

GL 341.231
COY REV.ED.



107245
LBSNAA

स्त्री प्रशासन अकादमी
Shastric Academy

Administration

मसूरी

MUSSOORIE

पुस्तकालय

LIBRARY

107245

अवाप्ति संख्या

Accession No ~~24773~~

वर्ग संख्या

Class No 341.231

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No Coy Rev. ed.

International Organization for Peace and Security

Completely revised to keep abreast of important developments in international affairs, the new edition of this useful and authoritative reference book gives a thoughtful and objective analysis of how the United Nations and its various organs, related agencies, and commissions came into being, how they operate, and what they are doing in their work to attain lasting peace and better living conditions all over the world. Here, too, is an inspiring, lucid interpretation of the responsibilities of the international civil servants in the Secretariat who assist all UN organs in translating the purposes and principles of the UN Charter into action.

David Cushman Coyle, author and noted authority on world affairs, explains the structure of the UN Charter, the responsibilities of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, and also the various UN specialized agencies—working in the fields of education, economics, science, health, agriculture, trade, transportation, and communication.

Mr. Coyle clearly analyzes the debates and recommendations of this great body on disarmament, control of the atom, collective security, the Suez crisis, and the whole ceaseless struggle for human rights and the economic and social well-being of all peoples.

For handy reference, the complete Charter and a list of the principal organs, agencies, and commissions of the UN are included.

BY DAVID CUSHMAN COYLE:

The United States Political System and How it Works (#Ks303—35¢) A brilliant account of the development of the oldest constitutional government in the world and how it functions.

Published with UNESCO:

Cultural Patterns and Technical Change (#MD134—50¢) Edited for The World Federation for Mental Health by Margaret Mead. A study of the impact of modern technical advances on traditional life in five representative old societies.

TO OUR READERS: We welcome your comments about any SIGNET, SIGNET KEY, or MENTOR Book. If your dealer does not have the books you want, you may order them by mail, enclosing the list price plus 5¢ a copy to cover mailing. Send for our free catalog. The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 501 Madison Avenue, New York 22, New York.

The United Nations

AND HOW IT WORKS

REVISED AND UP-TO-DATE

David Cushman Coyle

With an introduction by

AHMED S. BOKHÁRI



A MENTOR BOOK

Published by THE NEW AMERICAN LIBRARY

COPYRIGHT, 1955, BY DAVID CUSHMAN COYLE
© 1958 BY DAVID CUSHMAN COYLE

All rights reserved.

FIRST PRINTING, MAY, 1955
THIRD PRINTING (REVISED), APRIL, 1958

Library of Congress Catalog Card No. 55-7776

*MENTOR BOOKS are published by
The New American Library of World Literature, Inc.
501 Madison Avenue, New York 22, New York*

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

Introduction by Ahmed S. Bokhári	vii
Foreword	ix
1. The Grass Roots	13
2. Education, Science, and Culture	30
3. Money and Trade	41
4. Technical Services	53
5. Human Rights	60
6. Non-Self-Governing Peoples	78
7. International Disputes	88
8. Korea	106
9. Regional Arrangements	116
10. Disarmament	130
11. The Organization of the United Nations	143
12. The Philosophy of the United Nations	153
Appendix A	168
Appendix B	172
Index	204

To my wife
DORIS PORTER COYLE
with deep appreciation
for many hours of research
and for the benefit
of her judgment and editorial help
in the writing of this book

INTRODUCTION

Mr. David Cushman Coyle has studied the structure and the activities of the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies with a robust sense of the realities. The reader, therefore, need not fear that in this book he is being offered an anthology of platitudes with which demagogues eke out their speeches, leaving their listeners empty. In fact, Mr. Coyle has given a great deal of attention to what he aptly calls "the ground-level workings of the United Nations."

Yet he dreams too, dreams like all good men, of lasting peace and happiness. For he knows that although membership of the United Nations is through national governments, deep down the foundations of the United Nations rest upon the longings of the people. "We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to . . .": that is the opening sentence of the Charter, and no amount of repetition can dull its meaning.

Of man's fight against hunger, disease, and poverty, Mr. Coyle writes with great warmth, and there is no doubt that even the most emotionally sluggish amongst us will feel the glow when they read him and are infected with his enthusiasm. Through such a realistic, factual account of the United Nations as this can be seen the great possibilities that lie ahead. Mr. Coyle's analysis of the United Nations' political role is also heartening and presents complicated facts in simple distillation.

So those of us who like to judge the United Nations by its "achievements" will find much even in this small book which will strengthen their faith in man's capacity to shed the habits of the jungle. There will, however, be others who will regard the institution itself as proof of man's wisdom and count its very existence to be a gain. Both should welcome this book as a step forward in bringing the United Nations and the peoples of the world nearer each other.

The views expressed in this book are, of course, Mr. Coyle's own.

AHMED S. BOKHÁRI
Under-Secretary for the Department
of Public Information, United Nations

FOREWORD

In the spring of 1945 World War II was plainly drawing to a close. Millions of people had died in that war; millions more were homeless, hungry, and cold. The people of the whole world longed for a lasting peace. The victims of war devastation, and hundreds of millions who suffered grinding poverty even in peacetime, longed also for an escape from poverty, hunger, and disease. All over the world, too, wherever people lived under foreign domination or home-grown oppression, there was a growing demand for freedom and justice.

These deep desires for peace and for better conditions of life were joined in the great conference at San Francisco in the spring of 1945, when the nations combined their efforts in the organization of the United Nations.

The UN was organized to deal with the quarrels between nations that might lead to war. At the same time, the UN and its many working agencies have been helping the member nations in the agelong fight against human misery, injustice, and oppression.

The main purposes of the United Nations are not in conflict. It is clear that peace is necessary if the people of the world are to be free and prosperous. But peace does not come by accident; it has to be built by many kinds of action working together to provide for collective security and to remove the causes of war. United efforts to build a more prosperous world by cooperation among people of different nations and races may also help to lay the foundations for a lasting peace. People who work together against the hostile forces of nature often become friends. And finally, the united pressure of world opinion in support of human rights will in time help to reduce some of the causes of war among the peoples of the world.

The material works of the UN agencies—helping to build dams, to kill mosquitoes, to teach people to read—and its spiritual works, such as framing the Declaration of Human Rights, may be fully as important for peace as the great conferences and the search for a way to control the atom.

World-wide struggles against the hostile forces of nature are easily understood by millions of people who feel baffled by the harder problems of quarreling human nature. These material works of the UN therefore serve as a background for the UN efforts to hold the conflicts of human nature below the explosion point. The UN does not pretend that it can surely persuade or force all men to work together in harmony all the time. But it can help to bring world opinion to bear on many kinds of disputes that if left to fester between enemies might break out into deadly war.

The United Nations can talk about the rights of man, and by such talk can put moral pressure on nations where people are treated in ways that the world regards as wrong. The United Nations can take an interest in colonial peoples and in their progress toward independence or self-government—an interest that the governing powers cannot lightly brush aside.

The United Nations has been able to stop or to prevent several wars since 1945, notably in Palestine and Kashmir. In Korea the UN forces beat back the aggression. There can, of course, be no absolute guarantee that any organization on earth could surely prevent a third great war and the possible suicide of the human race. But much can be done to make that doom less likely; and much of it is being done in the United Nations.

In the United Nations, the human race is brought together, with all its virtues and faults, its wisdom and folly, and its good and ill will. This is not a world government. This is a world meeting to talk over the pressing dangers of our times and to hunt for the way to prosperity and world peace. It cannot rule the world by making and enforcing a world law with planes and atom bombs. But it can bring to bear the moral weight of world opinion. The recommendations of the Assembly of the United Nations may be all the more effective because they do not demand obedience but only ask a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

The organization of the United Nations and how it operates are described at some length in Chapter XI. At this point it will be enough to describe briefly the main features of the UN organization.

At the center is the General Assembly, where every

member nation is represented and has one vote. No nation has a veto power in the General Assembly.

The Security Council has eleven members. Five of these are the permanent members: Britain, China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United States of America. In voting on measures classed as "substantive" rather than "procedural," a motion cannot in most cases pass unless all the five permanent members vote for it. That is, each of these nations has a "veto." The difference between substantive and procedural is supposed to be related to the difference between actions on the merits of a question and actions affecting only the internal arrangements of the Council's work, but there naturally are likely to be disputes as to how a particular question is to be classified.

The six nonpermanent members of the Security Council are elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms, and do not have the veto power.

The International Court of Justice is made up of fifteen judges elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council.

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) consists of the representatives of eighteen member states chosen by the General Assembly. This council has many committees, commissions, and affiliated agencies, dealing with international cooperation in all kinds of work from fighting epidemics to carrying the international mails.

The Trusteeship Council supervises the administration of various territories that are governed by certain Powers as trustees. The Council considers reports and petitions and makes periodic visits to inspect the territories.

A list of the principal UN agencies, with their abbreviations, is given in Appendix A. The Charter, adopted in San Francisco in 1945 to be the Constitution of the United Nations, is given in full in Appendix B.

THE GRASS ROOTS

The United Nations Headquarters in New York is a strange place where the top of the organized human race breaks through the surface. In the gallery of the Assembly you can listen to a speaker talking in a foreign tongue. Or you can put on the earphones and hear the translator giving the speech in your own language, and yet it may not sound real.

It is often real enough, however, for this is the point of contact where contending nations can grind ponderously together, striving to get what they want without the fearful costs of military war. The grinding is real, though the words themselves may seem obscure. These people are talking about something. There must be more here than meets the eye.

There is more than meets the eye. Back of the delegates are not only their nations, each with its own interests and strategy. There is also the UN itself, with its Charter and institutions, to muster the moral and material forces of mankind. The UN rests on the faith and hope of the millions of people who look to it to take their part against the danger of war and the troubles of peace. And down in the grass roots of the world, where millions of people have never learned to read or write, these people are seeing the ground-level workings of the United Nations.

Down in the grass roots the UN is building its foundations by helping people to get more to eat, and to be free of epidemic diseases, and to start hoping for a better future. The people who see that side of it soon come to understand what it means.

The Better Future

Most of the people on earth are not as well off as the people of the Western World. Children born in Southeast Asia, for instance, can expect to live about thirty years. In the United States, the average lifetime for men is sixty-four years and for women sixty-nine. In New Zealand

it is several years longer. These long average lifetimes reflect comparative freedom from disease, ignorance, and poverty.

A hundred years ago the people in Western countries died young. Since then there have been changes, caused mainly by science and invention. These changes prove that many of the age-old troubles of mankind can now be reduced to small proportions or even totally abolished. All over the world those who still suffer show signs of discontent. They feel something new in the air, as if there might be an escape from their troubles, if they could only find it.

In the lands where people suffer from unnecessary ignorance, poverty, and disease, the United Nations brings a new hope. If there is time, and if the atom does not first wipe out civilization, the work of the UN among the grass roots may yet save the human race from despair.

Rice

About half the people in the world live mostly on rice. Most of the rice-eating people are poor. Rice, therefore, is a key to the main problem of survival in many overcrowded areas around the world.

Different countries have different systems for growing rice, some better than others. And there are two main kinds of rice, *japonica* and *indica*. Japonica rice in Japan yields about three times as much per acre as indica in India, but India cannot adopt japonica because it is a temperate-zone plant. The indica is suited to the tropics. This is a case for hybrids, some of which may combine the high yield of japonica with indica's ability to stand the tropical climate.

The Government of India is host to a Rice Research Station, sponsored by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization and ten other Asian countries. The program consists of crossing varieties of japonica and indica and selecting the hybrids that can be used in various countries. No one standard hybrid can be expected to turn out best for all climates and methods of cultivation.

In course of time the traditional methods of rice growing will be studied and improved. There are great differences in the rice yield per acre in various countries. Japan produces 2,350 pounds of rice per acre, while the U.S.A. rice fields yield only 1,390 pounds per acre. Both countries plant japonica rice, but in Japan where land is scarce, more labor is put into the acre. The United States has

plenty of rice land and labor is costly, so the planters use machines. They get a lower yield per acre but at a low cost per ton. Both methods are generally well suited to the conditions in which they are used, but they are not necessarily as efficient as they might become with more international exchange of information.

Farmers are slower in changing their methods of cultivation than they are in accepting new kinds of seed. This is a reason for the urgency of the hybridization project. Hybrid corn (maize) has already shown such increases over the yields of ordinary corn that it is rapidly becoming universal. In view of the great differences in yields between different strains of rice, the chances for a revolutionary improvement in most of the rice-growing countries are encouraging.

At the present stage, the UN work in rice breeding is unknown to the millions of people who may benefit from it. But it is not a high theory that will remain forever in the minds of learned technicians. As the new seeds are introduced the people will see the exciting change in their own lives, when the same land and the same year's labor will bring forth twice as much to eat. For people who are almost always hungry, that will seem like something to build a new world upon.

As a matter of fact, these simple grass-roots developments are usually far more profitable than ordinary business or industrial enterprises. An expenditure of half a million dollars in one of these programs can easily add a hundred million dollars to the total output of a country. This is one reason why a developing country can afford to contribute most of the cost of such projects, except for what has to be paid in foreign money. As development goes on beyond the simplest improvements in agriculture and public health, the rate of return comes down to the usual commercial and industrial percentages and finance becomes a more crucial factor. But at the start, a well-managed grass-roots program can be a strong stimulus to progress not only by encouraging the people but also by giving them a quick increase of income. This is an advantage that the UN has over the old League of Nations. Thirty years ago there were few chances to start such high-profit grass-roots projects, chiefly because the quick and cheap cures for the great debilitating diseases had not yet been invented.

Airways

One of the peculiarities of modern technology is that some of the wildest countries in the world can make immediate use of the most complex inventions. The airplane and radio, because they can jump over deserts and mountains, are in great demand where hard traveling conditions have always been an obstacle to progress. Iran, the ancient country of Persia, although it has one of the oldest civilizations in the world, also has a great amount of undeveloped country cut up by deserts and mountains. Iran is about as big as France, Italy, Spain, and Norway combined, but it has only about one-tenth as many people.

The Government of Iran therefore asked the UN for technical advice on the expansion of its airways. The international Civil Aviation Organization, one of the UN specialized agencies, sent experts to advise the Iranian airways on the improvement of their service and to help the government Department of Civil Aviation to train ground crews. Classes were organized for the study of air traffic control and radio techniques, supplemented by on-the-job training.

The experts composing the first ICAO mission included four from the Netherlands, two from Norway, one from Britain, and one refugee without a country. ICAO also provided fellowships for Iranians to study aeronautical engineering and electronics abroad. In 1955 Iran started its first regular domestic air-mail service after three years' work by a UN postal mission.

In Ethiopia an aviation school was established at Addis Ababa, with instructors supplied by ICAO. Ethiopia now has a network of weather-reporting stations, and the school is turning out Ethiopian mechanics to service the planes of the Ethiopian Air Lines.

In Mexico City the Mexican Government has set up a school for training ground crews and pilots, which in 1956 had more than 200 students from all parts of Latin America.

Canalboats

Canals, rivers, and lakes have always been natural highways in the flat parts of the world, and millions of people live their lives in boats on the quiet inland waterways. In

East Pakistan, for instance, there are some millions of boats, from rowboats to sailing sampans, godowns—tall warehouses on rafts—and steamers and motor craft. Many of the types are ancient, and they operate with a lavish use of cheap labor. Some of the great barges are rowed with sweeps that take nine men to an oar. But progress means a rising standard of living for poor men. No man can earn a good living pulling one-ninth of an oar. Gradually as standards and wages rise, workers must shift to more profitable jobs. Motors have to push or drag the heavy barges even on the ancient Ganges and Brahmaputra.

The Government of Pakistan turned to the United Nations for help in modernizing its inland water transport. Pakistan was not the only country with inland waterway problems, for in most of the Far East half the people live in the great river deltas and depend on water highways. One of the results of the inquiries from Asia was the organization of the Inland Water Transport Tour, an expedition of Asian experts to view the operation of waterways in other parts of the world. Members of the tour came from Burma, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Thailand, and Viet Nam. The group started by visiting Thailand, Burma, Pakistan, and India, so as to learn about one another's problems.

The Asians then proceeded to Europe, where they visited shipyards and waterways in France, Germany, and the Netherlands. They inspected new types of boats and tugs in England and Scotland. Going on to the United States, they studied traffic and equipment on the Ohio and Mississippi and along the intracoastal canals.

The members of the tour discussed the problems of water transport with experts in the countries they visited, comparing steam and diesel engines, push-towing and pull-towing and self-propelled barges. They studied riveted and welded barges, aluminum barges, tankers and refrigerated barges, and methods of mechanical loading and unloading. The information that they collected had to be digested and sorted out to find what might be useful in Asia. The value of labor-saving in any country depends on the going rate of wages. Wages have to rise gradually as modern methods are introduced and jobs open up where the workers can earn the higher wages. If high-powered machinery is brought in too fast, it does not make the country richer. On the contrary, business is dislocated by throwing men

out of work. Another limitation is the cost of foreign machinery, which has to be paid in dollars or some other foreign money. The trade balance of the country can stand just so much.

If technical improvements are introduced at the proper rate of speed, allowing time for the displaced workers to get new jobs and for the foreign-exchange costs to be covered by increased exports, progress will go along smoothly. The old League of Nations was well aware of the limitations on the proper rate of progress, and the United Nations agencies are even better aware of it. This is a part of the problem of digesting foreign information which was one of the main jobs of the members of the Inland Water Transport Tour. They returned to their countries prepared, not to imitate what they had seen in the West, but to do their own work with a wider background of experience to stimulate their invention.

As a result many improvements have been introduced. Inland Water Transport Boards have been set up, and conferences are held regularly to stimulate progress in the equipment and management of water traffic.

Fish Farming

Indonesia, formerly the Dutch East Indies, ranks as "underdeveloped" in Western science and technology. But it was a highly civilized country when the United States was a thin line of colonial settlements along the Atlantic shore, and when a Javanese princess married the Dutch Dr. Staats and migrated with him to the New World to become ancestress of some of the proudest families of New York.

The Indonesian civilization developed not only the arts but also some kinds of technical knowledge that are superior to any similar techniques in other parts of the world.

One of these ancient Indonesian techniques is fish farming. When the water is turned into the rice fields the farmers stock them with baby carp from the breeding ponds. The carp and rice grow up together for about three months. By the time the fields are drained the fish are the size of large sardines and ready to eat.

The UN has arranged for students from as far away as Haiti and Israel to study fish farming in Indonesia in order to help in developing similar fish supplies for their own countries.

Land Reform

In most of the countries where the farmers are poor and uneducated the ownership of farm lands is unsatisfactory. The most common source of discontent is "landlordism." The land is owned in large tracts by landlords who rent it out to the cultivators at exorbitant rents, running as high as three-fourths of the crop. The farmers naturally hate the landlords and long for the day when they themselves can own the land. The cure of these evils is not simple, and the farmers may be fooled by cruel and dishonest promises.

The most obvious way for enraged farmers to get rid of their rent burdens might seem to be to liquidate the landlords and take over the land. The drawback is that such violent methods would not protect the farmers from the kind of government that would go with them. After the farmer got possession of his land, he might find that the taxes, the forced deliveries to the government, and the days of forced labor on government work, would add up to a heavier burden than before.

The UN had a Conference on Natural Resources in 1949, where most of the delegates crowded into the meetings on land reform. They discussed the problems of their various countries and learned how complex the subject can be.

The General Assembly therefore passed a resolution in 1950 asking the Secretary-General and the FAO to study the problems of landholding. In 1951 the Economic and Social Council discussed the Secretary-General's report, and recommended to the member governments that they take up land reform "in the interest of the landless, small, and medium farmers." The United States sponsored a World Conference, and many countries started programs to improve the conditions of land ownership.

One of the most successful land distribution programs so far has been in Japan, where the Occupation authorities directed the purchase of five million acres from landlords. The land was sold to the tenants at fair prices and the payments were spread over thirty years with an interest rate of only 3.2 per cent. The farmers had a good bargain and they knew it.

At the same time, the landlords, instead of being liquidated, came out with valuable government bonds. Reports

from Japan indicate that the Japanese people are well pleased with the effects of the land distribution.

Dr. Bennett, the late head of the United States Point Four Program, offered the following general principles for a just and equitable agricultural system:

First, the farmer must be able to own land, or to use the land he tills under fair conditions and terms of tenure. Second, the farmer must have access to credit on reasonable terms to enable him to farm efficiently, whether as owner or tenant. Third, he must have access to knowledge and techniques that will make his efforts productive and profitable to him and to society.

The Economic and Social Council, at its meeting in April, 1957, urged governments to continue their efforts for land reform, and to encourage the organization of cooperatives in agriculture, fisheries, and community development.

The Agencies

The UN work at the grass roots is carried on by several agencies that deal with the basic material enemies of man—hunger, disease, and poverty.

Hunger is the special problem of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which was started in 1943 at a conference of national representatives in Hot Springs, Virginia. FAO has its own constitution and membership; not all FAO members belong to the UN. It has its own income derived from dues paid by the members, and its own governing body, the FAO Conference, which meets every two years. FAO is one of the specialized agencies affiliated with the UN through an agreement with the Economic and Social Council, approved by the UN General Assembly.

FAO sends experts to help countries that want technical advice on how to grow more food and other crops, how to control pests and plant and animal diseases, how to protect food in storage, and in general how to increase the yield of farms, fisheries, and forests. For example, in the Far East FAO has been successfully fighting rinderpest, a disease that before 1946 killed about two million cattle a year. As a result of FAO's efforts meat production has increased in Thailand, Burma, Afghanistan, and parts of India.

FAO advises on soil conservation and the use of fertilizers. It provides fellowships for technicians to study

in foreign countries where they can learn techniques that they can use at home. It also publishes technical year-books and other material useful in agriculture, forestry and fisheries.

FAO illustrates an important difference between the League of Nations technical agencies and those of the United Nations. A technical agency commonly does three kinds of work: (1) It is a clearinghouse of scientific information through which technical papers are exchanged among scientists of member nations. (2) It promotes standardized legal arrangements among the nations in connection with its specialty. Both these types of work were done by the League agencies and are now carried on by those connected with the UN. (3) It provides technical assistance, of which there was almost none under the League.

Since it is technical assistance that brings the UN into direct contact with millions of people, this difference from the old League is important. In this respect the UN has broader foundations than the League; this may make the difference between life and death for the UN.

The World Health Organization was started by a conference in New York in July, 1946, where representatives of 61 countries set up an Interim Commission to work on international health. The permanent organization came into being on April 7, 1948, when 26 members had ratified its Constitution. April 7 is now celebrated all over the world as World Health Day.

Even before 1948 the Interim Commission had begun to show what an international organization could do. Egypt was suddenly attacked by an epidemic of cholera in September, 1947. The Commission straightway mustered the cholera experts of the world, and the necessary materials for them to work with. By the end of December the epidemic was wiped out.

WHO is a specialized agency governed by the World Health Assembly. It advises member countries on public health and the control of disease. It makes war on the widespread plagues such as malaria, tuberculosis, yaws, and syphilis, and on less common diseases including leprosy, typhus, polio, diphtheria, and bilharziasis. In 1957 malaria in Formosa was reported to be "no longer a public health problem," and to be definitely on the way out in Burma.

