, the Peace Conference, acting in plenary session, appointed a Committee to deal with the first stages of organization. The Committee represented the nine Powers who sent representatives to the Council. Monsiour Pichon, then Foreign Minister of France, presided. They gave authority to the Secretary-General to make the necessary arrangements for the appointment of a staff, and they also fixed the amount of his remuneration....

As soon as these preliminary steps were accomplished, the Secretary-General set to work to collect the nucleus of his staff."

Interim Site for the Secretariat

Pending the provision of permanent quarters, the British Government provided temporary quarters in London. A member of the staff of that time, Mr. Arthur Sweetser, describes those first days as follows:

"Two buildings were made available by the British Government as the original home of the League's Secretariat. The first was Sunderland House on Curzon Street.....The second, provided later as the staff expanded, was a converted building fronting on Picadilly.....The staff soon obtained in those very British surroundings their first sense of homogeneity, together with certain British methods, particularly as regards correspondence, filing, document distribution, which followed on to Geneva and became a permanent part of the organization."

Financing the Interim Secretariat

First plans for financing the proposed League were to divide the costs in the proportions of contribution to the Universal Postal Union. Later experience showed that this had to be modified and division of costs worked out on a more equitable basis. There were no specific provisions, however, for financing the interim Secretariat. The British government however, granted credits against expected repayments, other contributions came from France.

Problems of early finance are described in the following extract from "The Origin, Structure, and Working of the League of Nations" by C. Howard-Ellis, (Boston 1928).

"During its first months of existence the League had no permanent quarters - for it was touch-and-go whether Switzerland would become a member - was provisionally housed in London and lived precariously on over-drafts from the bank and advances from the British and French governments."

Conclusion

It will be seen that no time was wasted in the development of the League Organization. The Draft Covenant was approved on April 28th, 1919, the Secretariat started work on June 10th, 1919. The Covenant came into operation on January 10th, 1920, the first session of the Council was opened in Paris on January 16th, 1920.