In some fields of health such as the relation between health and food, WHO overlaps the work of FAO and they operate together.

Another agency that often works in close contact with great numbers of people is the International Labor Organization. ILO was founded in 1919 as a self-governing institution associated with the League of Nations. It is now a specialized agency affiliated with the UN.

The annual Conference of the ILO promotes laws for the protection of wage earners by proposing international agreements which the delegates are obligated to take home and submit to their governments for ratification. A government that ratifies one of these agreements binds itself to report each year on what progress it is making toward passing the laws called for in the agreement. From 1919 to 1957, ILO sent out over 100 agreements and received notice of about 1,500 ratifications.

In March, 1956, ILO appointed a committee to study automation, and its Director-General devoted most of his 1957 report to that subject. The principal conclusions were that automation and related technological advances make it possible to produce many things that could not be produced before, and that they offer possibilities of higher living standards. Although they require shifting many workers to new jobs, they need not cause permanent unemployment if other conditions are adjusted to keep abreast of the necessary changes. In other words, if incomes are so distributed among the people that consumers can buy all the increased production, the markets will not glut and employment will continue. This refers to the general principle, already well recognized, that prosperity depends on a sufficiently high rate of total expenditure, private and governmental.

The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF) was created by the General Assembly in 1946. UNRRA, the UN Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which had been set up to relieve victims of war devastation, was closing its work in 1946, and UNICEF took over the relief of children who still needed help. UNICEF is not supported by the UN budget, but by voluntary contributions from governments and individuals—including the sale of the widely used UNICEF Christmas cards.

UNICEF specializes in the supply of medicines, food, and equipment for maternal and child welfare services; control of diseases specially affecting children; child nutrition; and relief of children in earthquakes, floods, famines, and volcanic eruptions. Its work overlaps WHO and FAO in many places and the organizations work together, each supplying what it can do best.

Two of the most important present jobs of UNICEF are its campaigns against yaws and tuberculosis.

Yaws is a disease of hot damp climates. Yaws makes masses of open sores. It is extremely contagious, and especially afflicts children. Few die of yaws, but many become helpless cripples and a lifelong burden on their relatives.

Yaws can be cured with one dose of penicillin costing fifteen cents.

Indonesia, for example, as soon as it became an independent nation, asked the UN to help in a war against yaws. There were estimated to be 10 million cases in the country when the job was undertaken in 1950. UNICEF gave the material and WHO sent medical experts to train Indonesian workers. Indonesia supplied buildings, workers, and the equipment that did not have to come from abroad.

In four years the hundreds of medical teams, trained by WHO and supplied with jeeps and materials from UNICEF, had examined 11 million people and cured 1,300,000 who had yaws. Many villages are now free of yaws; another few years and practically the whole country will be free of it. After that, as time goes on and the cripples die, they will not be replaced by more cripples.

Yaws has been practically wiped out in Haiti, and campaigns are going on in more than twenty-five other countries. The demand for penicillin—which is also used against syphilis, a close cousin of yaws—has been out-running the supply, so UNICEF and the UN Technical Assistance Administration have helped to build new antibiotics plants in India, Chile, and Yugoslavia.

Tuberculosis is another mass plague that strikes most often where living conditions are poor, and most often strikes children and young people. In India, for instance, TB kills about half a million people a year. It is also a great cause of poverty because it is a slow killer. People waste away and cannot work to support themselves.

In the crowded countries with low standards of living, there is no present chance to send the TB patients to hos-

pitals for treatment. But there is one thing that can be done quickly, and that is to vaccinate the children who have not yet caught the disease.

The vaccine, known as BCG, discovered in France fifty years ago, has been developed and tested on a large scale by the Scandinavians. In 1948, UNICEF and the Scandinavians joined forces with WHO to put on campaigns in countries that asked for help.

The BCG teams go into a village and test the children for TB. Those who have not been infected are vaccinated. Of those who are vaccinated, about 80 per cent cannot get TB for four or five years, and the other 20 per cent will not have it severely. From then on it is only necessary to vaccinate all newborn babies and keep up the immunity of the others. As the unfortunate ones who were already infected gradually die off, the number of cases and the amount of infection will diminish. Finally, if the country grows rich enough, and with the discovery of still newer drugs that may be expected, it can hope to come close to wiping out the disease.

In the meantime, the operation is extremely profitable. One vaccination costs only about twenty cents, less than the cost of two UNICEF Christmas cards in the UN bookshop. The child who doesn't get TB may grow up and earn his own living instead of being a burden on his family. For twenty cents every four years, the profit to the country is high.

In 1952 UNICEF and WHO launched an experimental campaign against trachoma in Morocco. Trachoma is an eye disease that often causes blindness. Some good results were obtained, but it was evident that a massive attack on the universal plague of flies would be needed, since flies carry the disease. That in turn must depend on widespread health education.

In 1953, when the International Children's Emergency Fund came to the end of its emergency charter, the Fund reported that it had vaccinated 22 million children with BCG, cured 3 million of yaws, protected 12 million from malaria, and so on through a long list. The General Assembly voted unanimously to continue the Fund indefinitely and gave it a new name, the UN Children's Fund. But the initials UNICEF were kept as a trade-mark. To millions of people, the only United Nations they know is UNICEF, the friend of children.

The other principal UN agency working directly at the grass roots is the UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), which covers the whole field of education and therefore overlaps all the other agencies. It is entitled to a separate chapter and is described in Chapter 2.

Several important programs aiding the underdeveloped countries to raise their standards of living are being carried on outside the UN. One is the Point Four Program of the United States; another is the Colombo Plan set up by members of the British Commonwealth. There are also numerous private institutions working on special problems, such as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation.

When the UN agencies are asked to assist a country with technical development, they request the government to arrange that all organizations related to the proposed work be brought into a cooperative plan. An example is the rehabilitation center for cripples at Solo in Java, started by an Indonesian surgeon after the War. In 1954 the UN sent an expert from the United States to visit Solo. As a result of his report the center was built up with the cooperative help of the Indonesian Government, the United Nations, the World Veterans' Foundation, ILO, WHO, and the Directors of the Colombo Plan.

The Expanded Program

The UN Charter recognized that there was a wide demand for economic development, and there was also a growing realization that poverty might be a cause of discontent and of war. In January, 1949, President Truman in his Inaugural Address announced a "bold new program" of economic progress for the less developed countries of the world, later known as Point Four. This announcement aroused such enthusiasm that the UN was able to find support for an effort to increase the work of its own technical assistance agencies.

As a result the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance was adopted. A special account was set up to which the member nations were asked to contribute. In June, 1950, representatives of 54 nations met and pledged the equivalent of \$20,000,000 for the first 18 months of the new program. The United States contributed 60 per cent of this first budget. By 1957 some 84 countries and

territories pledged over \$31,000,000 for the year's budget, and the United States provided less than half of the total.

The special fund is managed by the Technical Assistance Board, made up of the executive heads of the UN and the agencies under a full-time Executive Chairman. Most of the money received is allocated to FAO, WHO, UNESCO, and ILO, and to an agency called the Technical Assistance Administration, which is a part of the UN Secretariat. UNTAA takes care of requests for services that do not come in the field of any other agency, such as general development plans, a national income census, town planning, industrial development programs, or land and inland water transport.

Under the present system for giving technical assistance, the governments of the underdeveloped countries are asked to make the decisions as to the type of assistance they need and as to priorities for individual projects. This system encourages governments to lay out their development programs to fit the kind of improvements they want, combining their own national projects with the help they may need to obtain from outside.

Material and Moral

What does growing more rice have to do with saving the world from destruction by the H-bomb? Isn't this just playing with pebbles on the beach while an earthquake is sending a tidal wave to wash us all away? It is a dangerous world but it is not as simple as that.

The United Nations has to save the world, if possible, from the H-bomb in the next few years and from more and worse in the future, from now on as long as civilization endures. In the long run, the human race may survive if people learn not to fear and distrust one another as much as they do now. Organizations to deter military aggression and to build up a secure and harmonious world are necessary. But underlying all that, the issue of life or death is moral, not only among the delegates who discuss and argue in the great conferences but also among the people at home.

When the United Nations sends a team of foreign experts into a village to cure disease or to increase the food supply, they are expected to train local people and work with them. The local contribution to each project is generally many times as large as that of the UN, in terms

of labor, equipment, and money. In the five years before 1956 more than 6,000 men and women from 70 different countries were engaged for varying periods as experts in the technical assistance work of the UN and its specialized agencies.

The material purpose of the work is a necessary part of the moral relation that is created among these people. Being a material thing, the reduction of disease or the increase of food can be seen and agreed upon. In the simplest kinds of "development" there is no argument. The people unite to create a new thing and see that it is good. They can shake hands and feel the bond of friendship in a successful common adventure. This is the most fundamental way that good will can come among men of different races, religions, and cultures.

But almost the same kind of activity can create hatreds. When men work together as master and slave, or as conqueror and subject people, without mutual respect or a common purpose, they can build deep-seated hatreds. There are such hatreds today in most of the world.

When any sort of "project" is undertaken, therefore, the question has to arise: Is someone out to exploit the workers in this project for some purpose that they do not think is good? Is this development program a trap to get political control of the country? Or are the foreigners trying to make friends in order to win allies in a war they are planning? Or do the foreigners simply hope to make a commercial profit out of the country's development? If the foreigners have enemies, the enemies will tell the people that the development projects are a trap. In the long run the people are going to judge the honesty of the foreign experts who offer to help them, and they will give them friendship or hatred accordingly.

There is no dishonesty in wanting to do business with a growing and prosperous country, if it is honest business with profit to all concerned in it. There is no dishonesty in wanting to make friends in order to have allies for the defense of peace, if the real plan is to defend peace and not to start an aggressive war. Selfish reasons for helping in an enterprise are not wrong if they are reasons that everyone agrees are good.

In fact, good hard-headed reasons for taking part in a development project are valuable because they are easier to believe than a professed love of doing good for its own sake. The foreigners, especially, do well to hunt for hard,

well-understood reasons by which to explain themselves in order to ward off the natural suspicion with which many people often regard strangers.

It is natural for an engineer to get satisfaction from seeing the plans of his brain take form in a stout bridge that is praised by the people who needed a bridge. It is natural for a doctor to enjoy winning a tough battle against a disease. Under the UN flag, men can go on a mission with men of other nations to do a job that plainly gives them these creative satisfactions. The same satisfactions are, to be sure, common among the technicians who work for the United States Point Four Program or the Colombo Plan, or for one of the private foundations. But in places where the people are keenly suspicious of the Great Powers, the same technicians can go under UN auspices and be more readily accepted.

The best of all reasons for technical assistance is that, carried through in the spirit of good will, it builds the foundations of peace as well as prosperity. At the grass roots of the world, the people may be ignorant of books, but they are wise in human nature. They are suspicious of charity, but they do not miss the meaning of these simple village improvements. In the long run, if the human race is so fortunate as to have a long run, these foundations will bear the growing structure of good will among men.

It is particularly valuable to demonstrate that all the nations can contribute to the pool of knowledge. When, for instance, an expert to fight livestock diseases was needed in Tunisia, one was sent from Ceylon. Colombia has provided a radio specialist for Pakistan. Icelandic fisheries experts have helped to modernize the fishing industries of Ceylon, India, and Turkey. In 1956 India contributed 89 experts for service abroad. The world-wide mutual respect on which peace must finally rest is built up by all such interchanges through which nations that are giving help are also receiving help from others. This growing network of knowledge, with the network of good will which, in the best conditions, grows with it, cannot solve all the fearful problems of a world threatened with destruction, but they are a necessary part of the solution.

The improvement in living conditions where technical assistance has been given by the UN or by the various national and private programs has been notable in many localities and in some places even spectacular. But it is

important to remember that so far only scattered lamps of progress have been lighted in a vast gray landscape. This slow total progress is only partially caused by lack of money. Even more it is the effect of scarcity of experts qualified to teach and learn and also free to move to foreign lands. More rapid progress has to depend not only on more generous contributions of money but also on training more persons to do the work.

As the Secretary-General said in the introduction to his annual report in 1957: "While production may be expanding and the level of living in general may be rising, the gains in per capita income are greatest in areas that are already economically advanced." The gap between rich and poor nations is still widening, and what the world needs instead is a world-wide advance that will make the poorest people feel that they are catching up with progress, not falling behind.

EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND CULTURE

When the DDT team has left the village and the mosquitoes and bugs are, for the time being, dead, then what is going to happen? The people will sleep better of nights, and before long they will notice that fewer people have chills and fever. But will they then join enthusiastically in the march of progress, or will they go on with their ancient customs, merely hoping that some day the spray team may come back and clean up the bugs for them again?

Most people, and especially those who cannot read, are conservative in their ways. They may have heard of the wonders of progress, and may have seen a few of the magic tricks of science. But they do not quickly see how many of their ancestral customs they would have to change if they want to enter the new world where such tricks are done.

It is not even enough to learn to drive a jeep. Someone has to know how to worry about unusual noises in its interior. It is not enough to be rid for a while of the large visible insects that can be killed by DDT. Someone has to learn to worry about dirt and deadly creatures that are invisible. And that is only the beginning. The higher the standard of living rises the more things have to be attended to and the more the people have to know in order to make the system work.

Education, therefore, is a special requirement that has to be supplied with all the other kinds of development in agriculture, health, industry, or political-economic institutions. Not only must the people who will do the work, from vaccinating to banking, be trained for their jobs, the whole population has to be educated to believe in progress and to accept necessary changes without too much delay. This necessity for keeping all parts of the procession coming along is a common source of trouble in even the advanced nations. As the less-developed nations hurry to take on the methods of modern science, there will be the

same kind of troubles. Parts of the social and political system will be slow to develop the new qualities that are necessary to make the new projects work successfully.

The UN Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, known as UNESCO, grew out of conferences among the governments in exile in London during the last years of World War II. The Nazi invasion of western Europe in 1940 had destroyed a large part of the educational system of the conquered countries. The governments of those countries knew that after liberation their schools and universities would need books and equipment, new buildings, and new teachers to replace those who could not be found. So a Conference of Allied Ministers of Education was formed in London to study reports of damage and to look for means of restoration as soon as their countries should be liberated.

In the meantime the Allies began planning for a United Nations Organization, and it was evident that the new organization would have to take an interest in education all over the world. The London Conference of Allied Ministers began to invite representatives from other countries outside of Europe. The United States sent a delegation to the Conference in April, 1944.

As the time for the UN meeting in San Francisco drew near, the United States showed an increasing concern with the educational and cultural features of the new organization. Congressman Karl E. Mundt, afterward Senator, put in a resolution on this subject, which the House of Representatives passed on May 22, 1945. Two days later the Senate passed a similar resolution introduced by Senators J. William Fulbright and Robert A. Taft.

These resolutions noted that, "Whereas the future peace and security of the American and of all other peoples rest upon the achievement of mutual understanding among the peoples of the world," the Congress urged the Government to take part in establishing a permanent international organization for educational and cultural affairs.

The idea back of these resolutions was that whatever may be attempted by a world organization—to prevent war, to promote world prosperity, and to foster justice and democratic institutions—knowledge and understanding, or the lack of them, are the most important causes of the things that people do. The success of all other efforts, therefore, depends on the success of the effort to increase knowledge and understanding.

The United States belief in mutual understanding as a means of building friendship and peace has deep roots in tradition. For instance, in 1859 Abraham Lincoln told a farmers' meeting:

From the first appearance of man upon the earth down to very recent times, the words "stranger" and "enemy" were quite or almost synonymous. . . . Even yet, this has not totally disappeared. The man of the highest moral cultivation, in spite of all which abstract principle can do, likes him whom he does know much better than him whom he does not know. To correct the evils, great and small, which spring from want of sympathy, and from positive enmity among strangers, as nations or as individuals, is one of the highest functions of civilization.*

The need for wide international contacts in education, science, and culture was clear to the delegates from all over the world at San Francisco. The UN Charter authorized the UN to promote the formation of an affiliated agency for educational and cultural development. A Conference for that purpose met in London in November, 1945, and wrote a Constitution for the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization which was signed on November 16, 1945.

UNESCO exists in its own right by virtue of the fact that its members have accepted its Constitution. Its members are not necessarily members of the UN. Its regular revenue does not come from the UN, but from the direct contributions of its member nations. The organization's General Conference, meeting once every two years, adopts its budget and assesses the contributions from the members. The routine management is carried on by an Executive Board of twenty-two members.

Fundamental Education

Less than half the world's children go to school. In the region of South Asia and the Pacific, for instance, about 55 million children out of a total of 95 million have no schooling whatever. One immediate result of the lack of schools in so much of the world is that most of the human race cannot read or write. Progress cannot go far along

* Address to Wisconsin State Agricultural Society, Milwaukee, September 30, 1859.

modern lines in communities where hardly anyone can read.

But UNESCO has found that where most of the people cannot read, learning their letters is not usually what they need to begin with. They need to learn some simple practical improvements in their way of life that they can quickly understand and accept as good. Perhaps the first thing is to learn to boil the ditch water before drinking it. Perhaps they need the idea of digging a latrine, or of building a raised cooking place instead of using a fire on the ground where cattle and children get mixed with the cooking pots. They can learn to build better houses out of local materials, and usually they can improve their food supply by planting a vegetable garden.

When the people have tried a few simple novelties and have found them acceptable, those among them who have already thought of the advantage of knowing how to read will find it easy to convince the majority. Then if a teacher with the modern visual aids and other equipment can be had, learning to read is easy. By this time the crust of ancient habits and customs may have been cracked. After a while the outsiders can leave for another village, and there is a chance that local people will go on under their own steam, digesting the new methods and ideas into their own culture, so that instead of a foreign development there will be a native growth with live roots in the soil.

Breaking the crust of tradition is not always easy, since usually the tradition has taught people to accept their ancestral ways as best. Even when discontent has become explosive there is danger that ancestral taboos may block the changes that would have to be made in order to get a substantial improvement of conditions. The best way, and sometimes the only way, to get around these blockades, is by starting with small acceptable changes at the grass-roots level.

For a job of this size, teaching hundreds of millions of people, UNESCO cannot itself find the money to hire enough teachers. What UNESCO can do is to show the various member nations how to go at it, and it can supply certain kinds of training and equipment.

Many countries have peculiar language problems, especially where a country has dozens of separate languages. Often the only way the different tribes can talk together is in a foreign tongue such as English or Spanish. Where the pupils need to learn English for practical use, they do not

need to start with Shakespeare. UNESCO specialists can expedite the practical teaching by sorting out the common words that are most useful in daily work and concentrating on those.

Pictures are being used more and more in teaching at all levels of schooling. A team of visual-aid experts ran a three-month seminar in New Delhi, in 1952-53, to teach Indian teachers how to use film strips, pictures, and other visual materials in fundamental education. Another UNESCO team was sent to Sicily to help the government in fundamental education and the use of visual aids.

A more ambitious project is the launching of training centers for teachers in fundamental education work. The first of these was opened in Patzcuaro, Mexico, for Latin American teachers. It graduated its first class of forty-six students in November, 1952. The Arab States Fundamental Education Center was opened the following year in Egypt, in a building erected by the Egyptian Government. The courses include methods of teaching reading and writing, home economics, health, agriculture, and cottage industries. The centers publish books on educational methods as well as readers, primers, and visual aids such as film strips.

The UN is particularly interested in promoting the spread of free and compulsory schools among the new independent countries of Asia and Africa, and wherever in the world people are just now coming into the duties and problems of self-government. The UN believes that if these new nations are to become successful democracies their people must have all the schooling they can get as quickly as possible.

The value of world-wide technical exchange can be illustrated by the new processes that are beginning to revolutionize the manufacture of books and newspapers. The changes run from new ways of making newsprint paper out of straw, bagasse, and hardwoods, to photographic composition and printing that can be used effectively even with the complicated alphabets of Asia. This new technology appears to point toward cheaper books and newspapers and toward better chances for small, competitive printing enterprises to flourish. The spread of these methods may considerably speed the process of fundamental education.

One of the important requirements in fundamental education is for simple books in all languages on subjects that

the students feel the need to know about. If there is no such reading material at hand, many of those who learn to read will quickly forget. Another danger is that most of the books that poor people can get at low prices will be trash material not in line with the civilizing purposes of the UN. It is therefore doubly important for UNESCO to promote the use of printed material telling about the United Nations and the Declaration of Human Rights, to make known to the people the fact that they live in a world that may be friendly to them.

Books, Records, and Films

UNESCO helps to expand international traffic in literary materials, phonograph records, and motion-picture films.

A UNESCO report on the work done in 1952 listed as "probably the most outstanding accomplishment in the cultural field" the signing of the International Copyright Convention, sponsored by UNESCO. This agreement protects the rights of authors and artists in books, plays, music, films, painting, and sculpture, in all the countries ratifying the Convention.

Another international agreement sponsored by UNESCO provides free trade among the members for educational films, sound recordings, film strips, microfilm, glass slides, wall charts, maps, and posters. The agreement exempts these articles from all tariffs and quota restrictions in passing from one member country to another. A separate UNESCO Convention exempts books, newspapers, works of art, scientific equipment, and many other educational materials from tariff duties.

The shipment of delicate scientific instruments across national boundaries had been inconvenient because when the customs officials looked into the package they often damaged the contents. UNESCO therefore sponsored an international agreement by which customs examination can be done at the laboratory while the instruments are being packed or unpacked by experts who are familiar with how to handle them.

Museums

A well-managed museum will draw many thousands of visitors who, even if they do not spend time there for serious study, will be sure to learn something as they pass

through. They learn what things look like in other parts of the world, and how things looked in past ages. They may get a new light on the physical sciences as well as on geography, history, and art.

UNESCO believes that the education supplied by a well-managed museum is bound to give people a better understanding of their own ancestral background and also of the world outside their own locality. This kind of education may help to make people willing to have their country cooperate with other countries, and it therefore is worth promotion by UNESCO. Accordingly, UNESCO holds conferences in various parts of the world for museum directors and other specialists to exchange information about how museums can best be used in popular education.

For the Blind

At the suggestion of the government of India, UNESCO undertook in 1949 to promote standardization of Braille, the written alphabet of the blind, as it is applied to various languages throughout the world. Blind students who use more than one language would be benefited by using the same symbols so far as is practicable. Standardized Braille would be especially useful in countries where people commonly speak several languages, and where the language of higher education or of religion is different from the ordinary speech. UNESCO published in 1954 a basic reference book on the use of Braille in various languages by Sir Clutha Mackenzie, one of the ablest leaders of the blind.

As a result of these efforts, by 1957 enough uniformity had been achieved so that a blind person could read his own language even though printed in a foreign country; and in the main the Braille symbols all over the world now represent the same sounds—which is more than can be said for the visible letters of even the common Western alphabet.

A conference of blind musicians was held at UNESCO House in Paris in 1954, to improve the standardization of Braille music notation as it is used in different countries. This conference was attended by musicians from Europe, North America, Latin America, the Middle East, India, and Japan. The conference voted for a permanent organization under the World Braille Council, which had been set up by UNESCO in 1952.

Coupons

One of the greatest obstacles to the spread of knowledge in the postwar world has been the "dollar shortage." Most of the trading nations have not been able to sell enough to the United States to pay for the materials and services that they have had to buy in the United States. These countries have therefore been chronically short of United States dollars. The worst of these shortages have been covered by grants of dollars from the United States Government to friendly countries, but these grants do not cover everything. Educational institutions have been especially hard hit. They needed books and periodicals, films and laboratory equipment, which could be had only in the United States or in other "hard currency" countries whose money was almost equally hard to get in international trade.

UNESCO, however, does have some dollars and other hard currencies. It has therefore issued several million dollars' worth of UNESCO International Coupons to institutions and scholars in soft-currency countries. These coupons are good for hard money, and are used for buying educational materials. In one year UNESCO coupons bought more than half a million dollars' worth of school equipment in the United States.

The coupon scheme was so successful that another plan was added. Gift coupons are for sale in countries that produce many kinds of educational material—the United States, the United Kingdom, the German Federal Republic, the Netherlands, France, Australia, and Canada. Private persons and organizations in these countries may choose a Project from a UNESCO catalogue of Gift Projects. The donor buys UNESCO coupons and sends them to the Project. The Project can then use the coupons as a kind of money order in the currency of the country from which they came. An additional advantage of this system is that it may help to set up contacts between people in different countries who are interested in education.

Still another coupon scheme provides help for students to travel in foreign countries where they need foreign money for expenses. Between 1947 and 1956 the UN aided more than 10,000 specialists or young students to study in nearly a hundred "host" countries. They came

from 125 nations and territories including some of the countries where modern technology is already highly developed.

Science and Culture

Many of the specialized agencies of the UN are devoted to scientific progress and the engineering applications of science. Their fields often touch or overlap, and they cooperate at these points in joint activities. UNESCO helps the member nations to expand scientific education and training. In the spreading of cultural materials and international cultural contacts UNESCO is the chief UN agency.

UNESCO enterprises include making a world survey of mathematics textbooks, encouragement of national associations of science teachers, preparation of traveling scientific exhibitions, and publication of articles on scientific research.

UNESCO has produced catalogues of color reproductions of paintings, and has sent out a large number of traveling art exhibits. It has helped to organize international conferences on music and the theater, and has sponsored the translation of literary works among the European and Oriental languages.

The Deserts

A special project of UNESCO is the organization of studies on arid land problems. A UNESCO Advisory Committee on Arid Zone Research holds periodic conferences. Representatives are invited from other specialized agencies and from international scientific associations that have information on desert conditions.

The main purpose of this enterprise is to provide a system for the exchange of scientific knowledge on the subject from different parts of the world. The lands where water is scarce cover at least a quarter of the land surface of the globe, and the kinds of plants, animals, and human communities that live in these dry areas are widely different.

UNESCO helps in the establishment of dry-land research stations in various parts of the world, using scientific methods for learning more about how the dry lands can be made useful. UNESCO also helps to spread infor-

mation about the traditional knowledge and skills of desert peoples. It can easily happen that a cattle rancher on the edge of the Western desert in the United States can find the answer to a bad situation by learning of age-old methods used in Pakistan or the Sudan.

Under the stimulation of the UNESCO program, member countries have sent delegates to meetings for the discussion of arid-zone water supplies, biology, climatology, and energy sources. Study projects assisted by UNESCO grants cover such matters as exploration of the Sahara; the effect of vertebrate animals on desert conditions in India; or the potentialities of coastal deserts, now under study by the International Geographical Union.

One special advantage of the desert research work is that it will benefit all the many nations that have desert lands, and so will help to arouse interest and support for exchange of scientific knowledge in general.

National Commissions

The UNESCO Constitution provides that each member state shall make arrangements for bringing its educational, scientific, and cultural organizations in touch with UNESCO, preferably by forming a National Commission.

In the United States, for example, a National Commission for UNESCO was established by an Act of Congress. About eighty private organizations, ranging from the American Association for the Advancement of Science and the American Farm Bureau Federation to the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Negro Newspaper Publishers Association and the U. S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, are affiliated with the National Commission. The one hundred Commission members are appointed by the Secretary of State. The affiliated organizations nominate sixty members; most of the others come from federal, state, and local government. The Commission helps the government in its relations with UNESCO; it helps in recruiting experts for UNESCO missions and suitable delegates for UNESCO conferences. It holds a National Conference every other year, and publishes material on UNESCO that it regards as useful for the information of the people of the United States.

The many-sided work of UNESCO represents a part of the many-sided life of the human race. It represents the healthy peacetime interests of people all over the world.

It helps to build up the sane side of human life, in the hope that the sane part of the human mind will in time get the better of the part that falls into war. Nevertheless, UNESCO has been bitterly criticized by people hostile to the United Nations, especially by some of those in the United States who are known as "isolationists." In order to determine whether there was any substance to such attacks, in 1953 President Eisenhower appointed a committee of three distinguished citizens to study UNESCO activities. The committee reported that UNESCO does not advocate world government or world citizenship in the political sense, does not try to undermine national loyalties, does not interfere with the United States school system, and does not show any evidence of atheism or hostility toward religion.

As U. S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in transmitting a UNESCO report to the National Commission: "The advancement by UNESCO of human welfare through education, science, and culture promotes international understanding which contributes to peace."

MONEY AND TRADE

International prosperity depends partly on production, partly on the exchange of the money of different countries, and partly on the conditions for exchanging goods and services. The UN has many agencies helping with production, one of which is the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which promotes international investment. The International Monetary Fund helps to smooth the exchange of currencies, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade serves as a bargaining market where nations can make agreements to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers.

The World Bank

The International Bank was organized at a conference at Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, U.S.A., in the summer of 1944 along with its sister institution, The Monetary Fund. By 1957 the Bank had sixty-four member nations. Each member nation subscribed to the stock of the Bank for an amount based on its wealth and trade, varying from \$3,175,000,000 for the U.S.A. to \$400,000,000 for India and \$200,000 for Panama. On joining, each member paid in 2 per cent of its subscription in the form of gold or dollars, and 18 per cent in its own money. The other 80 per cent is not paid in. It merely stands as a guarantee to cover the Bank's liabilities in case of loss. Losses are not likely, but the guarantee helps to make investors willing to buy the Bank's bonds.

The Bank can lend the original 2 per cent as it thinks best. It can lend the other 18 per cent only with the permission of the member who subscribed it. This is to protect a member from having its money drawn into a foreign loan before its home market is ready to stand the strain. Most of the money the Bank has available for lending is obtained by selling its bonds in the open markets of countries that have capital to invest abroad.

The Bank can lend to a member government or one of

its agencies, or to a private enterprise in a member state if the government guarantees the loan. The Bank is not in business to make money, but it must not be careless with its assets, or they would quickly melt away in a vast sea of desired but unprofitable projects all around the world.

The management of the Bank has five general principles to guide it in deciding whether to lend money in a particular case.

First, it will not use up its funds to finance any operation, however useful, if the borrower can get money from someone else on reasonable terms. This Bank is a public institution set up to increase the total of international lending, not to replace any transactions that will go on without its help.

For instance, since the first job of the Bank was to aid in the reconstruction of war-battered Europe, it started in 1947 by lending dollars to France, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Luxembourg, to be used for buying supplies mainly from North America. When the Marshall Plan came into the picture with a large supply of dollars to be spent for recovery the Bank turned its attention to other fields of action.

The second principle is that the Bank will ordinarily lend a country only the foreign money it needs to pay for foreign supplies and services connected with a project. The Bank has to satisfy itself that the borrower is making proper efforts to raise local capital to pay for the labor and domestic materials that go into the project. For this purpose the Bank often advises on government policies to encourage local savings.

Often a development project gives employment to workers at better wages than they have been getting, and they are likely to start buying more goods that are imported from abroad. If this added demand for imports threatens to put a dangerous strain on the country's reserves of foreign money, the Bank may lend it some money to cover this demand for a year or two until trade can adjust itself.

The third principle is that the borrower and guarantor must have a good prospect of paying principal and interest. Not only does the Bank have to keep its capital from being lost, it also has to hold the confidence of investors so that they will buy its bonds.

The project must be an economically sound one in the sense that it will add more to the country's wealth than its

cost. If it is a public work that draws an income, like a hydroelectric project, it will usually be able to earn enough direct income to cover its capital investment and interest. If it is a system of free roads, paid for out of tax revenues, it ought to cause an increase in the wealth of the country that would yield the necessary taxes to pay for it. The Bank wants to know that the government is strong enough and well enough managed to collect the necessary revenues.

The revenues from an enterprise, whether they are earnings or tax returns, are of course in the money of the country. The main question for the Bank is whether these revenues can be turned into dollars or whatever money is required for payments on the loan. The Bank wants to know whether the government is handling the problems of foreign exchange in such a way that the loan payments can be met along with all the ordinary costs of foreign trade.

The fourth principle is that the Bank will prefer the projects that are most useful and urgent. At best the Bank and all other sources of foreign capital cannot cover everything that growing nations would like to have. The developments that will be most likely to cause private enterprise to expand on its own capital are preferred. These developments include a high proportion of public or semi-public service enterprises—such as electric power plants, roads, railroads, flood control, and irrigation.

Finally, the fifth requirement is that the borrower must have the knowledge, skill, and financial position to carry the enterprise to success. Given a good basic ability to deal with the project, the borrower can get plenty of technical advice and assistance, and the Bank insists that all the necessary experts be called in. The Bank keeps up its interest in the building and operation of the enterprise during the life of the loan.

In the course of its work, the Bank sends missions to member countries, to survey particular projects or to consult on a general development program. In its general development surveys, the Bank cooperates with other agencies that may have an interest in the proposed work, especially the other specialized agencies of the UN.

When the Bank first began to operate in 1946, the great need of all countries was for dollars. The Bank had a nest egg of dollars in the 2 per cent part of the subscriptions, and the United States released its whole cash subscription

of \$635,000,000. In 1947 the Bank sold \$250,000,000 worth of dollar bonds in the New York market. Since that time other currencies have been in some demand, as borrowers found that they could buy machinery and supplies from countries other than the United States. The Bank has sold bonds for Canadian dollars, pounds sterling, Netherlands guilders, and Swiss francs, and has made a number of loans in several European currencies out of the 18 per cent funds released for lending by member countries. From 1956 to 1957 the Bank's increase in funds came about 60 per cent from outside the United States.

The Bank draws other private capital into its projects by selling some of its loan securities or by encouraging private investors to take part in its projects. If necessary the Bank can guarantee the securities it sells, but most of them have a good market on the strength of the Bank's reputation without its guarantee.

By the end of October, 1957, the Bank had made 184 loans amounting to the equivalent of \$3,381,847,893, of which about \$83,600,000 had been refunded or cancelled at the request of borrowers.

One of the most notable projects using Bank funds is the Damodar Valley Corporation in India, a development organization similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority in the United States. The original purpose of this project was to prevent the costly floods of the Damodar River. In 1945 a TVA engineer was called in, and with his advice the plans were extended to cover a full development of the river, including irrigation, navigation, and electric power. The Bank made three loans, totaling \$44,500,000, mainly for electric power development. Two other loans amounting to \$51,500,000 went to the Indian Iron & Steel Company to expand its plant and iron mines. In 1953 the Bank lent the Corporation a further \$19,500,000 for the foreign-exchange costs of various parts of its program. A loan of \$75,000,000 was made to the Tata Iron and Steel Co., Ltd., in 1956, for expansion of steel production facilities.

In July, 1957, the Bank made public the report of a mission of experts which had been sent to study the economic system of the Kingdom of Jordan at the request of that hard-pressed country. The experts recommended a ten-year program of development estimated to cost about \$120,000,000. The report urged steps to expand agricul-

ture, mining, industry, transport, electric power, and community development. A little over half the cost would have to be financed from sources outside Jordan.

The International Finance Corporation (IFC)

This agency was established in 1956 to encourage the growth of private enterprises, especially in underdeveloped countries, by supplying capital and serving as a clearing-house to bring together investment opportunities, private capital, and expert management. It was started with an authorized capital of \$100,000,000, and has authority to obtain additional funds by selling its own bonds. The IFC is closely associated with the Bank but is a separate specialized agency with its own treasury.

Special UN Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED)

There has long been a proposal to set up a special organization, financed by contributions from member states, to grant funds for public works projects where they are needed as part of a development program. Grants that can be obtained from individual countries, such as those made under the U.S. Point Four or the Colombo Plan, do not of course fill all the needs; and a principal point of the proposed SUNFED would be that a representative body of UN members would decide where to allocate the money.

On July 31, 1957, the Economic and Social Council voted 15 to 0, with 3 abstentions, to recommend the establishment of SUNFED by the Assembly. The United States, Britain, and Canada abstained, saying that the funds available would not be enough to make an effective program until savings could be had from a successful disarmament plan.

The International Monetary Fund

The International Monetary Fund is a system of cash reserves that the member nations can draw upon to meet temporary deficits in their international trade.

The Articles of Agreement of the Fund were drawn up by the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944, and came into force on December 27, 1945. Nations that join the Bank must first be members of the Fund. Each member is as-

signed a "quota" in the Fund and is assessed a subscription usually equal to its quota. As a rule the member pays one-quarter of its subscription in gold, unless that would take more than 10 per cent of its official supply of gold and dollars. The rest of the subscription is paid in the member's own money.

When a country buys more from abroad than it can sell abroad, it has to find some kind of foreign money to pay the deficit. Ordinarily such payments are drawn from the country's reserves of gold or of foreign money—generally pounds or dollars. If these reserves start to melt away with frightening speed, the country will take some kind of action to reduce its trade deficit.

In general, the quick remedies for a trade deficit are harmful to world trade, since they consist of setting up trade barriers to keep out foreign goods. There are other remedies that are not harmful to world trade. But they take longer; they may not be within reach of a country with only a small reserve. The main purpose of the Fund is to be a supplementary reserve that in favorable cases will make possible a sound adjustment of the member's international trade position.

The Directors of the Fund have discretionary powers to restrict or expand the amount of help they will give to a member, according to whether they think the member is taking the correct actions to balance its trade. The Fund cannot encourage a member simply to draw out its subscription and fritter it away on a trade deficit without curing the deficit. That would mean that the weaker members were dropping out and the Fund would be left with only the few rich countries that have no need of its services. The Directors therefore consult regularly with the member governments about their financial policies and advise them about possible improvements.

The Fund is particularly interested in bringing about what is known as "convertibility." The British pound sterling, for instance, would be convertible if a dealer coming into the money market with a thousand pounds could freely change them for dollars, francs, or any other kind of money he might want. Another ideal is the stabilization of exchange value. The pound is stable if it will always bring the same number of dollars or ounces of gold.

If a country has been having trouble keeping its reserves, it ordinarily does not have convertible money. There are exchange restrictions of some kind, which limit

the amount of that country's money that anyone can turn into gold or dollars. If the country decides to make its money convertible, it removes these restrictions. But it looks with apprehension at what may happen next.

The chief danger, when money is made convertible, is that too many people who have that kind of money will suddenly come in and want to cash it for dollars. This creates a "run on the bank" that might be disastrous. If such a run develops, the "bank may have to close." That is, the government puts back the exchange restrictions, and is left in a weaker position than before.

Why, then, should a country want to take the risks of removing exchange restrictions? The removal is an exercise of financial strength to take advantage of the profits of free trade. The country can then shop around freely to buy its imports wherever it can get the best bargains. It will also have to sell abroad in unprotected competition with its rivals. This necessity may scare some of its businessmen, but if they can stand it they will become more productive and safer against inflation of their costs.

If all the principal countries can make their money convertible, world trade will be increased and will be more efficient. Goods will be bought and sold in the most profitable markets. The Fund devotes much of its attention to advising nations on how to become financially strong enough to take the risks of convertibility with good prospects of success.

There are two kinds of devices that countries can use for balancing their trade when they are failing to sell enough abroad to balance what they buy. One kind of treatment is designed to make people in the country buy less from abroad; the other kind is designed to get foreigners to buy more of what the country has to sell. The first kind includes tariffs, which raise the prices of foreign goods in the country. It also includes restrictions on imports or on the use of money, which directly cut down the buying of foreign goods. The international trade organizations aim to persuade countries to avoid these devices as far as possible, since they stifle trade.

The second kind of treatment for balancing trade is made up of devices for selling more goods to foreigners. One way is to "devalue" the currency, or reduce its value in ounces of gold. Then a foreigner with gold or its equivalent can buy more of the devalued money than before. This is the same as offering a special discount to foreign

buyers, for the internal prices paid by citizens do not change much, if any, when the money is devalued in gold. The United States devalued the dollar in 1933 to promote exports; and the countries of Western Europe devalued their currencies in 1949.

The members of the Fund have agreed not to devalue their money more than 10 per cent without getting the advice of the Fund. Frequent changes in the value of money are disturbing to trade because they make dealers fear to sign contracts for future payments.

The device that is most approved for stimulating exports is to keep prices down—in other words, to avoid inflation. If there is not too much money in circulation in the country, compared with the goods and services for sale, prices will hold down, and foreign buyers will be attracted. On the other hand, if there is too little money, there will be deflation, and prices will fall so far as to cause unemployment. The government's problem is to adopt policies that will lead to the correct balance between inflation and deflation, and the correct balance between encouraging exports and maintaining full employment.

If the government knows how to adopt the right policies, and if the voters will stand the short-term discomforts that go with such policies, a country may be able to balance affairs internally and externally at the same time. Since this condition leads in the long run to the highest combination of prosperity and real income, it is worth some sacrifices if it can be attained. The Monetary Fund advises the members on how to attain the right balance.

The exact measures that are needed to put a country in sound condition vary with circumstances, but in the main they consist of actions that governments can take if they are allowed to do so by the voters.

To prevent inflation there are two principal financial devices. One is to raise taxes and cut public spending until the correct state of budget balance is reached. The other is to raise the government "discount rate," which will cause higher interest rates generally and discourage borrowing. The discount rate is the rate of interest that the commercial banks have to pay if they borrow from the central bank, or, in the United States, from the Federal Reserve banks.

The general principle of budget balance, now well understood by financial experts, is that in depression the

government should run a deficit so as to give the people more money to spend. Then if a boom comes on, the government should reverse and run a surplus, so the people will have less money to spend. If the price level is satisfactory as it is, then the budget should have only enough deficit to create the money each year that is needed to carry on the growing volume of business. No one can hit the ideal levels exactly, but governments can come close enough to do fairly well in stabilizing prices.

The reason for raising the discount rate in a threatened inflation is that too many people are borrowing money from the banks to use for investment or spending. If interest rates go up they may put a damper on this borrowing. The effect is not as powerful as the effect of budgetary changes. Many countries leave their official discount rates unchanged for years at a stretch.

Aside from these two financial devices, the principal way to avoid inflation is by speeding the advance of technology. Increased efficiency of production reduces costs and allows prices to come down while real wages go up. This is the most valuable adjustment, but it takes a long time. It serves as underpinning for the sound financial policies that are able to take effect more rapidly.

In the underdeveloped countries, the inflation danger is likely to arise in connection with economic development. New factories can be built with the people's savings, or with foreign money invested in the country, with comparatively little danger. But if the program is pushed too fast it may be financed by government borrowing from the banks, which is in effect the same as printing the money. Too much of this may poison the new development with inflated prices that discourage real savings and chill the whole program. The techniques for holding to a sound development policy call for expert advice which can be obtained from the Bank and the Fund.

How does the Monetary Fund do its work? First of all, it consults with countries that are protecting their trade balance by artificial trade barriers, advising what policies to adopt for improving their fundamental strength. Then it stands ready to help out as the member countries take one step after another toward freer trade.

Each time a country loosens up on the bandage that is restricting its trade, it may start to bleed a little from its gold and dollar reserve. If the loss is soon stanchied, the new adjustment is a success. The circulation is improved

and the country is stronger. During this process, the country may supplement its own reserve by purchasing the currency it needs from the Fund, paying in its own currency. It may need dollars or pounds or some other money to take care of a temporary deficit while trade is getting adjusted to the new rules.

From the beginning of its operations down to the end of October, 1957, the Fund had sold currencies—U.S. and Canadian dollars, British pounds, West German marks, and Belgian francs—worth \$2,845,100,000. Most of these transactions were sales by the Fund of U.S. dollars.

When a country is past the adjustment period, and has built its reserve to a new safe level, it can restore its position in the Fund by buying back its own currency for dollars, or other freely convertible currencies, or for gold. By October 31, 1957, members of the Fund had repurchased \$1,083,600,000 worth of their currencies.

The amounts that members can get from the Fund are limited in various ways. They have almost free rights to buy their gold deposit, and a limited right to sums in excess of that, with an over-all limit generally equal to their quota. The Directors may allow a country a stand-by account that it can draw upon in case of need. They can stretch these limits for specially useful adjustments that the Fund wants to encourage. The Fund provides money only for adjustments that it is convinced can be carried through in three to five years. It is not in the business of making long-term investments.

For each accommodation the member pays the Fund a fee, which is not interest, since the member is not borrowing. It is a charge for services, and is mainly intended to put pressure on the members to buy back their own money as soon as they are able. The fees may or may not pay the running expenses of the Fund; that is not their purpose.

In the first years after 1945, the Monetary Fund had little to do. The troubles of the member nations were so deep-seated that no temporary help could cure them. For the time, they had to protect themselves with trade barriers until they could build up their production. But as the war damage has been repaired and business has improved, the Fund has had more and more opportunities to promote the free exchange of money that is the lifeblood of healthy world trade.

While levels of production have increased, widespread boom conditions have added to inflationary pressures in many parts of the world. Expensive national development programs have created a strain in some countries, and the Suez Canal shipping crisis late in 1956 added new difficulties and stimulated heavier demands on the Fund's resources. Members drew more than \$1.1 billion from the Fund during its eleventh fiscal year, from May 1, 1956, to April 30, 1957. The United Kingdom alone drew \$561,500,000 and concluded a stand-by agreement allowing it to draw an additional \$738,500,000 through December, 1957. Other countries that purchased foreign exchange from the Fund during this period were France (\$262,500,000), India (\$200,000,000), and Argentina (\$75,000,000); and a number of smaller transactions were announced.

On the whole, the members have continued to keep their policies in line with the Fund's objectives, and each year has brought some degree of progress toward currency convertibility. They have made increasing use of the opportunities for technical cooperation, and have become well accustomed to referring important questions of foreign exchange policy to the Fund for advice.

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade

In 1945 the Economic and Social Council decided to call a Conference on Trade and Employment, with the hope of reducing tariffs and other trade barriers. A Preparatory Committee was given the job of drafting a Charter for an International Trade Organization, which the proposed Conference might establish.

The Conference met in Havana in 1947 and 1948 and adopted a Charter for the ITO, but that organization has so far failed to come into action for lack of acceptances from the member nations, particularly the United States. In the meantime the Preparatory Committee decided to go ahead with more informal negotiations for tariff reductions. This latter operation soon became a success, and led to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT. The United States and all the other principal trading nations joined in the GATT conferences.

In these conferences, each member nation comes in with a list of other people's tariffs that it hopes to get reduced, and a list of its own tariffs that it might reduce in

the course of bargaining. The rule is that if any two countries agree to reduce certain tariffs for each other's benefit, they must give everyone else the same reduction. The conferences also take up other kinds of trade barriers, and consider complaints about members that violate their agreements. Usually these complaints are quickly adjusted. But in 1952 the United States was accused of violating its agreement by raising its restrictions on the importation of dairy products. Since the United States was not in a position to correct this situation, the Netherlands received permission to retaliate by restricting its wheat imports from the United States.

The effect of GATT has been a notable reduction in obstacles to trade. Along with the Bank's assistance to the international flow of capital, and the Fund's help in the exchange of money, the general situation of world production and trade since the Bretton Woods Conference has shown an encouraging rate of improvement.

TECHNICAL SERVICES

The modern world depends on many kinds of technical service to make possible the most efficient production and distribution. Some of the necessary services have to be international. Several UN specialized agencies are devoted to providing these international technical services.

It is noteworthy that these technical organizations, which deal only with experts and are generally unknown to the ordinary man in the street, began to appear long before the grass-roots services such as WHO and FAO. Probably the main reason for this difference in timing is that the techniques for directly attacking disease and poverty developed later than those for services such as telegraph and mail. The progress of international action from legalistic and technical abstractions to the provision of human everyday services is one of the main reasons for the increasing vitality of the idea of international co-operation.

International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

ITU is the oldest of the specialized agencies, having been founded as the International Telegraph Union in 1865 in Paris. In 1932 the radio agreements were added. The latest revised governing Convention went into effect at the beginning of 1954. The central office of ITU is in Geneva, Switzerland.

The principal work of ITU is to persuade the nations to agree to a practical allocation of radio frequency bands. It also tries to establish the lowest practicable rate schedules for radio, telegraph, and telephone services. ITU committees study and report on engineering problems, from radio ground-wave propagation to the design of telegraph apparatus and the protection of telephone lines from corrosion. ITU publishes technical literature and collects and reports on technical papers published by others.

The most difficult job is of course the allocation of bands. In 1947, a Special Administrative Radio Conference was called to work out a new schedule of bands. The Conference worked from May to October, and prepared a general table of allocations to various services, covering all bands from 10 kilocycles per second to 10,500,000 kc/s. The Conference looked to the nations in each part of the world to get together and allocate these bands for the prescribed services among themselves. The agreements were hard to get, especially where the use of radio for propaganda between hostile countries was an important factor.

In 1951 a new Conference was held in Geneva, where much more detailed allotment lists were adopted. It is believed that these lists may serve as a basis for an increasing amount of agreement among the nations. There is of course always a strong pressure on every country that wants to communicate by electric or electronic methods, to agree to a system that will bring order into the waves and allow messages to go through. This was the reason for the first ITU in 1865 and it is an even more powerful force for agreement in the use of the ether today.

Universal Postal Union (UPU)

The Universal Postal Union was established in 1875. In that year the Universal Postal Convention, proposed by the Postal Congress of Berne, Switzerland, in 1874, came into force. Meetings of the Postal Congress are held every five years to examine the rules of UPU and keep them up to date. The rules cover such matters as freedom of transit for the mails through the members' territories, and arbitration of disputes. The custom before 1875 was to divide the receipts between the country sending a piece of mail and the country that delivered it. The Universal Convention specified that each country would keep the money received from the sale of its stamps, and would pay only certain charges to an intermediate administration providing transportation. Special agreements have been adopted covering arrangements for insured mail, international money orders, collection of payments, and newspaper subscriptions.

Any nation can join UPU if two-thirds of the members agree. The Union is administered by an International Bureau located in Berne.

International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)

In 1919 an International Commission for Air Navigation was formed in Paris to set up technical standards, and in 1928 the Pan American Convention on Commercial Aviation was drawn up at Havana. These earlier agreements were superseded by ICAO, which was proposed at an international conference in Chicago in 1944. ICAO came into effect on April 4, 1947, on being ratified by twenty-six states. The headquarters are in Montreal, Canada.

The chief purposes of ICAO are to promote safety and technical progress in aviation, and to see to it that the member states are fairly treated in the operation of airlines.

To avoid confusion, ICAO has introduced codes of standards and recommended practices, which are in effect in all member countries. These codes cover such questions as the licensing of pilots; the right of way in the air; traffic controls; safety rules; airworthiness; and the simplification of customs, immigration, and inspection regulations at airports.

ICAO deals with the organization to be provided by each member to rescue the victims of aircraft accidents, and the system of inquiry into the causes of accidents. It has proposed international treaties of agreement on various legal questions, such as recognition of property rights in aircraft, and compensation for damage caused by foreign aircraft falling in a country.

ICAO has a budget of about \$1,200,000 for technical assistance. In February, 1953, it had fifteen missions in the field.

The ICAO basic agreement authorizes its elected representatives to arbitrate disputes between the member nations over air rights. Its first such case was between India and Pakistan. India complained that Pakistan refused to let Indian aircraft fly over Pakistan territory from New Delhi to Kabul in Afghanistan. The representatives took up the dispute in 1952. In January, 1953, they approved an agreement that not only allowed Indian planes to pass but provided for Pakistan to ship fuel to Afghanistan so that the planes could refuel in Kabul for the return trip. This settlement was accepted by both governments.

Since India and Pakistan were engaged in a violent and

dangerous dispute over the territory of Kashmir, the fact that a UN agency brought them to a peaceful agreement on the aviation matter is notable. The Kashmir question has been held below the explosion point with the aid of a succession of special commissions and mediators sent from the UN. The long-run chance for a reconciliation in this highly emotional dispute is perhaps improved whenever the two governments decide to cooperate on some useful and ordinary business arrangement.

World Meteorological Organization (WMO)

The main purpose of WMO is to help establish a network of weather stations and a quick exchange of weather information. It promotes standardization of weather observations and uniform methods of reporting. It helps to find ways of applying meteorology to aviation shipping, agriculture, and other activities. Finally, WMO encourages research and training in the science of meteorology.

WMO is governed by a Congress composed of delegates who are the Directors of the Weather Bureaus of the member governments. The Congress meets at least once every four years, and between sessions the organization is headed by an Executive Committee. Headquarters are in Geneva.

One of the jobs of WMO is to publish the *International Cloud Atlas*, containing pictures of hundreds of typical clouds in polar, temperate, and tropical skies, together with instructions for observing and classifying clouds and a summary of the present scientific knowledge of cloud formation.

WMO organizes technical assistance to countries that want advice on setting up weather services or on the use of weather services in agriculture, public health, and industry. WMO teams have worked in Afghanistan, Haiti, Israel, Libya, Turkey, and Yugoslavia, for example. WMO fellowships allow students to study weather techniques in countries that have well-developed services.

A special WMO Commission is studying the best arrangement of networks of observation stations. In the 1952-53 season, whaling ships in the south polar seas were brought into the weather observation network for the first time. Another technical project is the development of apparatus for transmitting weather charts by radio. Others deal with the detection of coming thunderstorms, the classification of snow, and an observation manual for the crews of aircraft.

Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO)

The Economic and Social Council decided in 1947, on the advice of the UN Transport and Communications Commission, that there should be a specialized agency to deal with agreements and information related to water navigation. As a result a Maritime Conference met in Geneva early in 1948, and drafted a Convention on IMCO, to come into effect when ratified by twenty-one states, of which seven shall each have at least a million gross tons of shipping.

IMCO is designed to promote cooperation among the member nations in regulating shipping and improving safety and efficiency, and to help all nations get fair treatment in shipping without discrimination and with freedom from unfair practices.

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE)

ECAFE is one of three regional commissions attached to the UN Economic and Social Council. This is the first organization in history that has brought together most of the nations of the Orient to discuss their problems and plans. Its main task is to help in developing the production and trade of the area extending from Pakistan to Japan, including the islands of the Western Pacific.

In connection with industrial development, for instance, ECAFE has studied the general conditions for effective foreign aid programs, has recommended the development of national income and resource budgets, and has suggested principles for planning how to bring in new industries without upsetting the standard of living.

ECAFE has made surveys and supplied information about developments in the steel industry, electric power, mineral resources, small-scale industries, housing, and building materials. It has given special attention to the problems of financing economic growth, the promotion of trade, and the design of flood control and water resource development. It has cooperated with FAO in a study of the economics of agriculture and in promoting land reform. In 1949, it organized a conference in Singapore on inland transport, out of which grew the Inland Water Transport Tour, mentioned in Chapter 1.

The headquarters of ECAFE are in Bangkok, Thailand.

Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA)

This Commission is composed of representatives of all the nations that have territories in the Western Hemisphere—the American countries and France, Holland, and the United Kingdom. ECLA has headquarters at Santiago, Chile, and a branch office in Mexico City. It deals with the planning and management of economic development.

The Commission has discussed how to make more capital available in the Latin American countries, both by attracting more foreign investment and by encouraging local savings. It has recommended that the Latin American nations expand trade among themselves, especially by improving transport facilities. It has made studies of agricultural credit, forestry, mineral resources, and trade problems, including balance of payments. The Commission studies how to expand the trade of Latin America with Europe and the United States. ECLA held a conference in October, 1952, in Bogotá, to discuss development of the iron and steel industry. It has asked member governments to consider encouraging the immigration of European workers as well as migration within Latin America.

Other subjects that the Commission has worked upon include rural health, tourism, supplies for educational institutions, and arrangements for cooperation with the Inter-American Economic and Social Council.

Economic Commission for Europe

In 1946 the most urgent problem in Europe was to revive production and trade, so that people could eat and could repair the devastation of war. The United Nations Economic and Social Council, which was established in that year, looked over the situation in Europe and suggested a regional organization to coordinate reconstruction work. The Assembly in December, 1946, directed the Council to establish an Economic Commission for Europe.

ECE went into action on March 28, 1947. As a start it took over the responsibilities of several previous organizations—the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, the European Coal Organization, and the European Central Inland Transport Organization. ECE was directed to help the European countries work together, and especially on the restoration of devastated countries.

All the European states that belong to the UN are members of ECE, together with the United States. European

states that do not belong to the UN are allowed to attend ECE meetings and to take part in committee work. The Commission meets once a year; most of the ECE work is done by special committees. The staff is part of the UN Secretariat.

One of the most valuable features of ECE is that of all the regional organizations in Europe it alone, being directly under UN administration, has members from both Eastern and Western Europe.

ECE committees carry on a vast amount of technical work that is necessary for the smooth running of trade and industry in Europe. They arrange for the return of railroad cars, allocate scarce coal supplies, and promote standardization of spare parts. The ECE Committee on Agriculture studies and reports on such matters as farming methods for small farmers, tenancy regulations, and cooperative credit. The Committee on Electric Power makes technical studies and helps to untangle the legal problems of hydroelectric projects on boundary rivers. Other committees deal with the engineering industry, housing, steel, timber, inland transport, and the development of trade.

The staff of ECE issues an annual *Economic Survey of Europe* and a quarterly *Economic Bulletin for Europe*, which are authoritative guides for many kinds of economic planning by European governments.

All these technical service agencies and commissions deal with the organization of the modern economic system. Many of them are unknown to the ordinary man in the street or the man on the farm, but what they are doing makes the difference between primitive ways of living and the full use of science and invention.

The technical services are more closely related to the behavior of governments than they are to the everyday thinking of the people. These commissions and conferences bring together the experts from all over the world to discuss hard scientific facts. They decide what needs to be done in order that industry and trade can be carried on efficiently. Then they report to their home governments, putting them under pressure to cooperate in a great network of practical relationships.

The network of cooperative technical services may not be enough to guarantee peace and good will on earth. But working together for constructive purposes can create a tendency toward friendly feelings among governments as well as among peoples.

HUMAN RIGHTS

According to the Charter one of the main purposes of the United Nations was "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights." In Article 56, also, the Charter lays an obligation on the member states to cooperate with the Organization in promoting universal respect for human rights and freedoms and universal observance of them.

The Charter does not describe in detail what it means by these rights and freedoms. The details were left to be worked out by the Organization.

Defining right and wrong so as to gain the acceptance of eighty-odd different nations is not simple. People of different races and religions in different parts of the world do not agree on some questions—such, for instance, as the rights of women. Moreover, there are differences in the meaning of the word "right"—between the right to a fair trial, for example, and the right to good public health services or to a fair chance to find a job. The different moral aspects of these classes of right have been clearly recognized in the UN debates.

Another point has been clearly recognized. No nation on earth can truly say that it gives its citizens absolute legal justice, on one hand, nor absolute protection against poverty and ignorance on the other. But the delegates believed that setting up the best ideals that the majority would agree to would help the world to make progress toward those ideals. Even if the nations could not boast of perfection, they could continue to reaffirm their faith in human rights.

The Declaration of Human Rights

To lay down the general principles of right and wrong the Assembly authorized the Economic and Social Council to appoint a Commission on Human Rights. The Commission was directed to draft a Declaration of Human Rights for adoption by the Assembly. Then in order to bind the nations to give serious attention to these principles, there was to be a Covenant, guaranteeing certain rights of the citizen. Any nation that would ratify the Covenant would

be "taking the pledge" to abstain from certain forms of injustice and oppression against its own people.

The Commission was appointed in 1946 and spent several years in discussing how to put into words the great principles of the Declaration. It received advice from many other UN agencies and from outside organizations interested in various aspects of right and wrong.

In general it can be said that all rights that need to be upheld are the opposites of wrongs that someone is suffering. A bill of rights therefore starts with a bill of wrongs that need to be corrected. When the United States Constitution was being adopted some of the states refused to ratify it until they were assured that a Bill of Rights would be added. They wanted a guarantee that the new government would not oppress their people with the same wrongs that had led the colonists to revolt against the British Crown. Thus the United States Constitution forbids the government's forcing the citizens to give house room to soldiers in peacetime, because the British Army had been brutal in this respect in its treatment of colonial families. In the same way the UN Commission studied the common wrongs of the twentieth century in all parts of the world, including ancient almost prehistoric horrors revived by Hitler and other totalitarian rulers.

All the wrongs of modern times that were a source of trouble or fear anywhere in the world were raw material for the Commission on Human Rights. The Rights of Man, now as in any previous age, are the right not to suffer the common wrongs of the time.

The Declaration of Human Rights was finally adopted by the Assembly without a dissenting vote on December 10, 1948. The Declaration proclaims the universal right of all persons to life, liberty, and security of person; to freedom from arbitrary arrest; to freedom of movement and residence, of speech, press, assembly and worship; and to the other legal rights commonly protected by democratic constitutions.

The Declaration also proclaims the rights of people to social security, education, and opportunities to earn a living. These rights are recognized as being in a different class from the legal rights usually described in a constitution. The United Nations makes the distinction between "civil and political" rights on the one hand, and what it called "economic, social, and cultural" rights on the other. In general, the civil and political rights, if they are stated in

the constitution of a country, can be enforced by law. A man who is arbitrarily arrested and held without trial, for instance, can appeal to a court for a fair trial according to law. If the courts are so corrupt or so tainted with dictatorship that the citizen cannot get his constitutional rights, his nation is guilty not only of oppressing the people but also of violating its own laws.

With the economic, social, and cultural rights the situation is different. No country so far has discovered how to give its people full employment under good working conditions all the time. No country knows how to treat its people with moral justice beyond all criticism, nor how to give the people all the education and health that can be desired.

But governments can do much to help in promoting health, education, justice and prosperity. The weight of world opinion, in fact, stands behind those in any country who would blame the government for unsatisfactory conditions. For example, the Economic and Social Council at its 1950 session decided to discuss the problems of full employment once every year. Governments, it declared, could achieve and maintain full employment in an expanding world economy under conditions ensuring fundamental political and economic freedoms to the individual.

In any country, a person who suffers a legal wrong and who can get no redress from the courts is the victim of tyranny or misgovernment. If the democratic voting processes are working fairly well he and others of like mind may hope to defeat the government in an election and bring in a government that will properly enforce the laws. Or, if the wrongs go so deep that free elections are impossible, those who are wronged will look for opportunities to overthrow the government by violence.

A citizen who is hurt by unemployment or by bad health conditions or other circumstances may blame his government for neglect of its duty. In this class of dispute, the citizen cannot appeal to the courts; for his complaint is only that the government has failed to pass the right laws to help in correcting unemployment or high rates of disease. In democratic countries such forms of discontent ordinarily serve as ammunition for the opposition political parties. If the discontent is sufficient it leads to a change of government at the next election.

Whether the citizen's appeal is to the law or to the political decision in the next election, or, in a dictatorship, to

the processes of resistance, in all cases the moral support of the United Nations acts to encourage the citizen in hatred of injustice. Even the most tyrannous governments do not tell their people that the government glories in doing wrong. The arguments are over what is right and what is wrong. When the secret police drag a man away at midnight and send him off to a concentration camp, the government explains that it is protecting the nation against treason. When a dictator holds an election in which the citizens are not allowed a free choice, he does not boast of the wrong, but proclaims his election as the free and democratic choice of the people. But when the Assembly of the United Nations gives its judgment, that judgment has a thundering authority as the voice of mankind. Arbitrary arrest without due process of law is clearly defined and clearly condemned. An election will not be recognized as free and democratic if it is done under oppressive conditions.

The Declaration of Human Rights, therefore, can properly deal with both the duty of nations to treat their people justly, and the duty of nations to serve their people as well as possible in the promotion of health, prosperity, and social security. The Declaration is not a law, but a statement of moral judgment. It is a set of principles to which a nation can appeal in complaining against another nation before the General Assembly. It is also a set of moral standards to which private citizens or political parties can appeal in complaining against the behavior of their own government.

The Covenants

In the Declaration, the Assembly addressed the nations and told them its judgment on the nature of right and wrong. Beyond that, the Assembly directed the Commission on Human Rights to draft a Covenant to be placed before the nations in the form of a treaty to be ratified.

After some discussion the Commission recommended the submission of two Covenants, one covering legal and political rights, and the other for economic, social, and cultural rights, since these two kinds of rights are different in their relation to laws and constitutions. This suggestion of dividing the substance of the Declaration into two separate Covenants was accepted by the sixth session of the Assembly in 1951.

A nation ratifying the first Covenant would bind itself to make and enforce laws protecting its own people against unjust and cruel treatment. There is, of course, no enforcement power in the UN to force a nation to keep such a promise—except the power to receive complaints and to proclaim that wrong is being done. Any nation does not lightly put itself in a position to be openly convicted of wrongdoing.

A nation ratifying the second Covenant would acknowledge its duty and responsibility to do all it can to promote better living conditions. In connection with this general duty, it would also recognize certain legal rights connected with economic and social security. The right to join trade unions, for instance, comes in the second Covenant as a necessary economic right to promote the public welfare.

Many democratic countries have constitutional guarantees of some rights that are not included in the UN Covenants. These are rights of historical or local importance that a majority of the delegates did not regard as necessary in a world statement of principles. The Covenants therefore must provide that ratification will not reduce any rights already established in a ratifying country.

The final drafts of the two Covenants have been repeatedly postponed, and by 1957 they had not yet been submitted to the member nations.

In addition to working on the Covenants, the UN is advertising the principles of human rights in various other ways. The 1950 session of the General Assembly, for instance, proclaimed December 10 as Human Rights Day. This anniversary is celebrated in many countries with ceremonies to remind the people of the Declaration and to spread the knowledge of its principles. The UN actions on a number of special problems also serve to illustrate and buttress the general principles of the Declaration.

Freedom of Information

One of the most complex rights is that of freedom of information. A UN conference on this subject, held in the spring of 1948 in Geneva, adopted three draft Conventions: one on gathering and sending of news, one on the right of governments to demand correction of news that they claim to be false, and one on freedom of information.

The first of these proposals would ask the nations to agree that foreign newsmen could have the same right to

get at the sources of news as the native newsgatherers. The second Convention, on the right of correction, would bind all governments agreeing to it that whenever a news source in any country gives out any item that is objectionable to another member of the agreement, the offended country can send an official complaint to the government of the country where the story originated. Then the government receiving the complaint promises to give it due publicity.

The whole subject of freedom of information is complicated by the fact that it includes on one side the freedom of newsmen and publishers to get and give out the news; on another side the freedom of the people to read or hear the news; and on a third side the rights of governments to protect themselves. The right of publication is easily corrupted into the publication of false reports. The rights of government are easily corrupted into censorship and the "big lie" techniques of public deception. The simple purpose of UN action might be to protect the public's right to full and honest news; but there are some governments that are not ready to grant the public any such right without reservations. The result is that the moral authority of the UN in this matter is less certain in its pronouncements than in dealing with other human rights.

Genocide

Genocide is the subject of a special Convention adopted on December 9, 1948, by the General Assembly and submitted to the members for ratification. The ratifying states agree that the crime of genocide consists of trying to destroy a "national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such." Genocidal actions include killing members of a group because they are members, causing them serious injury in body or mind, or trying to destroy the group by preventing births among its members or by transferring its children to other groups. The ratifying states agree to the punishment of any of their citizens who commit genocide, including public officials responsible for genocidal policies.

Of course, a state seriously determined to practice genocide might not hesitate to deny all the facts, whether it had signed the Convention or not. But the Convention helps to bring to a focus the force of world opinion which even dictators are not entirely able to disregard. As of 1957, fifty-six states had ratified the Genocide Convention.

Rights of Women

The Economic and Social Council established a Commission on the Status of Women in June, 1946. This Commission deals with the political and legal rights of women, and such matters as equal opportunity in education and employment.

The Assembly adopted a Convention on the Political Rights of Women on December 20, 1952, and submitted it to the member nations for their ratification. Any nation joining in this Convention admits the right of women to vote, to hold public office, and to serve on public institutions, such as juries, without discrimination. In some countries the laws do not grant these rights to women and would have to be changed before the government could become a party to the Convention. By 1957, thirty-nine states had signed this Convention, and twenty-seven had ratified or acceded to it. Another Convention, to protect women against automatically losing their nationality if they marry foreigners, has been discussed without leading to early decision.

The Commission on the Status of Women recommended that the UN missions sent into dependent territories to inspect the condition of the people should include women as well as men, so as to promote the equal rights of women in those territories.

The Commission has begun to study a number of inequalities in the position of women in various countries, which will not be easily or quickly changed. One of these is the difference in opportunity for employment in the public service. Another is unequal pay for women doing equal work with men. Another is the unequal position between men and women in the holding of family property and in other legal features of the family relationship. Still another is the unequal opportunity in most countries for women to get an education.

War Victims

Prisoners of war and refugees have presented a heartbreaking situation since the beginning of World War II.

Millions of men, women, and children disappeared without trace in the course of the war. Some of them are alive, and those who are lucky may still find trace of their surviving relatives. Most of the missing persons are dead,

but there are no records of their deaths. One of the results of these disappearances is to tangle the legal titles to property. The heirs cannot get a clear title. Another is that the wife or husband of a missing person may not be permitted to remarry without positive proof of death.

The Economic and Social Council brought up the subject of the missing-persons problem in 1948. As a result the Assembly called a special conference of governments at UN Headquarters in March, 1950, which set up a Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons. The Convention provides for a bureau that will examine such evidence as may be obtainable. When it finds no reason to the contrary it will declare a missing person dead, for purposes of fixing the legal position of his survivors.

Under Hitler some of the prisoners in concentration camps were used for "scientific experiments" which left them alive but crippled in one way or another. The plight of the surviving victims was considered by the Economic and Social Council and was brought to the attention of the Secretary-General of the UN. The Secretary-General did not question his own right to inquire on behalf of the UN, although Germany was under occupation and was not a member of the UN. He inquired of the Allied High Commission in Germany, the Federal Government (West Germany), the German Democratic Republic (East Germany), and various international agencies interested in helpless persons.

As a result of these inquiries, the German Federal Government accepted responsibility for the care of the several hundred unfortunates who could be located. The Economic and Social Council notified the authorities in other countries and various public and private agencies that were in a position to help in locating victims not living in West Germany.

Prisoners of war continued to be a cause of dispute after 1945 because so many of them failed to return.

In 1950, the Assembly received a memorandum from Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States on the fact that many prisoners of war captured from Germany and Japan had not returned to their homes. The three governments noted that all the victorious Allies had agreed among themselves to repatriate the war prisoners, and they accused the Soviet Union of failing to do so. They asked the Assembly to seek out the truth of the

matter and try to secure the release of the survivors.

The Assembly requested the Secretary-General to set up an impartial Commission for the examination of these charges. It urged all the governments concerned to co-operate with the Commission.

The U.S.S.R. objected to having the subject considered, on the ground that when the UN was founded it was not given any right to deal with the settlement of the war. The Soviet delegation also denied that the Soviet Union was holding any prisoners.

The Secretary-General announced the Commission in June, 1951. It was made up of Countess Bernadotte, whose husband had been murdered when he was acting as mediator for the UN in Palestine; Judge José Gustavo Guerrero, Vice-President of the International Court of Justice; and Judge Aung Khine, Judge of the High Court, Rangoon, Burma. Such a committee was well calculated to represent the untrammelled conscience of mankind and to serve as a dependable guide to world opinion.

In 1957 the Commission reported that because of the refusal of the Soviet Government to cooperate it had not been able to negotiate directly with that country, but that some progress had been made by direct negotiations between countries and by the good offices of the Red Cross. More than 28,000 Germans had been repatriated, mostly from the Soviet Union, and more than 33,000 Japanese, mostly from China. Some progress had been made in getting names of prisoners who had died. The West German Government, however, stated that it had the names of 87,000 prisoners of war and 16,000 civilians who had been taken by the Soviets but whose fate was unknown.

Refugees

Another large-scale problem left over from World War II was that of the refugees. The International Refugee Organization, which was formed by a number of governments to take care of the war refugees, was dissolved in 1949, leaving the remaining part of the burden to be taken up by the United Nations. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees began operations on January 1, 1951.

The High Commissioner's office was made responsible for the interests of most of the people in the world who

have fled from their home countries and dare not go back for fear of persecution. Exceptions are refugees who have been given national rights in the country where they now are, and some others such as Koreans and Palestinian Arabs who have special agencies looking after them. In 1951, there were believed to be about two million surviving refugees coming under the High Commissioner's mandate, more than half of them in Europe.

The UN pays only for the expense of running the Office of the High Commissioner and its various branches, a total of less than a million dollars a year. The expense of taking care of the refugees is paid for from voluntary contributions, public and private.

The High Commissioner is responsible for the international protection of refugees, the promotion of activities that will help the refugees to find secure homes, and the coordination of private organizations that work for refugees. International protection is necessary because the laws of most countries have no place for foreigners without passports or other evidence that they belong somewhere. A "stateless" person may be refused the right to enter a country at all.

Accordingly, the refugee problem has stimulated international action to define the legal position of people without a country. A Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees was adopted in 1951 at a Conference of Plenipotentiaries held in Geneva. By 1955 it had been ratified by sixteen states. This Convention is designed to make clear what people are refugees and what rights they shall have. Other international agreements provide for the settlement of refugees in the countries where they are living, and for giving refugees the benefit of social security and medical assistance. The High Commissioner has the authority under a General Assembly resolution to make agreements with governments to improve the condition of refugees.

In 1957 the High Commissioner reported progress in finding homes for refugees with tuberculosis or other serious disabilities, especially those from Hungary and some of the Europeans from mainland China living in the Shanghai Emergency Staging Centre. Norway, Sweden, and Denmark had accepted more than 200 from Shanghai, with their families; and of the Hungarians in Austria and Yugoslavia, Denmark had taken 1,137, Norway 1,344, and Sweden 5,994. Most of these cases had tuberculosis; some were mental cases or aged invalids.

Race Conflicts in South Africa

In the first session of the Assembly, in 1946, India complained about the treatment of Indians in the Union of South Africa. One of India's chief accusations was that the Asiatic Land Tenure and Representation Act of 1946 forced the segregation of Indians both for living quarters and for business.

India said the situation was likely to cause unfriendly feelings between the two countries, and that it violated a treaty and the UN Charter. South Africa replied that segregation was a domestic question which the UN had no right to meddle with, and that the agreement quoted by India was not a treaty. South Africa also pointed out that the UN Charter mentioned human rights but did not say what they were, and that until there was a UN bill of rights, telling just what rights were included, the UN could not find anyone in violation of the Charter on that score.

The Assembly rejected a South African proposal to ask the International Court of Justice whether this matter was purely domestic. Instead, the Assembly said that friendly relations between two member states were plainly being impaired. It advised South Africa to conform with the previous agreement and with the Charter.

In its seventh session, in 1952, the Assembly found the dispute no nearer to a settlement. Meanwhile thirteen Asian states, ranging from Lebanon to the Philippines, brought in a complaint against the South African policy known as apartheid, for segregating the Negroes. The Assembly set up a three-man commission to study the race situation in South Africa. It also passed a resolution declaring that where several races live together in a country they ought to be equal before the law. The Assembly affirmed that racial discrimination was contrary to the pledges of the members who had signed the Charter, and solemnly called on all members to conform to their Charter obligations. South Africa refused to accept these resolutions.

In the eleventh session of the General Assembly India and Pakistan again complained of the treatment by South Africa of people of Indian origin. The question was discussed in January, 1957, without the South African delegation, which had been withdrawn from the Assembly in protest against the decision to discuss it. A resolution

urging South Africa to negotiate was passed 49 to 0, with 11 abstentions.

At the same time the apartheid policy was taken up, and a resolution introduced by the Philippine delegate calling this policy "inconsistent with the Charter" was passed 55 to 5 with 10 abstentions. Some of the abstentions in these cases were explained by delegates who opposed racial discrimination but doubted the right of the UN to discuss the "internal policies" of South Africa.

Elections in Germany

In Germany, the question of reuniting East and West Germany has been a perennial source of dispute. The center of the dispute is similar to the early dispute between the Soviet and American authorities in Korea—the question of free and democratic elections. The West German Government, backed by Britain, France, and the United States, insisted that any Soviet proposal for uniting Germany could be accepted only if it included free all-German elections. The Soviets wanted to have an agreement first between the two German governments on an equal basis, with elections to come later. The result was a deadlock.

Accordingly, the three Western Powers took up a suggestion of Chancellor Adenauer of West Germany that they should ask the UN to step in. They asked the Sixth General Assembly (1950) to appoint an impartial commission that would examine both West and East Germany and report whether genuinely free elections could be held in those areas.

The Political Committee of the Assembly took statements from East and West Germans. The West Germans said that free elections could not be held unless all Germans had a free chance to give their views. They wanted an impartial commission to investigate. The East Germans said that this was a domestic problem to be settled by Germans under the supervision of the Occupying Powers, and that UN interference would be a violation of the rights of the German people.

The Assembly voted to appoint the Commission, consisting of representatives from Brazil, Iceland, the Netherlands, Pakistan, and Poland. Poland refused to serve, calling the Commission illegal.

The Commission made arrangements to study condi-

tions in Western Germany, but was unable to make contact with the authorities in the Soviet Zone and East Berlin. It therefore reported back to the Assembly on April 30, 1952, that it had been unable to do the work for which it was appointed.

At first sight it might seem that the lack of success in this case, and in the UN relations with South Africa, left the United Nations looking entirely futile. Such a judgment would miss what the UN is really supposed to do. Many human disputes are insoluble so long as the parties refuse to budge. But if the United Nations goes through all the motions of offering the instruments for finding a solution, and expressing the almost unanimous judgment of the world on the issues being disputed, the effect is not futile. The effect is to leave the nation that blocks a settlement in the position of being condemned by world opinion. Such condemnation may not be fatal, but no nation can take it without an uncomfortable loss of face.

Human Rights in Eastern Europe

Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania ended World War II as defeated allies of Germany. They were given peace treaties under which they promised to grant the ordinary democratic rights and liberties to their people. They were repeatedly proposed for UN membership by the Soviet Union, but rejected by the majority as not being "able and willing" to carry out the obligations of membership.

In early 1949, Bolivia called the Assembly's attention to the fact that a Hungarian court had sentenced Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment. A few days later Australia asked the Assembly to take action on violations of religious and civil liberty in Bulgaria and Hungary. In Bulgaria a court had sentenced four Protestant leaders to life imprisonment and eleven others to shorter prison terms.

Several countries who were parties to the peace treaties had tried to get the offending governments to appoint negotiators, according to the terms of the treaties, to discuss the question of possible treaty violation. The UN Assembly adopted a resolution on April 30, 1949, pointing out to Hungary and Bulgaria the serious accusations and urging them to cooperate with the other signers of the treaties in a settlement of these questions.

Australia also brought in an accusation that Romania

had set up an oppressive control system over the courts, the expression of opinion, and the exercise of religion, and had persecuted the churches when they protested.

The Assembly noted in October, 1949, that Bulgaria, Hungary, and Romania were still refusing to cooperate, and it asked the International Court to give an opinion as to several questions on the interpretation of the peace treaties. On the strength of the Court's opinion the Assembly on November 3, 1950, condemned the three governments for "willful refusal" to honor their treaty obligations. They were, however, admitted to membership in the UN on December 14, 1955, in a "package deal" by which countries previously vetoed by the Soviet Union were admitted along with others that had been previously excluded by the majority in the Security Council.

The Hungarian Revolt

On October 28, 1956, the Security Council met and took up the question of the Hungarian revolt, in spite of Soviet objections. Three days later Imre Nagy, who had come to power in Hungary, cabled saying that Hungary had withdrawn from the Warsaw Treaty by which she was allied with the Soviets, and asking the Assembly to discuss the matter. He also said that Soviet armies were invading the country. But within the next few days Nagy was overthrown and the Kádár government, supported by the Soviets, took over. In the Council a resolution calling on the Soviets to end their interference was vetoed by the Soviet delegate, and the question then went to the Assembly, which passed a similar resolution on November 4.

For two months the Assembly tried to send observers to Hungary, but they were refused admittance, and at last on January 8 it set up a Special Committee, of Australia, Ceylon, Denmark, Tunisia, and Uruguay, to find out the truth and report.

The Soviet and Kádár position was that the revolt had been a minority uprising of reactionary elements stirred up and aided by "outside imperialists," and that the Hungarian Government had asked for Soviet help. They denied the stories that trainloads of Hungarians had been carried off to the Soviet Union. They said that the affair was a domestic Hungarian matter which the UN under its Charter had no right to discuss. The Special Committee was refused permission to set foot in Hungary.

The Committee heard 111 witnesses who had escaped from Hungary, including government officials, managers of state enterprises, journalists, professors, lawyers, engineers, and labor leaders, as well as leaders among the "freedom fighters," students, railroad workers, and nurses. One witness had been a manager in the uranium mines, and another a stenographer for the secret police. The Committee also examined a mass of documents, including reports from embassies in Budapest. It regarded the testimony as conclusive, and so did the Assembly. The Committee's report, submitted on June 20, was accepted by the Assembly on September 13 by a vote of 60 to 10, with 10 abstaining. Only the communist countries voted "No."

The resolution passed by the Assembly noted the Committee's conclusion that the events in Hungary "constituted a spontaneous national uprising," and went on to state flatly that the Soviet Union, "in violation of the United Nations Charter, has deprived Hungary of its liberty . . . and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental human rights." The resolution stated that the Soviets had imposed the Kádár government on the Hungarian people, had carried out mass deportations, and had violated treaty obligations; and it called upon them to restore the rights of Hungarians and return those who had been deported. It appointed Prince Wan Waithayakon of Thailand as a Special Representative to bring pressure on the Soviets, and decided to keep the question of Hungary on its program for further discussion.

What good did all this do the Hungarians? Very little, at the time. But it is necessary to keep in mind that no power on earth could drive the Soviets out of Hungary by force, except by starting World War III. What can be done, however, is to deny false stories, tell the truth, and condemn acts of violence and oppression, in a voice that must be heard and respected. No nation that is trying to influence the people of the world to follow its lead and take its side can shrug off the loss of confidence that a UN condemnation inflicts upon it in the eyes of the world.

That is what could be done, and the UN did it. In the long run such an action is a setback for tyranny and a gain for freedom, even though the run may be long. What more could any human influence do, if we are not to blow up the world?

Reports coming from Hungary in 1957 indicated that

after the Assembly demanded an end to mass deportations many who had been deported were brought back and further deportations were "substantially diminished."

Mass Murder of Prisoners

In the seventh session of the Assembly the Soviet Union brought in a "complaint of the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war by the United States military authorities on the island of Pongam." The Soviets proposed a draft of a resolution referring to numerous "atrocities" by the Americans, and asked the Assembly to condemn them. The nub of the charge was that the Americans were killing prisoners who demanded to be sent home. The complaint was filed just before a recess, and would normally have been referred to a committee for study.

The Assembly did not refer the complaint to a committee but took it up immediately in full meeting. The Americans accused the Soviets of a "shabby propaganda stunt" in bringing up the atrocity story at the last minute of a session, so that it could lie unanswered for long enough to horrify the world.

At this period the cease-fire negotiations were going on in Korea, and the principal point in dispute was whether the UN would return North Korean and Chinese prisoners who did not want to go home.

The United States claimed that in an attempt to put pressure on the UN negotiators the Communists had organized riots in the prison camps, and that some of the prisoners had had to be shot in the course of restoring order.

The Assembly rejected the Soviet resolution by a vote of 5 to 45, with 10 abstaining.

Slavery

In 1947, the American Federation of Labor asked the United Nations to make a complete study of forced labor in all member states and to take action to get rid of it. (The A.F. of L. had collected a large mass of testimony from released prisoners and escapees describing conditions in the Soviet Union and its associated states, which it wished to bring to public attention.)

The Economic and Social Council received the A.F. of L. request and invited the International Labor Organiza-

tion and the Secretary-General to study the problem. In 1951, the Council adopted a proposal, put forward by Britain and the United States, to set up a committee of inquiry. The committee was told to study "systems of forced or corrective labor which are employed as a means of political coercion or punishment for holding or expressing political views."

The Secretary-General and the Director-General of ILO appointed Sir Ramaswami Mudaliar, who had headed the Indian Delegation at San Francisco in 1945; Mr. Paal Berg, former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Norway; and Sr. Felix Fulgencio Palavicini, formerly Mexican Ambassador to Britain.

The committee sent a questionnaire to all states whether members of UN, of ILO, or of neither. It also invited all private organizations with information on forced labor to come in and testify. Most of the countries of the world replied to the committee's questionnaire, and a number of organizations and private persons gave evidence. The committee decided to send out to all the interested governments a summary of the testimony. It reported to the Assembly that the Soviet Union and the states associated with it employed forced labor on an extensive scale.

In September, 1956, a UN conference in Geneva adopted an antislavery agreement, bringing up to date an earlier agreement of 1926. The new treaty goes beyond the well-known kinds of slavery to forbid such things as debt bondage, serfdom, bride price, inheritance of wives, and certain abuses in the adoption of children. The agreement was ratified by the Soviet Union in April, 1957.

It is worth noting that the practice of employing convicts in a prison factory or on highway construction, as is done in many civilized countries, was not the target of the "forced labor" investigation, which applied only to the punishment of *political* prisoners. Merciful treatment of criminals is also important as a matter of human rights, but is not in the same classification with the problem of political slave-camps.

Progress Among the Nations

Each year some of the nations take action on their own account to abolish a wrong that has begun to hurt the national conscience, and in its place to establish a right in the form of a new law. *The United Nations Review*

for December, 1954, gave a list of actions taken by various nations during the previous year to promote human rights.

In the United States, the Supreme Court had declared it unconstitutional to require colored and white children to attend separate schools. The U.S.S.R. had repealed a decree forbidding Soviet citizens to marry foreigners. In Denmark, new constitutional clauses forbade discrimination on account of "descent," and guaranteed the rights of privacy and freedom of expression. Greenland was given representation in the Danish Parliament. Brazil passed a law against propagating race, religious, or class hatreds. Japan had set up Civil Liberties Commissioners to look into complaints of injustices and take steps to get them corrected.

The duty of governments to protect their people from epidemic diseases, economic depressions, and widespread ignorance, can no longer be denied. But this duty has only recently been recognized and governments are slow to shake off old ways and take on new responsibilities. The United Nations helps to push the nations along the way they must go to find better conditions of life for their people.

The moral pressure of the United Nations—pressure on reluctant nations to give up legal wrongs—is a striking example of the power of united action. The advance of justice and mercy can often be pushed with the greatest effect by the moral pressure of people not injured themselves but shocked by cruelty to others. Wrongdoers are extremely sensitive to condemnation by the "public"—that is, by the people whose disapproval may be injurious to their success. This sensitivity of nations is constantly proved in the meetings of the UN Assembly and the Security Council. No nation boasts of wrongdoing; if a nation is determined to do evil it looks for ways to evade the judgment of the world.

When an overwhelming majority of the Assembly, made up of delegates of many races, religions, and languages, passes judgment, there is no more terrible judgment to be had on earth.

NON-SELF-GOVERNING PEOPLES

The age of modern European imperialism began with the opening of sea routes from Europe to Asia around the Cape of Good Hope and to America across the Atlantic. After A.D. 1500 most of the world came under European control. Then came a movement for independence, starting in the eighteenth century with the successful revolt of thirteen British colonies on the North American coast, and continuing with the Spanish colonies in Central and South America. The movement for independence, called "self-determination" by Woodrow Wilson at Versailles in 1919, has now progressed so far that the United Nations Assembly treats it as a matter of course. Of about 800 million people who lived in dependent areas in 1945 over 600 million had gained full independence by 1957. Most of them are in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, the Philippines, Israel, Morocco, Tunisia, Ghana, and Malaya. The Assembly expects the remaining 170 million or so inhabitants of non-self-governing territories to be trained for self-government and released from control as soon as they are ready to look after themselves.

In the UN there are two systems under which the nations that govern dependent territories give an accounting of how they treat their subject peoples. One is known as Trusteeship, under which the governing nations report to the UN Trusteeship Council. In the other, less formal system, the nations report to the Secretary-General on the economic, social, and educational conditions in their areas.

Trusteeship

The trusteeship system has come down from the mandate system of the League of Nations. After World War I, the former German colonies were taken over by the League. Their administration was farmed out to various powers which accepted a "mandate" to govern in the interest of the people and to give account of their stewardship to the League.

Under the UN, ten of the former mandates were made

into Trust Territories by agreement with various powers that accepted responsibility for administering the territories under UN supervision. The British Government took charge of three Trust Territories in Africa, France took two, and Belgium one. In the Pacific, two trusteeships are held by Australia, and one by New Zealand. The Territory of the Pacific Islands, formerly under a Japanese mandate, was placed under United States administration.

Italian Somaliland, taken from Italy in World War II, was assigned to Italy as Trustee pending independence in 1960.

The UN Charter established a Trusteeship Council to look after the interests of the people in the Trust Territories. On the Council are all the UN members that hold trusteeships and an equal number of other members.

The Council sends out a questionnaire of several hundred detailed questions on the political, economic, social, and educational progress of the Trust Territories. It also receives hundreds of petitions and complaints from organizations and individual people in the Territories.

The Council sends regular missions to visit every Trust Territory once every few years. The missions are chosen from a wide variety of nations to get a broad view of the problems. For instance, one mission to West Africa had representatives of Iraq, Belgium, Mexico, and the United States. The missions look over the Territory, talk with the people, and are ready to hear comments and complaints.

The Trustee government is required to submit a full report every year. It sends a special representative prepared to answer questions about the Territory. On the basis of all the various sources of information, the Council makes a report on each Trust Territory to the General Assembly.

The General Assembly in turn discusses the trusteeship reports and makes recommendations for the government of the Territories. It does not hesitate to criticize what has been done and to call for more education, better laws, and more signs of progress toward self-government.

Togoland

The Trusteeship Council and the Assembly take a keen interest in old customs that may have been long established in a Territory but which offend the moral sense of outsiders. The British Administration in Togoland on the West Coast of Africa, for instance, was asked not only to

provide more schools and medical services, but also to abolish corporal punishment. The Administration proudly reported in 1953 that during the previous year a well-equipped hospital was established in the Territory, free primary schools were opened, and a new secondary school and two teacher training colleges were established; and finally during the year no court in the Territory had sentenced anyone to be whipped. The Council urged the Administration to continue its efforts for the complete removal of corporal punishment from the territorial law.

In the two Togolands, one under British and the other under French administration, the most difficult problem for several years was the dissatisfaction of the Ewe people (pronounced "evoo") living on both sides of the border between the British- and French-administered Togolands. They trade and visit and intermarry across the border, with many irritating inconveniences. Moreover, their natural ambition to govern themselves as one nation instead of two has been frustrated by the division of their foreign rulers. Accordingly, their leaders repeatedly appealed to the United Nations.

When the Ewes first complained to the Trusteeship Council, the French and British Administrations answered in a joint memorandum. They promised to reduce frontier barriers and ease the passage of people and goods between the divided Ewe areas, to remove double taxation, to teach the Ewe children both English and French, and to set up a consultative Commission for Togoland Affairs. These reforms did not of course satisfy the Ewes.

A mission that visited Togoland in 1949 reported that the issue was still hot.

In 1952 the General Assembly considered a report from a second mission, which had been in Togoland that same year. The mission said that unification had become a live political issue on both sides of the border, but that the people were still not agreed on how it ought to be done.

In 1954 the General Assembly again discussed the Togoland problems at length. Britain called attention to the fact that it was administering British Togoland in conjunction with the adjoining Gold Coast territory. As the Gold Coast was soon to be granted independence, the British wished to drop the Togoland trusteeship.

Representatives from the area indicated a wide divergence of opinion. Some wanted to unite British Togoland

with the new independent Gold Coast; others wanted union with French Togoland. The non-Ewe peoples objected to independence, saying they would be oppressed by the Ewes.

Finally, in 1956, the people of British Togoland were invited to vote on whether to join the Gold Coast in setting up the new independent state of Ghana, or to continue under British administration pending some other solution of their problems. The voting was orderly and the people voted 93,000 to 67,000 to join the Gold Coast. Accordingly, the territory is now a part of the state of Ghana, which was admitted in 1957 to the United Nations as the eighty-first member.

As for French Togoland, a special UN Commission reported to the Trusteeship Council in September, 1957, that the relations between France and the Territory had been much improved by a new governing statute, passed by the French Parliament in the middle of 1956 and endorsed by the votes of over 70 per cent of the Togoland people in October of that year. The new statute gives wide powers to the Togoland Government, reserving to the French authorities only the administrative jobs considered to be "financially and technically onerous." The Commission regarded these jobs as likely to be transferred gradually as local people are trained to take over the more difficult kinds of work. The Trusteeship Council commended the French administration and sent the report along to the Assembly "in order to set in motion the influences that would help to bring further progress toward self-government."

These situations illustrate how the UN purpose of extending self-government to dependent peoples can be peacefully carried out wherever the governing powers are willing and are ready to agree that the people are capable of standing on their own feet.

Somaliland

Another good example of how the UN promotes independence is the Trusteeship of Somaliland. This Italian colony was taken by the British in the last war, and its future was left to the decision of the United Nations. The Assembly decided in 1949 that the Somalis were not ready for independence but might be after ten years of development. Italy was appointed as Trustee, with a special Advisory Council of representatives from Egypt, Co-

lombia, and the Philippines to aid it in its administration. The British turned over the government to the new administration on April 1, 1950.

The Somalis have a hard road to travel before they can stand on their own feet as an independent people. While they are learning the political skills that will enable them to operate an independent kingdom or republic, they need also to make as much progress as they can toward economic independence. Sooner or later they will have to earn enough money in world trade to buy the things that they have to import. To earn money they have to develop their unused resources, such as underground water. They have to change from the nomadic habits of desert tribes into a more settled way of life, which they may do when they have more wells for watering their camels, cattle, sheep, and goats. They have to learn to read and write, not only in Italian but in their own tongue. But there is no written Somali language and the spoken language is divided into many dialects. Two language experts from UNESCO were called in to advise the Administration on what form of Somali to make official, and on the invention of an alphabet in which to write the official language. For a people aiming to become a modern nation in ten years, this could be called an ambitious program.

Politically, too, the people have a hard road but one that they are undertaking with high hopes. They do not all agree—one indication of political good health. The first nationalist party, the Somali Youth League, was formed in 1943. It is strongly anti-Italian. The Youth League representative told the Trusteeship Council in 1953 that the Administration was moving too slowly. He demanded an over-all economic plan and a native legislature with the right to legislate.

Another representative advised the Council not to be too much in a hurry for political democracy. He said:

The tribes cannot be disbanded and a new system substituted in a few years. They must be guided and interested by means of appropriate measures so that a gradual transformation takes place until final social, economic, and political progress has penetrated and extended to the entire Territory, creating new living conditions. Somaliland's evolution will be the result of two concurrent movements: first, the development of the parties and of the various administrative and political organizations which the Administering Authority is es-

tablishing, particularly in the cities and other centers; secondly, the evolution of the tribes as a result of a diffusion of new ideas and above all of changes in the economic situation.

Whether the new self-governing Somaliland of 1960 could stand entirely on its own feet, pay its own expenses, and take its own part in the work of the United Nations, was not at all clear to the Administration or the Trusteeship Council as the ten years of training and development slipped by with frightening speed. But full independence and self-support are good ideals that not every older nation can reach entirely and all the time. The lesson of Somaliland is that the world is fast learning the technical requirements of independence and is fast developing confidence that peoples with no previous experience can hope to set up a modern nation in less than a lifetime.

Samoa

In November, 1946, Western Samoa was being shifted from a League of Nations Mandate to a United Nations Trusteeship, under New Zealand as Administering Power. The Administrator invited the inhabitants to express their opinions on the proposed Trusteeship Agreement that New Zealand had submitted to the UN.

The Samoans petitioned for immediate self-government under the protection of New Zealand. At the suggestion of New Zealand, the Trusteeship Council decided to send a mission to Western Samoa. The mission was made up of members from Belgium, Chile, and the United States. It was in Samoa in July and August, 1947, and at the same time the New Zealand government consulted with the Samoans. In November, New Zealand adopted a new form of government for Western Samoa which was closely in line with the mission's recommendations.

Under the new Samoan Amendment Act, the principal chiefs are established with the High Commissioner in a Council of State. Samoan Members have an absolute majority in the legislature, which has authority to make the laws and to dispose of the revenues of the Territory. The Trusteeship Council has expressed satisfaction with the New Zealand policies and has recommended that the Samoans should be encouraged to take on more and more of the responsibilities of self-government.

The right of the UN to send missions to look over the

Trust Territories is new. This right did not exist under the League of Nations mandate system. The trusteeship system is considerably broader in its scope and gives the administration of these Territories a much more extensive supervision than under the League.

Non-Self-Governing Territories

The Trustee areas, containing some 20 million people, represent the direct responsibility of the UN, being in each case the ex-colonies of defeated Powers whose sovereign claims were wiped out by war. About 58 other territories, containing 150 million people, are ranked as non-self-governing, and the UN Charter lays an obligation on the Powers that control them to report on their progress each year. Many of these territories, such as Hawaii and Jamaica, have a considerable range of freedom in local affairs, although their foreign relations are decided in Washington or London. Others are governed by administrations in which the inhabitants have little or no part.

Information on the progress of non-self-governing territories is sent to the Secretary-General of the UN, who submits it to a special committee for study. It then goes to the Assembly for action. In the Charter the governing countries agreed to send information on only social, educational, and economic conditions in their territories. But the Assembly has repeatedly asked them to report also on the development of self-governing institutions.

In cases where a nation stops sending information the Assembly calls for an explanation of what change has justified erasing the name of a territory from the non-self-governing list. An example was when the United States ratified the Constitution of Puerto Rico, which gave that country the right to choose all its public officials and make its own laws. The United States then classified Puerto Rico as "self-governing" and ceased to report on it to the UN. The Assembly voted to accept the claim that Puerto Rico is self-governing, with the Latin American countries voting "Aye."

The Assembly has passed resolutions advising the governing nations to apply the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights to the people of dependent areas, and to take advantage of technical assistance opportunities for developing those areas. Reports on such action are requested. The Assembly has also made clear its insistent desire for progress toward self-government.

Libya

The United Nations, representing the world community, is the natural sponsor for any new nation asking to be born. Korea and Somaliland are not the only UN god-children. Another former Italian colony, Libya, was judged to be politically ready for early independence although it would need technical and economic help in getting established. In November, 1949, the Assembly appointed a Commissioner, Adrian Pelt of the Netherlands, as head of an international Council to help the Libyans set up a government. The Council met on April 25, 1950, and by December 2 of the same year a Libyan National Assembly had been organized and had chosen the Emir of Cyrenaica as King. A provisional federal government was established in March, 1951, and on December 24 King Idris I proclaimed Libya's independence. The UN General Assembly welcomed the new nation, but it was not admitted to the UN because of a Soviet veto until the "package deal" of 1955.

Foreign help to Libya comes from various sources. Financial help has come from Britain, France, Italy, and Turkey. Technical assistance is given in a cooperative program of the United Nations and the United States Point Four Program. The country started as one of the poorest in the world, but not without hope of improvement. The average income was the equivalent of about \$35 per person per year. Eighty-five per cent of the people were unable to read or write, and 300 infants out of every 1,000 died before they were a year old. There were no resources except a generally poor soil, a scanty supply of water, and a population largely untrained but with ability to learn and an ambition to improve their way of living.

Most of the work therefore started with education and training. UNESCO gave technical help in starting new schools, and especially in the training of teachers. Students took training in all sorts of needed skills, from typing and bookkeeping to Arabic and English, geography, carpentry, and mechanical drawing. In the oases of the Fezzan a UNESCO expert from Austria organized education centers to teach the people reading and the use of better tools and better methods of hygiene. A team of olive pruners from Tunisia traveled throughout the country showing how

to prune the olive trees so as to get better crops. Sheep were improved by importing better breeding stock from Turkey.

In 1956 Libya was reported to have one of the fastest-growing school systems in the world. Developments in these early years included a successful community center for women in the Fezzan, improvements in vegetable growing as a result of demonstration gardens, and establishment of many literacy centers that soon grew into community clubs. There was also a rapid spread of football and volleyball in the country.

Meanwhile WHO set up a program of public health, and the Libyan Government made a contract with UNICEF to test and vaccinate the children against tuberculosis. An expert from the World Meteorological Organization organized a system of weather reports, important not only for flying but also for modern agriculture. Foreign experts in government have helped the new Libyan administration to set up its necessary public services with a modern budget and tax system and sound foreign trade and banking policies.

One might get the impression that there is not much room for Libyan independence. But in fact, every foreign expert came to Libya because the government invited his organization to send him. The Libyans have been working hard to push back the desert and build themselves a prosperous country, using all the expert advice they could get.

Self-Determination

Underlying the trusteeship system, the Charter provision for reports on all dependent areas, and the evident enthusiasm for helping new nations to be born and to prosper, is the principle of self-determination of peoples. This principle is not as simple as it looks at first sight.

At Versailles, after World War I, President Wilson tried to stand firmly for self-determination as the Peace Conference worked at redrawing the boundary lines of Europe. At some points he was frustrated by the demands of the victorious Allies who wanted territory for defense purposes or for other reasons not including the wishes of the inhabitants. At other points the principle of self-determination ran up against the fact that hostile peoples lived in the same territory. Some cruel mass migrations have been

forced on the peoples of Europe to rearrange them into areas where they could be free of hostile foreigners. And still there are pockets of people who cannot govern themselves because they do not occupy the right land to make a workable nation.

Some of the difficulties in applying the principles of self-determination are illustrated by the experiences of the United States. Until the present century the United States was an expanding power, taking, buying, or conquering the western lands until it came to the Pacific, and at the same time taking in millions of immigrants from other countries, chiefly from Europe and Africa.

Then in the Spanish War of 1898 the United States captured Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and the reaction against imperialism set in. The people of the United States found that they did not want to govern foreign-speaking people in distant lands. They took measures to make these countries independent as soon as the inhabitants could successfully carry out the duties of independent nations.

On the other hand, the United States has made it clear that no state in the Union can resign and set up for itself. This was settled in 1861-65 by one of the fiercest wars in history. The United States recognizes many Indian tribes as "nations" with treaty rights that include a considerable degree of self-government, subject, however, to veto by the United States Congress. But it does not allow immigrant groups to set up independent governments on its soil. They can vote in elections, and can vote as a German bloc or an Irish bloc if their leaders can hold the people together. But they cannot escape the sovereignty of the United States.

These experiences have left the people of the United States strongly in favor of self-determination—but only where it is a practical way of living. They believe that any race or language group that wants to be an independent nation ought to be allowed to do so, provided it can make a workable nation. Being a workable nation means coming fairly close to paying its own expenses, helping its neighbors to keep the peace, and cooperating with the United Nations. By these standards not every small group of people that wants self-determination can get full national independence. But world opinion, as shown in the UN, is plainly favorable to the independence of peoples wherever it is practicable.

INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

In addition to the massive conflicts between communist and non-communist groups of countries there are always some disputes among the other nations. These lesser disputes may not seem likely to blow up the world, even if they sometimes break out into open fighting. But in fact they weaken the world society and make it more susceptible to conquest by aggressive dictators.

One of the most important jobs of the United Nations, therefore, is to settle international disputes if possible, or if they cannot be settled, to keep them under negotiation without shooting while time passes and passions may perhaps cool. Often the negotiations drag along for years with no final settlement. But as one UN delegate remarked, "It is better that old men get ulcers than that young men get shot."

The United Nations has dealt more or less successfully with many international disputes, great and small. In 1954, a United States Senate Committee report listed twenty-one "disputes or situations" that had been brought before the Security Council up to that time and seventeen "political controversies" before the General Assembly. The following cases are among those that have attracted the most attention.

Kashmir

When the British Government granted independence to India in 1947, it could not persuade the Hindus and Mohammedans to agree on setting up a single over-all government. After much discussion the new nations of India and Pakistan were formed; one to contain a majority of Hindus and the other a majority of Moslems. A large and cruel exchange of populations took place and there was severe rioting. Blood was hot.

By a part of the agreement the British rulers set free the mountain principedom of Jammu and Kashmir, with the right to decide for itself whether to join India or Pakistan. Shortly afterward there were reports of an invasion by Pakistani tribesmen. India complained to the Security

Council on January 1, 1948. The situation was complicated by the fact that most of the population was Moslem, but the Prince, or Maharajah, was Hindu. The Maharajah had decided to join the state to India, and India had accepted.

India complained that Pakistan was guilty of aggression. Pakistan told the Security Council that it had tried without success to control the wild tribes on the border, and that the Maharajah's joining of India was illegal. Both sides were willing to let the people vote on the question once order had been restored.

The Security Council appointed a Commission to investigate and mediate between the contending states.

The Council itself recommended that the two states should call home their people who were not regular residents of the territory, and that they should agree on a cease-fire. As soon as the disorders had quieted down, the Indian army should be reduced to the minimum needed for keeping order. Then there should be a free and impartial election to decide which nation would get the territory. The Council directed the Commission to go to India and Pakistan and help to work out an agreement.

When the Commission got to India in July, 1948, it learned that regular Pakistani troops were in Kashmir "to prevent a forcible seizure of the country by India." The situation looked more and more like war. The Commission therefore proposed to both governments that they agree on a cease-fire and withdrawal of troops. It offered suggestions on how the voting was to be carried out. By December, India and Pakistan had agreed to a cease-fire as of January 1, 1949, with truce details to be decided later. The cease-fire line was settled the following July 27.

The Commission then attacked the problem of getting the two sides to withdraw their forces so that peaceful conditions for voting could be established. It was unable to bring the parties to an agreement. In December, 1949, the Commission reported a stalemate to the Council, and suggested that perhaps a single UN representative with broad powers might have better success.

General McNaughton of Canada, who was President of the Council in December, made an unsuccessful effort to bring about an agreement. In April the Council appointed Sir Owen Dixon of Australia as UN Representative, and his appointment was accepted by both India and Pakistan.

Sir Owen made a new effort to get a withdrawal of

forces, but without success. He reported back to the Security Council and asked to be relieved.

The Council on April 30, 1951, appointed Dr. Frank Graham of the United States as UN Representative, and called upon the two governments to cooperate with him.

Dr. Graham talked with the Governments of India and Pakistan during the summer of 1951. He found them willing to agree on proposals to avoid open warfare and war-like talk, and on the acceptance of the principle of deciding the issue by a vote. But they could not agree about how and when to demilitarize.

Dr. Graham reported the situation to the Council, which directed him to continue his efforts. The Soviet delegate objected, saying that the UN efforts had been really intended to support a British and American plot to get a military base in Kashmir. He suggested leaving the whole matter to the people of Kashmir.

From then on, as the years passed, both sides reduced their armed forces in the territory, but no agreement on a vote of the people was reached. In February, 1957, the Security Council sent Gunnar Jarring of Sweden to see if any settlement could be agreed upon. He found the leaders of both countries ready to talk with "complete frankness and cordiality," but with no signs of agreeing. India's position was that Pakistan must take all its troops out before India would further reduce its forces in Kashmir. Pakistan said it had brought home its troops but that India was refusing to do its part. Pakistan suggested arbitration to decide whether it had removed the troops or not. India refused on the ground that to submit to arbitration would amount to letting Pakistan have a voice in Kashmir affairs, which would be a violation of sovereignty since Kashmir was already a part of India. Pakistan complained to the Security Council that India was already incorporating Kashmir in the Northern Zonal Council of India, to tighten its ties with India, and gave notice that it would seek further action by the Council.

Mr. Jarring reported that he had no proposals for a settlement but that both India and Pakistan seemed to want to find a solution.

The UN position all along has been that the two parties should hasten to reduce their armed forces in Kashmir and make arrangements for a vote. This UN request has made slow headway. But in the meantime, the shooting was stopped; India and Pakistan continued to sit side by side

in specialized agency committees and other UN activities and have often voted together. By 1954 the two governments had established direct conferences between their Prime Ministers, and the danger of war appeared to be over.

Indonesia

Two days after the surrender of the Japanese forces in Indonesia, which had formerly been under Netherlands control, Indonesian nationalists set up a Republic of Indonesia and declared their independence. After serious disorders, political negotiations between the Dutch and the Indonesians finally broke down when the Netherlands launched what it called police action and what the Republic of Indonesia insisted was a military attack. The Security Council succeeded in arranging a cease-fire in August, 1947, and both sides accepted a good-offices committee of Australia, Belgium and the United States to conduct negotiations for a truce. The Netherlands and the Republic signed an agreement in January, 1948, including eighteen principles to serve as basis for final settlement.

Later the agreement broke down, and there was more fighting. The Council called for a new cease-fire in January, 1949, and recommended that the Netherlands recognize the independence of Indonesia. A conference was held at The Hague later that year, with representatives of the Netherlands, the Republic of Indonesia, other parts of Indonesia not included in the Republic, and the UN Commission for Indonesia. With constant encouragement from the UN, the transfer of sovereignty was finally accomplished on December 27, 1949. Less than a year later, at the next session of the General Assembly, Indonesia was admitted as the sixtieth member of the UN.

Greece

At the end of World War II Grece was left in a badly devastated condition. The communist states of Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria lay along the mountainous northern border, in a favorable position to help communist guerrillas attempting to capture the country. The Greek Army had been shattered, and was too weak to cope with the guerrillas alone. By request of the Greek Government British troops were in Greece to help in its defense.

In January, 1946, the U.S.S.R. complained to the Security Council that British troops were interfering in Greek internal affairs. Greece denied the interference. The Council refused to act. Another complaint of Greek attacks on the Albanian border was also rejected. Then Greece asked the Council to look into the aid being given by the communist states to the guerrillas. The three communist states denied that they were giving any such aid. The Council appointed a commission to examine the situation on the spot. The majority of the Commission reported that the three northern states were helping the guerrillas; the minority, consisting of the Soviet and Polish members, denied it.

In March, 1947, the British were financially unable to go on helping Greece, and the United States took over the job, explaining its action to the Security Council. The United States Congress, in appropriating money for aid to Greece, stipulated that the action should be stopped if at any time the UN should decide that it was no longer necessary. The United States would not veto any such decision. This action strengthened the position of the UN in the Greek situation.

The Assembly took up the Greek question again in the fall of 1947, and recommended that Greece and her three neighbors settle their disputes by diplomacy. It appointed a special committee, which later reported that Greece had consented to cooperate but the other three countries had refused. From that time on for several years, each Assembly renewed its condemnation of the communist aid to the guerrillas and continued its committee to watch developments.

In time the situation changed. Yugoslavia ceased to give aid to the guerrillas in Greece. The Greek Army was built up to such strength that it was able to restore order. Economic aid helped to rebuild the country, and with returning prosperity the internal appeal of communism faded.

In the end, the problem that could not be solved was that of the return of some twenty-five thousand Greek children who had been taken north of the border in 1948. The Assembly asked for the return of children who wanted to be sent back or who had relatives in Greece ready to receive them. Yugoslavia cooperated, but other East European states, where most of the children were believed to be held, refused to release them.

The Berlin Blockade

In September, 1948, France, the United Kingdom and the United States complained to the Security Council that the Soviet Union had cut off land communications between their zones of Germany and their sectors of Berlin. The Council voted to discuss the blockade as a threat to the peace—over the protest of the U.S.S.R., which contended that the measures had been necessitated by currency reforms in the Western zones that threatened the Soviet zone with economic collapse. Various members of the Council tried to find a solution that both sides would accept, but the proposed draft was vetoed by the Soviets. The President of the Assembly and the Secretary-General, basing themselves on an Assembly appeal to the Great Powers to “compose their differences and establish a lasting peace,” also urged the parties to hunt for a means of agreement, but with no immediate result.

In the meantime, the Western powers supplied Berlin by air, with spectacular success. When the Soviet Union was ready to give up the attempt to make Berlin untenable for the other three powers, the Soviet representative took advantage of the opportunity provided in the UN to start quiet talks that soon led to an agreement. It was universally recognized in this case that a reasonable solution of the trouble would have been much harder to arrange if the opposing parties had not been able to meet easily and informally in the corridors of the UN building.

The United Nations inherited the situation in Palestine. That territory had been placed under a British mandate by the League of Nations. In 1947 the British Government asked the UN Assembly to look into the Palestine question. The Assembly held a special session in April and May, 1947, and appointed a Committee to recommend what should be done. The Committee majority recommended that Palestine should be divided into an Arab state, a Jewish state, and a special area including Jerusalem under an international government. This plan was accepted by the Assembly on November 29, 1947.

The plan provided that the British mandate should end by August 1, 1948, and the new states were to come into existence within two months after the British forces had evacuated the country. It soon became clear that there

was going to be trouble between the Jews and the Arabs. The Assembly on May 20 appointed Count Folke Bernadotte, President of the Swedish Red Cross, as Mediator.

The British gave up their mandate on May 15, and the new state of Israel was proclaimed. Soon the Arab states were marching against Israel. The Council called on all governments to abstain from war in Palestine. It issued a cease-fire order on May 22. By June 9 the Mediator had received the agreement of all parties to a truce, starting June 11, to last four weeks.

At the end of the four weeks the Arab states refused to extend the truce, and fighting broke out again. On September 17, 1948, Count Folke Bernadotte and the chief of the French observers, Colonel Sérot, were assassinated in the Jewish sector of Jerusalem. Dr. Ralph Bunche, of the United States, who was acting as assistant to the Mediator, was directed to take over.

During the last three months of 1948 there were several outbreaks of fighting, but the truce was restored on January 7, 1949, with troop withdrawal and supervision by UN observers. During the next six months all the Arab states signed armistice agreements with Israel. The Security Council urged the states to negotiate a final peace settlement. Dr. Bunche was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his work in Palestine.

The Assembly, on December 9, 1949, directed the Trusteeship Council to administer the international City of Jerusalem, but both Arabs and Jews refused to give up their parts of Jerusalem. The Jews moved some departments of their government into the city.

After 1949 the relations between Jews and Arabs failed to improve. The UN Truce Supervision Organization reported many violations and disputes. A particularly dangerous dispute arose over the refusal of Egypt to let ships bound for Israel pass through the Suez Canal. Repeated efforts of the Security Council failed to persuade Egypt to lift these restrictions, and the situation remained tense. All the Arab states made it plain that they would never reconcile themselves to the existence of Israel.

Suez

In the summer of 1956 Egypt received large shipments of arms from Czechoslovakia which were stacked in the Sinai Desert, near to the Israeli border. Israel accused Egypt of planning war, and also complained of increasing

raids by Egyptian bands known as *fedayeen*. The United States withdrew a previous offer of a loan to Egypt for building the Aswan Dam on the Nile, saying that excessive purchase of communist arms had undermined Egypt's ability to pay. Egypt reacted by seizing control of the Suez Canal on July 26, 1956.

The Suez Canal had been dug, through Egyptian territory, under a concession negotiated in 1888, and was owned and operated by a corporation, the Universal Suez Canal Company, the stock of which was held largely in England and France. Egypt offered to pay for the stock at the prices of the day before the seizure, but that did not satisfy the users. Led by Britain, France, and the United States, they tried to negotiate an acceptable agreement with Egypt, but without success, and on September 12 France and Britain complained to the Security Council. Negotiations were still under way when on October 29 the United States informed the Council that Israel had invaded Egypt in violation of the armistice. The U.S. called for an immediate meeting.

Israel charged that Egypt was building up its system of *fedayeen* raids not merely to harass but to destroy Israel, and that self-defense had made it necessary to seize the *fedayeen* bases.

On October 30 Britain and France called on Egypt and Israel to stop fighting and withdraw their forces ten miles from the Canal so as to avoid blocking traffic. They asked Egypt to agree to let them temporarily occupy the canal zone, which Egypt refused. In the Security Council the United States offered a resolution calling for a cease-fire and calling upon all members not to use force in the area. This was vetoed by Britain and France, and their aircraft began bombing military targets in Egypt the next day. The Security Council then called the Assembly into emergency session. Egypt blocked the Canal by sinking a large number of ships in it, while maintaining at the same time that it was blocked by Anglo-French action.

The Assembly met November 1 and urged that all parties agree to a cease-fire. The British and French, insisting on the necessity for police action, consented to withdraw only if Egypt and Israel would consent to the sending of a United Nations force to keep the peace. On November 5 the Assembly voted to establish such a force, and it was assembled with great speed in the next few

days, principally by air. Ten nations, none of them being among the Great Powers, provided the troops. Much of the transport and supplies were contributed by Italy, where the force was assembled, and by Sweden and the United States. The first unit of the UN Emergency Force was flown into Egypt on November 15.

At time of the cease-fire, Israel had captured most of the Sinai Peninsula, together with great stores of arms, and the Anglo-French forces had occupied the northern end of the Canal. As these forces withdrew the UNEF advanced, acting as a buffer to prevent contact between them and the Egyptians, until the UNEF came to rest along the Israeli border, where it settled down to the job of patrolling and preventing raids. It also took over from Israeli forces the forts on the narrow neck of the Gulf of Aqaba, which the Egyptians had previously used to block access to the Israeli port of Eilat, Israel's only door to the Far East.

The obstructions in the Canal were removed by contractors from Denmark and the Netherlands, with aid from other nations not involved in the conflict, working under UN auspices. The Canal was clear by the middle of April, 1957.

The net results of the flare-up in Egypt did not settle the conflicts between Israel and the Arab states or between Egypt and the users of the Suez Canal. Conditions in the Middle East remained highly explosive. But for the moment the influence of the United Nations, and the threat of Soviet intervention, had succeeded in quenching an outbreak that might have led to a much bigger war.

A by-product of the UN action was the invention of a new kind of police force, the UNEF. The Assembly made it clear that this force was not intended to take any part against one side or the other, but only to prevent "incidents" and renewed fighting. The questions in dispute must be left for negotiation, however long that might take. The central principle is that in the present explosive state of the world no actual shooting is allowable. Military power still has a large place in the negotiations of nations, but its use as a "deterrent" is accepted only as an unfortunate and dangerous necessity, to be mitigated if possible by disarmament. Meanwhile the UN does not recognize that any injustice or threat could justify starting a shooting war.

The UNEF was armed enough to stop a riot but not

enough to resist an attack by an organized military force. Its defense was entirely moral. Any of the four contending nations that would attack a unit of the UNEF would be shooting the "soldiers of peace," as they were called. These were men from Brazil or Finland, India or Yugoslavia, who had come there to stand together in the line of fire so that no one could shoot at an enemy without killing a friend. As it worked out, even the civilian population treated the UNEF soldiers as friends. There were few signs of riot, and they soon disappeared. The moral protection worked.

The UNEF is surely not all the world needs for keeping the peace, especially as such a force cannot even enter a fighting zone unless the belligerents first agree to a cease-fire. And there are still underlying conflicts of nations that must either be settled or lived down through the passage of time, if war is to be avoided. But every example of peacemaking is one step toward a more peaceful world. The UNEF is an invention that may find uses in future areas of tension.

Arab Refugees

In November, 1948, the General Assembly authorized a loan of \$5,000,000 for the immediate relief of the Arabs who had fled from Israel, and urged the nations to make up a fund of \$32,000,000 for the next ten months. The United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees (UNRPR) was established, and received contributions of \$35,000,000 from 33 governments. There were about 900,000 refugees to be cared for at that time.

A year later the Assembly decided to try a program of work relief—road building, forest planting, and other enterprises—that might open up new industries in which the refugees could become self-supporting. A Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) was created, with Henry R. Labouisse of the U.S.A. as Director. Its work has been hampered by the refusal of the Arab states to accept the refugees as permanent settlers, and their demand that Israel take them back. Israel's position has been that to admit so many Arabs would endanger the country but that she was willing to discuss paying them for the lands from which they had fled. The refugees themselves remained as a dangerous source of unrest, especially in areas such as the Gaza Strip on Israel's western border.

Some little progress, however, has been made. In 1957, UNRWA reported that in two years it had approved 714 projects by which 5,400 refugees had been helped to become self-supporting in agriculture, small industry, or trade.

A proposal for a Jordan Valley Authority was put forward by Dr. Walter Lowdermilk of the U.S. Soil Conservation Service after World War II. The development of the Jordan River would supply water to irrigate much of the land in the district that is suitable for farming, and would provide jobs for hundreds of thousands of the refugees in the Arab parts of the valley. The benefits to be had by all concerned from loyally working together on this project would offer good reasons for keeping the peace. A successful Jordan Valley Authority might well stand as a good example of a practical instrument that might be used in other places where national interests overlap a territory that is rich in possibilities for united development.

Tunisia

The relations between France and Tunisia were established by a treaty in 1881 and a further agreement in 1883, which made Tunisia a French protectorate, although the Bey of Tunis remained as head of the Tunisian state. But in recent years the Tunisians have accused the French of moving in on them and taking full control of their affairs. In April, 1952, eleven Asian and African members of the UN joined in urging the Security Council to take up "the present grave situation in Tunisia."

The eleven members said that the French Resident-General had arrested the Tunisian Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet, and that the controversy was a danger to peace. The French said that the officials had paralyzed the government and had to be removed so that the Resident-General could talk with the Bey in a suitable "atmosphere." The Council was unable to agree about what to do.

The eleven states, joined by two more, asked the Assembly to consider the question of Tunis. France declared that under the Charter the UN had no right to discuss Tunisia because it was a matter internal to France. The French delegation boycotted the meetings. Finally, the thirteen states joined in voting for a resolution proposed by eleven Latin American states. The resolution expressed

confidence that France would help to develop free institutions in Tunisia, and the hope that the parties would continue negotiations to bring about self-government. A resolution to this effect was finally passed, 44 to 3, with 8 abstaining. A number of the members agreed with France that the question was domestic and should not have been discussed.

In this dispute, there was a split between the anti-colonial nations of Asia and Africa on one side and the colony-holding nations of Europe on the other. The American nations took a middle ground, trying to reduce the split by urging France to promote self-government.

Each year from 1952 on the Assembly discussed the Tunisian question and France continued to claim that the UN had no right to discuss it. France declared that on its own responsibility it would fulfil its promises to allow the Tunisians to manage their own affairs. Negotiations, in fact, resulted in an agreement signed on March 20, 1956. Tunisia became an independent nation and was admitted to the UN, along with Morocco, on November 12, 1956.

The neighboring territory of Algeria, however, remained in an unsettled state of rebellion against French control.

Syria-Lebanon

One of the earliest cases to come before the Security Council was the dispute over the failure of French and British troops to withdraw from Syria and Lebanon after the end of World War II. In February, 1946, Syria and Lebanon complained to the Council. The cause of the failure to withdraw was not any deep conflict between these countries and the British and French, but a failure of the British and French to agree between themselves on the conditions of evacuation. At the time there was danger that the dispute might be widely interpreted as the beginning of an unfortunate quarrel between two Western Powers over the exploitation of two weak countries of the Near East.

In the Security Council a resolution was proposed "expressing confidence" that the British and French would move out as soon as was practicable. This resolution was blocked by a Soviet veto, but its moral effect was not lessened by that. The British and French evacuated Syria in about two months and Lebanon a few months later.

Czechoslovakia

In March, 1948, after the communist revolution in Czechoslovakia, the Security Council considered a complaint by Dr. Jan Papanek, permanent UN representative from the old Czechoslovak government. Dr. Papanek accused the U.S.S.R. of violating the independence of Czechoslovakia by a threat of force, and charged that the Soviets had helped directly and indirectly in the overthrow of his government.

The Soviet delegate denied the charges and said they had been brought up for the purpose of poisoning international relations and striking a blow at the United Nations. The new government of Czechoslovakia refused to take part in the discussion, saying it was an interference in the country's internal affairs and contrary to the Charter.

Proposals to instruct a committee to look into the evidence were blocked by a Soviet veto. No results of any kind could be had in this case, and the Council, in the legal language of the report, "remained seized of the question."

The Corfu Channel Dispute

In October, 1946, British warships in the Corfu Channel, off the coast of Albania, ran into a minefield and suffered damage and some loss of life. The following January the United Kingdom brought the matter before the Security Council, charging that Albania had laid the minefield and had failed to notify shipping. Albania denied the charge and said that the British had been trespassing in Albanian waters.

A proposal was introduced declaring that Albania was to blame for the minefield, and this motion was vetoed by the U.S.S.R. The United Kingdom then proposed that the Council should advise Britain and Albania to take the question to the International Court. This was passed.

The United Kingdom appealed to the Court on May 22, 1947. Albania agreed to appear, but pleaded that the question was not admissible under the Charter and the Statute on which the Court was established. The Court refused to throw out the question, and held that Albania by agreeing to appear had accepted the Court's jurisdiction.

The two contestants then agreed to ask the Court: first,

whether Albania was responsible under international law for the damage and loss of life and whether it should pay compensation; and second, whether the Royal Navy had violated the sovereignty of Albania by its actions in the Corfu Channel.

The Court decided that Albania was responsible for the explosions. It appointed two experts to assess the damages, and on December 15, 1949, fixed the compensation at £843,947 to be paid by Albania to the United Kingdom.

The Court also decided that on the occasion when the explosions occurred, the British had not been trespassing in Albanian waters. But it ruled that in the following month the British had violated Albanian waters, and that the declaration of the Court's judgment was all the compensation for that violation warranted in the circumstances.

The International Court

The International Court of Justice was established by a Statute which was made a part of the Charter. All members of the UN are "parties to the Statute," with voting rights in the choice of judges; and non-members can be admitted to the Statute on conditions laid down by the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Only states may be parties in cases before the Court, and only if they agree to submit to the Court's decision. Members can take their disputes before boards of arbitration or other tribunals of their own choice; but if they come into the Court they are bound to accept the Court's judgment.

A state may also declare that it promises in general to submit any and all questions of certain kinds to the Court, if an opposing state also agrees to the Court's jurisdiction. In 1955, thirty-two states, including Britain, France, and the United States, had accepted compulsory jurisdiction. The standard agreement covers all disputes about the interpretation of treaties, the application of international law, the existence of any fact that would be a breach of an obligation, and the amount of damages payable for the breach.

The Court is the successor to the Permanent Court of International Justice at The Hague. It is authorized to take jurisdiction in cases under old treaties that provided for the settlement of disputes by the former Court. The

Court not only settles disputes between nations, but gives advisory opinions to the UN and its agencies on matters of international law or interpretation of the Charter.

The Court is made up of fifteen judges, no two from the same nation. They are elected as persons, not as representatives of their nations, by the Security Council and the Assembly voting separately without any veto.

If the Court does not include any judge of the nationality of a state that is a party to a pending case, that state is entitled to choose a person to sit as a judge for that case. This is contrary to the usual judicial principle by which a judge disqualifies himself from sitting in any case where he has a personal interest; it represents here a relic of the tradition of arbitration rather than judicial decision.

The Court has already decided a number of cases where the parties were in disagreement about the meaning of treaties or of international law.

One example was the dispute between the Government of Iran and the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, in which the British Government appeared on behalf of the Company.

The Court ruled immediately that both parties should take no action to harm the property or prejudice the settlement, while waiting for the Court to decide the dispute itself. Iran then gave notice that it withdrew its previous acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction. It also refused to accept the Court's preliminary ruling. The question then before the Court was whether Iran could refuse the Court's jurisdiction without violating its treaty obligations. Iran appeared before the Court to argue its right to refuse to appear in the oil case.

The Court decided that Iran's original declaration accepting compulsory jurisdiction applied only to disputes about treaties signed after the date of the declaration. The records of debates in the Iranian Parliament and other evidence were brought in to establish that point. As no recent treaty covered the oil dispute, the Court declared that Iran was within its rights in refusing to argue the oil case before the Court. The United Kingdom had in the meantime complained to the Security Council about Iran's refusal to obey the preliminary ruling, but the question was settled by the Court's decision. Time therefore had to pass until the Iranian and British Governments finally came to an agreement between themselves.

At first glance it might seem that the Court accomplished little or nothing in the Iranian oil case. But as the oil question was not covered by any valid treaty rights, all the Court could do was to say so. It helped in the final pacific settlement of the dispute by rendering an authoritative judgment that Iran was not violating any rights coming under the Court's jurisdiction. This amounted to telling the parties not to accuse each other of bad faith but to make a bargain, which in the end they did.

In 1950 France and the United States came to the Court with a dispute about the rights of United States citizens in Morocco. The dispute covered a number of subjects and the decisions differed accordingly. The Court decided that United States citizens should have the same rights as French citizens to import goods free of certain currency controls. The claim of the United States that disputes between its own citizens should be tried in the United States Consular Courts, in both civil and criminal cases, was upheld. But the Court decided against the claim that a United States citizen in a dispute with a Moroccan could be tried by the consul, except in special cases covered by treaty.

In April, 1957, as a sequel to its seizure of the Suez Canal, the Egyptian Government deposited with the UN a Declaration stating how it proposed to operate the Canal. It pledged itself to abide by the Convention of 1888 that established the international character of the Canal. In a later Declaration, on July 18, Egypt formally accepted as compulsory the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes that might arise over the interpretation of the Convention or other treaty provisions relating to the Canal.

International Law Commission

The General Assembly in 1947 created the International Law Commission to write a code of international law. The Commission started with a draft of a Declaration of the Rights and Duties of States. Rights include the right to political independence, to govern the state's territory, and to fight in self-defense. Duties include keeping treaty promises, settling all disputes by peaceful means, refraining from using force without UN authorization, and respecting the basic rights of all citizens and aliens in the state's jurisdiction. At its 1949 session the Assembly rec-

commended the draft to the attention of member states and asked for comments and advice.

The Commission was particularly asked to draft the principles of international law covering war crimes, as developed in the trials of Nazi war criminals at Nürnberg. It has also studied the principle of reservations which may be made by a nation at the time of ratifying an international agreement. The Commission suggested that future conventions should contain a provision making clear what would be the position in case of ratification with reservations.

Other questions studied by the Commission have included the possibility of defining aggression and of defining offenses against the peace and security of mankind. There is much difference of opinion among member states, not only as to exactly what acts would surely amount to aggression, but also as to whether it is safe to make a list of such acts. Some members fear that an aggressor, if provided with an exact list, would find ways of attack not positively included in the list, and so create confusion at the moment when the world should be uniting to resist what everyone knows to be an attack.

The Commission has prepared a draft of a code of arbitration procedures, and another for the international laws of nationality and statelessness. It has made studies of the possibility of setting up an International Criminal Court, to try people accused of international crimes such as genocide.

The 1956 session of the Commission was devoted mainly to a codification of the law of the sea. The Commission recommended a general international conference, at which many points not yet settled might be put in the way of international agreement. The General Assembly voted in February, 1957, to call such a conference for early in 1958. The program of the conference included such questions as the limits of the territorial sea, the right of innocent passage, fishing and oil-drilling rights on the continental shelf, the nationality of ships, penal jurisdiction in cases of collision, sea pollution, the slave trade, and piracy, including piracy by aircraft.

By developing international law, by settling some kinds of disputes in court, and by direct action in the Security Council or the Assembly to urge the nations to keep the peace, the UN has a long list of successes to its credit. Some disputes have been settled so completely that none

of the parties concerned has any intention of bringing them up again. Some have merely been quelled, leaving both sides still enemies but not in a state of all-out war. Some of the disputes were of little consequence, since the parties were not likely to fight over the matter anyway, yet their settlement added to the orderly process of world association. Some disputes were important, because if they had flared up into heavy fighting the structure of world peace could have been dangerously undermined.

In all cases, settlements and judicial decisions help to build the framework for a peaceful world. Principles once established and then used in the decision of still other disputes gain respect. They stand as obstacles to future quarrels, cooling the blood of angry patriots who in the first flush of excitement may think they have more right on their side than later judgment will allow. All this work of conciliation, settlement, and definition, some of it too prosaic to make the front pages of the newspapers, is quietly building foundations upon which, if there is time, a solid world peace may someday be erected.

KOREA

At the end of World War II the Soviet and American forces took over the territory of Korea from the Japanese. A line had to be set between the two zones occupied by the Powers, and by agreement this line was drawn at the 38th parallel of latitude. The United States and the Soviet Union agreed that they would cooperate to set up a "provisional Korean democratic government," but this agreement soon ran into trouble. The two Occupying Powers could not agree on what they meant by a "democratic" government.

The United States then took the problem to the United Nations. The Assembly voted to set up a Temporary Commission on Korea to oversee the election of representatives in that country. The Assembly chose a commission made up of Australia, Canada, China (that is, Nationalist China), El Salvador, France, India, the Philippines, Syria, and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The Ukraine refused to serve and the Soviet authorities would not let the Commission enter North Korea. But the Commander of the U. S. Army of Occupation arranged for an election in South Korea on May 10, 1948, and the Commission observed the campaigning and voting.

The Commission reported that before and during the election the Korean people had "a reasonable degree of free atmosphere wherein democratic rights of freedom of speech, press, and assembly were recognized and respected." After considering this report, the Assembly on December 12, 1948, declared that a lawful government had been established in the part of Korea where the Commission had been able to observe the election. The Assembly also made it clear that in the eyes of the United Nations the Republic of Korea was the only government in Korea founded on the free will of the people.

By 1950, the government in North Korea, known as the "People's Republic of Korea," was believed to have raised

a considerable army, supplied by the Soviet Union with tanks and planes. The South Korean Army at that time was small and was armed only with weapons designed for guarding the border and for suppressing guerrilla bands. The United States had no military forces in Korea except advisers and a small group helping to train the Korean Army. On June 25, 1950, the North Koreans rolled south across the 38th parallel in great force, sweeping back the weak ROK border forces.

There has been much argument between communist representatives and those from non-communist countries about who was the "aggressor" in Korea. The communists say the South Koreans swept northward over the border with the apparent intention of conquering the People's Republic. According to that account of the event, the North Koreans resisted the attack and only then in self-protection marched south. The United Nations in judging the truth of the matter had the advantage of the fact that the UN Commission was on the ground watching what went on. The Commission reported that the ROK forces were not equipped for an attack nor organized in force near the border, and that in fact the North Koreans were the first to strike.

In the Security Council there was an unusual situation. The Soviet delegate had walked out on January 13, 1950, in protest because the Council refused to give China's seat to Communist China. He did not come back until August 1, and was therefore not in a position to use his veto when the Korean crisis came up in June.

The Security Council met on June 25 with ten members present and the Soviet member absent. The United States presented a resolution naming the invasion a breach of the peace and demanding the withdrawal of forces to the 38th parallel. The resolution was passed with a vote of 9 to 1. The Council also asked all members of the UN to help the Republic of Korea, and President Truman ordered United States air and sea forces to support the ROK troops.

The British and French delegates proposed that all forces sent by member countries should be united under the command of the United States. The Council adopted this suggestion, and also authorized the Unified Command to fly the UN flag in Korea along with the flags of the various nations taking part in the defense. President

Truman appointed General Douglas MacArthur to command the forces in Korea. General Matthew B. Ridgway succeeded General MacArthur in April, 1951, and he in turn was followed by General Mark W. Clark in May, 1952.

During the summer of 1950 armed forces of sixteen nations came to Korea to help the hard-pressed ROK Army. Gradually the onrush of the invaders was stayed before they could entirely overrun the territory of South Korea. Clearly the plan for a lightning conquest had not succeeded.

In early November of 1950 there were reports of Communist Chinese troops in the Korean fighting. This new development led the Security Council to invite the Communist Chinese Government to have a representative "present during the discussion" of the situation. By this time the Soviet delegate had returned to the Council. The resolutions proposed by the Soviet Union and the Communist Chinese were rejected in the Council by votes of 1 to 9. Then a resolution calling on all nations to give no help to North Korea was lost by a veto, there being 9 votes in favor and the Soviet vote opposed. The voting made it clear that with the return of the Soviet delegate the Council could take no further action to help repel the invasion in Korea.

On the other hand, the previous actions of the Council still held good. The united armies, navies, and air forces of the UN allies still stood firm under the UN flag. In fact, they were driving the invaders northward.

In the meantime the fifth session of the General Assembly, meeting in the last months of 1950, adopted a resolution setting up a United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (soon nicknamed UNCURK). The Assembly also established the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency (UNKRA) to organize relief and rehabilitation under the direction of UNCURK.

A resolution proposed by the United States, stating that the Communist Chinese Government was guilty of aggression against Korea, was adopted in the Assembly by a vote of 44 to 7 on February 1, 1951. In May the Assembly recommended that all countries put an embargo on the shipment of war materials to Communist China or North Korea. The communist countries refused to vote, saying that such matters were solely the concern of the Security

Council, where, of course, the Soviet delegate could use the veto. The Assembly, however, had already taken the opposite position in November, 1950, when it passed the "Uniting for Peace" resolutions, described in the last section of this chapter. The recommendations were accepted and acted upon by most of the countries outside the Soviet bloc. The effect was to hamper the operation of the Chinese and North Korean forces, which were obliged to depend almost entirely on supplies from the Soviet Union.

Armistice Negotiations

On June 23, 1951, the Soviet delegate gave a radio address from New York in which he suggested that the opposing forces in Korea should begin discussions looking to an armistice and to a mutual withdrawal of forces from the 38th parallel. Negotiators from the United Nations Command and from the Chinese and North Korean forces met on July 10. By the end of April, 1952, the two sides had agreed on all the conditions of a cease-fire except on one vital point—the question of forcing prisoners of war to return to their home countries.

Experiences with the forced return of prisoners after the end of World War II had led to the conclusion that some prisoners might be refugees who would be killed if they went home. In Korea there were clear signs that many North Korean and Chinese prisoners would commit suicide if they became convinced that they were to be forcibly sent home.

The UN authorities could not accept the responsibility for sending men to their death who had tried to find freedom south of the battlefield. Moreover, it was natural to think that if these prisoners were delivered up to punishment there would be few to surrender from any future aggressor force that might be fighting against a United Nations army.

On the other side, the Chinese and North Korean commanders were plainly reluctant to permit the prisoners to decide themselves whether or not to return home. Under such circumstances the dispute over how to free the prisoners was bound to be extremely hard to settle. It took another year of fighting, in which the Chinese and North Koreans gained no territory and lost heavily in men and materials, before they yielded the point.

Prisoners were brought before representatives of a

157215

Repatriation Commission for their protection and to assure them of their freedom to choose. Then they were addressed by persuaders from their home country, after which they could decide which way they wanted to go.

Thousands of North Korean and Chinese prisoners refused to go home, and many were bitter in their replies to the persuaders who tried to argue with them. Only a few from the United Nations forces decided to stay in communist hands.

In the cease-fire agreement the boundary zone was established along the front line at practically the location where the fighting came to an end. This line was close to the original line of the 38th parallel, though naturally a better defense line for both sides than the parallel itself. The outcome of the invasion of 1950, after years of bitter fighting, was that the North Koreans, with their Chinese allies, found themselves back at practically the same line to which the Security Council had ordered the invaders to withdraw on June 25, 1950, when the attack was one day old.

On the other hand, the terms of the armistice could be violated by the communists. In 1956, the Neutral Nations Supervisory Commission, appointed to oversee the carrying out of these terms, reported that the communists had been building up their forces and interfering with inspection, and that the Czechoslovak and Polish members of the "neutral" Commission had obstructed its work. Accordingly the UN Command gave notice that it also would not submit to inspection by the Commission until the communists ceased to default. The United States proposed a resolution reaffirming the UN demand for unification of Korea with free elections, and asserted that the communists had refused to accept any plan except one that would put all Korea under their control. This resolution was passed on June 11, 1957, by 57 to 8, with 9 abstentions, but there were no signs of any improvement in the political situation.

Inside the Republic of Korea, however, there was much improvement. By the middle of 1957, UNKRA reported a large degree of progress in the upbuilding of Korean industry, mining, housing, education, and medical facilities. Korean mills were spinning woolen yarn, reducing the need to spend foreign exchange for imported yarn. Modern cotton mills were in operation, and a cement plant was to be finished before the end of the year. New

classrooms at 288 schools had been completed in the last six months of 1956, and a seven-story hospital ward building was under way at the new National Medical Center in Seoul. In five years more than 1.5 million refugees had been resettled on their own land from which they had been driven by the communists, and 140,000 on land provided by the ROK Government.

The United Nations Survived

Trygve Lie, in his recollections of his service as first Secretary-General of the United Nations, remarks on how fortunate it was that "Korea did not become another Manchuria." What is the meaning of that? It may be worth while to recall, for purposes of background, the conquest of Manchuria and other similar events in the 1930s that came before World War II.

Before the outbreak of World War II there were several local aggressions in widely separated parts of the world. The Japanese took Manchuria. Mussolini took Ethiopia. Hitler took Czechoslovakia.

There was a moment when the Emperor of Ethiopia stood before the League of Nations and asked for help against Mussolini's attack. The League flinched. It seemed that the free nations could not or would not stand together to protect any victim of an expanding and conquering Power.

Then Hitler went too far. He attacked Poland, which had a defense treaty with the British. Britain acted. By the time Hitler discovered that the free nations, if pushed too far, would stand and fight, it was too late to call off the war.

The Emperor of Ethiopia lived to see the day when Mussolini and Hitler were dead, and the League of Nations also was dead. But Ethiopia is alive again, and is a member of a new United Nations that so far has survived.

Korea, at least, was not another Manchuria.

In a military sense, the UN won what had to be won to restore the breach of the peace, and no more. The UN had ordered the invaders to go back to the 38th parallel and stop fighting. That is what in the end they were forced to do. The UN also had a political objective from the beginning of its interest in Korea—the unification of the country under a democratic form of government. That

was not a military objective. The UN is not planning to start military action anywhere in the world where people are living under oppressive governments. Those conditions are deplored, but the UN's only means of working on them is by moral pressure. It was not a defeat in Korea when the UN armies stopped fighting before liberating North Korea.

Uniting for Peace

When the Assembly met in September, 1950, the need for some better arrangements to deal with future aggressions was plain. The original plan, adopted in 1945, was evidently not practicable under the conditions that had developed since that time.

The Charter originally provided for a UN police force, which many people hoped might in time grow to be stronger than any national military power. The police force was to be placed under the control of the Security Council, on which sat the Great Powers with their right of veto. It had to be assumed that all the Great Powers would stand against aggression, otherwise the UN system for enforcing peace by police power would of course break down. The idea of a world police force recalls the plan urged during World War I by William Howard Taft and other prominent Americans for a League to Enforce Peace—a forerunner of Mr. Wilson's proposal of the League of Nations.

In Korea, although the Security Council had never been able to agree on the organization of the UN police, it was suddenly possessed of a fighting force contributed by sixteen member nations. The command was delegated to the United States by action of the Council, and the Council symbolized its authority by raising the UN flag over the UN armies. Thus for once there was a UN force enforcing peace. But it could not happen again in any case where the Great Powers were not unanimous in their support. Something different would have to be tried.

The United States, therefore, brought into the General Assembly a set of resolutions called "Uniting for Peace." This proposal was discussed at length and finally passed on November 3, 1950, by 52 votes to 5, with 2 members abstaining. The 5 votes in opposition were those of the Soviet Union, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Ukraine.

Under the new rule, if any sudden aggression breaks out, the Assembly can be called into emergency session on twenty-four hours' notice by any seven members of the Security Council in case the Council is blocked by a veto. Once the Assembly is in session, it can pass a resolution advising the member states of the emergency and calling upon them to help the victim by military and other means.

Since the Assembly is not always in session, it has established an Interim Committee to carry on when the Assembly is not sitting. The Interim Committee is made up of representatives of all the member states. One of its most important duties is to watch for dangers to the peace and to provide for calling the Assembly in an emergency.

In the Uniting for Peace resolutions the Assembly provided for a Peace Observation Commission, composed of representatives of fourteen states, including all the five permanent members of the Security Council. If trouble seems to be brewing along the border of any state, the Commission may send observers with that state's consent, so that the UN may get its own trustworthy reports on what happens. The Commission is at the service of the Interim Committee, the Assembly, and the Security Council.

Since any aggression is always launched with a barrage of false reports accusing the victim of being the aggressor, there might be confusion and delay in meeting the emergency if the UN did not have its own reliable source of information.

The Assembly also created the Collective Measures Committee to work out in advance the organization for a prompt resistance to aggression. The Collective Measures Committee asks the member states to consider setting aside some of their military forces in readiness for emergency use, and to pass necessary laws to avoid legal delays in case of an emergency. The members send reports of their various preparations to the committee, where, of course, they are open to inspection by any aggressive-minded government that happens to have a representative on the Committee. In fact, the knowledge of such preparations, if they are substantial, may help in the future, as such knowledge has sometimes helped in the past, to keep the peace.

The adoption of the Uniting for Peace resolutions came only after a long and serious debate, in which the very

nature of the United Nations was examined. The Soviet delegate, opposing the resolutions, said that they were designed to weaken the Security Council by taking away its full responsibility for peace and security. The Soviet argument pointed out that the "principle of unanimity," that is, the veto, would be evaded if the Assembly could act when the Council was stopped by a veto.

The spokesmen for the resolutions said that under the Charter the Assembly had always had the right to express its opinion on any matter not being handled by the Council. In other words, the majority in the Assembly, by passing these resolutions, was asserting that the veto could only block action in the Council, but in so doing would leave the question free for consideration in the Assembly.

It should be said that the veto power was originally attached to the police power that was intended to be at the disposal of the Security Council. The United States insisted that if the UN was to have a police force it must be controlled by a body in which the United States could not be outvoted. All the other Great Powers felt the same way, since it was plainly impossible to have a peace organization attempting to discipline a Great Power by military force. The Uniting for Peace resolutions were not designed with any idea that the Assembly would organize a war against a first-class Power, i.e., would start World War III. They were designed to provide for suppression of a small or "brushfire" war in which no Great Power is prepared to fight openly on the side of the aggressor. That is what was done in Korea, but it was only an accident that the Security Council was able to act. Now the Assembly can act.

If any new war should flare up between small states or parties in a state, it may well be that the aggressor is secretly backed by one of the Great Powers, but that the backer, while prepared to veto any Security Council action, is not prepared to fight openly at the risk of a world war. In such a case the Assembly could promptly declare which side is the aggressor, and other Great Powers could then come in on the side of the victim, as several did in Korea, without necessarily starting World War III. It seems possible that since 1950 a number of brushfire wars in various parts of the world may have been prevented by this new ability of the Assembly to give an authoritative sanction to aid for the victim.

The flexibility of the UN is illustrated by the different

uses that have actually been made of the Uniting for Peace machinery. In the Suez crisis, the Assembly could not of course think of raising a force to fight against the two Great Powers that were engaged. But it met in emergency session, found that all the belligerents were willing to call off the fighting, and created an entirely new type of military force to police the armistice. In the Hungarian crisis no military operation under UN auspices was feasible but the Assembly was able to take a political action against the aggressor that would have been impossible in the Security Council.

Whether future crises can be successfully handled is of course impossible to say. But in Korea the United Nations not only escaped a mortal danger but also strengthened its constitution against future dangers.

REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

According to the UN Charter, member nations may form regional alliances to maintain peace and security, provided these activities are "consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations." In 1945, when the Charter was adopted, the main purpose of this clause was to avoid disturbing the rapidly growing organization of the American republics, which had already come to be a force for peace and understanding in the Western Hemisphere. It was generally expected, however, that future disagreements among the UN members could be settled within the United Nations, and that there would be small practical need for regional defense alliances. This expectation turned out to be premature.

Military alliances have grown up among the North Atlantic countries and the Western Pacific countries, in addition to agreements for strengthening the collective security of the American republics. Economic and political arrangements have also come into being in Western Europe looking toward some kind of federal European Union. All these alliances and united agencies are designed to fortify the peace by military, economic, and political cooperation. They are auxiliaries to the United Nations. They cover areas smaller than the UN world-wide field of action—regions in which the nations have in common more principles and traditions of united action than are to be found in the broader society of the world as a whole.

NATO

The Western European and North American allies demobilized their armed forces as rapidly as possible after World War II. Their people did not expect any further trouble that would call for large-scale military defense, and they wanted the boys home.

Later these nations became convinced that the Soviet Union had not demobilized on anything like the same scale. Five of the countries of Western Europe, therefore, decided to unite and build up their defense forces. Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg signed

a Western Union defense treaty in Brussels on March 17, 1948. As soon as the news of this treaty reached Washington, President Truman welcomed the action and declared that the United States would be glad to help.

The United States Senate adopted on June 11 a resolution proposed by Senator Arthur Vandenberg recommending that the United States join in regional arrangements for collective security. With this backing, the President began negotiations with other countries in the North Atlantic area. These negotiations led to the North Atlantic Treaty, which was signed on April 12, 1949.

The twelve original members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO, were Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Greece and Turkey joined in February, 1952.

The principal section of the Treaty is Article 5, in which the members pledge themselves to consider an attack on any one of them as an attack on all. Article 3 pledges the members to cooperate in increasing their defensive strength by self-help and mutual aid. In Article 2, the members promise to build up their free institutions and to avoid economic conflicts among themselves. The treaty provides in Article 7 that it shall not be so interpreted as to affect in any way the obligations of the members to the United Nations, and it recognizes "the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security." In case of sudden attack the NATO forces will act as may be necessary and will immediately report to the Security Council. If the Security Council is able to take the necessary measures, NATO will withdraw and leave the Security Council in sole charge.

In September, 1950, as part of the new thinking that resulted from the attack in Korea, the Council of NATO unanimously agreed to invite the West German Government to contribute armed forces for the common defense of Europe. Everyone was acutely conscious of the resemblance between divided Korea and divided Germany, and of the possibility that an attack might be made on Western Germany. But the details of how to use German troops without creating the danger of a new aggressive German militarism were not immediately clear.

After a couple of years of negotiation, a temporary solution to the problem of using German troops was reached.

This solution took the form of a treaty setting up a European Defense Community composed of six countries: France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg. The treaty was signed May 27, 1952.

The main feature of this arrangement was that it would have established a single European defense force where soldiers of all six member nations would serve together in a European uniform. Other European countries were invited to join. The European military establishment would be placed under a European Minister of Defense with supernational authority and a united European defense budget, and would join the NATO defense force as a single organization.

The treaty was abandoned in 1954 when the French Parliament refused to ratify it. A new agreement of the six countries and Britain, known as the Western European Union, was signed in Paris in October, 1954, and went into effect in 1955. Under this agreement West Germany was recognized as a sovereign state with the right and duty of limited rearmament as a member of NATO.

As time went on NATO branched out from military to political consultations and also to the development of increased cooperation in scientific research. In 1957 Paul-Henri Spaak, NATO Secretary-General, was emphasizing Article 2 of the treaty, which pledges the members to coordinate their economic policies, and suggesting in particular that the Western nations work together in helping underdeveloped countries on a basis of "commerce" rather than "generosity."

The Western European Union continued as a local defense alliance within NATO, and a mechanism for regulating German rearmament, but it did not show signs of growing into a political United States of Europe. That objective was being pursued by other means.

European Union

The dream of a political union of Europe is as old as the Roman Empire. In modern times Hitler tried to unite Europe under his dictatorship. Among the free peoples of Europe the dream takes the form of a United States of Europe, with some kind of federal government. There are, however, many obstacles in the path of European union, ranging from ancestral hatreds to commercial trade barriers that powerful interests demand as protection against competition.

On the other hand, there are forces pushing the Europeans toward political union.

The most conspicuous pressure toward union is the necessity for common defense. Defense requires more than a unified military force. In the long run defense demands a great increase in the efficiency of European production. And that calls for political union.

In the United States one of the main reasons for high production per man-year is the political union of the States. Under the federal union, the States are forbidden to raise trade barriers against one another's products. Although this prohibition is often evaded, the evasions are of little effect compared with the customs barriers and the change of money between the states of Europe. Another advantage of the political union of the United States is that the Federal Government is strong enough to make and enforce laws against monopoly. These laws too are often evaded, but there is notably less monopoly in the United States than in Europe. Trade barriers and monopoly work together in Europe to waste the energy of the people.

In Europe, it has long been recognized that if the shackles could be loosened, production might be greatly increased. Military costs would be easier to bear. Living conditions would improve. European statesmen are well aware of the strong reasons for trying to build a United States of Europe.

The Council of Europe

After World War II, many organizations sprang up to promote one or another form of European union. In May, 1948, a general conference of Movements for European Unity was held at The Hague. The conference recommended that a European Assembly should be created. As a result, the five countries that had signed the Western Union Treaty at Brussels in March of that year decided to invite Italy, Ireland, and the three Scandinavian countries to join in forming a Council of Europe. The ten countries signed the agreement on May 5, 1949. Five others joined later.

The Council has not had much work to do, since there are so many other regional agencies in Europe. It has also suffered from the fact that there are two opposing views on European union. In general, the continental Europeans look for a close federal union with a strong government

over all. Britain and the Scandinavian countries prefer a less formal cooperative alliance. Actual growth toward European union has taken place mainly in connection with economic agreements, rather than by direct attempts at political organization.

Benelux

An early move toward European union was the economic agreement of Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg, known as Benelux. This agreement was signed in 1944 by the governments in exile in London. It called for a customs union, to do away with tariffs among the three member states and to set up a single tariff wall to protect all three against imports from the outside. Its purpose was to enlarge the free trading area of the member countries and to create a combined economic system strong enough to compete in world trade. There were considerable differences, however, in cost and price of goods between Holland and Belgium, and many business concerns would have been ruined if trade were freed too suddenly of all obstacles. So although tariffs were abolished among the Benelux states (effective January 1, 1948), some trade quotas and currency controls were continued.

Meanwhile the members developed a new agreement (signed in 1947) to work toward a full economic union, one that would be able to stand the free flow of goods, investments, and people throughout the area. Full economic union would have to include a close interlocking of the economic, financial, and social conditions in the three countries, so as not to have such differences in levels as to cause a dangerous one-way flow in the channels of trade. All their foreign relations that affect these internal conditions must be carried on by the Benelux union rather than by the separate states.

Organization for European Economic Cooperation

OEEC was formed to coordinate the work of the European states in operating the Marshall Plan. The United States had announced in June, 1947, that if the Europeans would work out a coordinated plan for their own recovery the United States would contribute to help them pay the necessary costs. A temporary committee of sixteen Eu-

ropean states drew up the plans for the new program. In 1948, as soon as the United States Congress had authorized the plan, the OEEC was established.

At first OEEC was busy with rebuilding the shattered industry and agriculture of Europe. This work made such progress that soon the organization turned its attention to longer-range problems such as efficiency of production and the lowering of trade barriers.

An important offshoot of OEEC was the European Payments Union. EPU was organized to untangle exchange problems. For example, a European country might find itself running a trade surplus with one neighbor and a deficit with another. When this situation arose the usual remedy was to attack the trade deficit by restricting imports. With many of the countries trying to avoid deficits by cutting off other people's markets, they often found their own best markets cut off in turn.

EPU acts as a sort of clearinghouse. A country may earn extra francs by a trade surplus on one side, and turn them over to EPU to offset a deficit in guilders caused by heavy buying somewhere else. To a gratifying extent this arrangement has relieved the countries from trying to balance their trade with each other country, provided they could balance their total trade.

EPU has been in difficulties sometimes because of nations running badly unbalanced over-all deficits or surpluses. In such cases it is authorized to advise changes in national policy designed to give a better balance of imports and exports. To cover temporary unbalances the EPU treasury had to have a modest working capital, and that was supplied out of Marshall Plan funds. In the long run, this device may break down if one country, such as Germany, consistently outsells all competitors. To handle an unbalance of that sort will require some kind of European supergovernment with taxing power. Such an authority is gradually being developed, starting with the Schuman Plan.

The Schuman Plan

This plan for a united political control over the steel and coal industries of Europe was proposed by Robert Schuman, the French Foreign Minister, in May, 1950. The treaty establishing the European Community for Coal and Steel was signed April 18, 1951, by France, the Federal

Republic of Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

The purposes of the Schuman Plan were: first, to improve the efficiency of coal and steel production in Europe; and second, to create a regional program of great economic importance in which France and Germany would work together as partners, and so might learn to forget old hatreds and become friends.

Efficiency was sought by enlarging the market area and by prohibiting monopoly practices. After a period of gradual adjustment, the trade barriers would disappear, and coal and steel could be shipped from one place to another inside the Community wherever the cost and price relationships called for them to go. This freedom would kill off the most inefficient producers and enlarge the operations of the more efficient ones. But it would not work if they should arrange a cartel or other monopoly scheme to prevent the free flow of trade.

The Community is authorized to forbid monopoly, and to fine any company that is convicted of practicing it. In order to exercise the power of enforcing an anti-monopoly law, the Community is equipped with a real government, consisting of a High Authority of nine members, a Consultative Committee, an Assembly, a Council of Ministers, and a Court. The Court has power to reverse the decisions of other bodies in the Community for exceeding their authority. As a whole the Community is a true federal government, superior to the six member states, within the field of the laws governing coal and steel.

By 1957 the High Authority was able to report that practically all the old trade barriers had been removed. Steel production, which had been lagging before 1952, had increased 36 per cent in five years, considerably faster than that of Britain or the United States, though still slightly less than in the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile the Community was powerfully reinforced by the addition of two other organizations, the Common Market and Euratom.

The Common Market and Euratom

Three years after the establishment of the European Community for Coal and Steel, the Benelux nations proposed to France, Germany, and Italy the extension of similar agreements to cover trade in general and the devel-

opment of atomic energy. The foreign ministers of the six countries met in June, 1955, and began discussions that led to the signing of two new treaties on March 25, 1957. One of these established the European Economic Community, known as the Common Market; and the other the Atomic Energy Community, or Euratom.

Each of these organizations was given a form similar to that of the Community for Coal and Steel, with separate executive commissions but with the same Assembly, Council, and Court acting for all three.

The transition to over-all free trade within the Community will take longer than for coal and steel because of the great number of different items, but it is planned to be completed in about fifteen years. The Community as a whole will have a single tariff law for imports from the rest of the world. Other European countries, however, will be welcome to join as full members or to come inside a free-trade area on special terms.

The treaty provides for numerous special organs to aid in economic development, such as a Monetary Committee and a European Investment Bank. For the time being the general budget will be carried by contributions from the member governments. But the Coal and Steel Community already has power to tax the industries under its control, and in time the Common Market organization will undoubtedly develop tax powers.

Euratom is similar in form but is comparatively simple because there are no great vested interests in atomic energy to be disturbed by the abolition of trade barriers. Euratom will handle all imports of atomic fuels, develop research, establish safety standards, and take precautions against the use of nuclear material for illegitimate purposes.

The population of the six countries making up these communities is about 160 million, much the same as that of the United States. To obtain the benefit of this large market they will need a federal government with sufficient powers to maintain a workable balance by taxing some parts of the system and subsidizing other parts, and to maintain a fair degree of efficiency by suppression of monopoly. The temper of Western Europe looks toward such a federal system, and the present community organizations seem to be capable of developing in that direction.

Other signs point the same way. In October, 1957, it was reported that the Scandinavian countries and Finland

were blueprinting a customs union and a joint investment bank, and that the seventeen members of OEEC, including both the Community and Scandinavian groups as well as the United Kingdom, had agreed to begin negotiations for an all-European free-trade system.

The Western Pacific

The settlement of the war with Japan was not a responsibility of the UN, but of the fifty-four nations that had been on the winning side. In 1947, the United States proposed a peace conference, but the plan fell through because the Soviet Union refused to cooperate. Finally, in 1950, President Truman decided to go ahead and make peace if possible, even without the Soviets. He appointed John Foster Dulles to negotiate with Japan and with the Allies. The result was a Peace Conference at San Francisco in 1951 where the Soviet efforts to prevent the signing of the peace were unsuccessful. Japan signed the treaty with forty-eight other nations.

Since Japan was disarmed, the United States undertook to keep a garrison in Japan until she could raise her own defense forces.

Some of the Pacific nations questioned whether Japan in rearming might not again become aggressive. To meet the doubts raised by the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand, Mr. Dulles negotiated treaties of mutual defense between those countries and the United States.

The attack in Korea and Chinese aid to the communists in Indochina roused fears of a massive communist drive against Southeast Asia and the islands of the Western Pacific. As a result of these danger signs, in 1954 Mr. Dulles, by then the United States Secretary of State, proposed a Pacific regional defense treaty somewhat like NATO. A conference was held in Manila in September.

The only Asian countries to take part were the Philippines, Thailand, and Pakistan. The other members of the Conference were Australia, France, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Many Asians were suspicious of these other partners in Asian defense, wondering if they might have imperialistic designs of their own. In order to meet these suspicions the Pacific Charter, adopted at the Conference, pledges all the members to promote the independence "of all countries whose people desire it and are able to undertake its responsibilities."

The Conference also adopted a Southeast Asia Collec-

tive Defense Treaty in which the parties agreed to unite in defense of any member subjected to attack, or of any other area that the members should unanimously agree to include in their common defense line. A protocol to this treaty specially mentioned Laos, Cambodia, and the non-communist part of Viet Nam, the three states of Indochina, as coming under the protection of the agreement, but stressing that the members would take action on the territory of these states only with their consent.

In its first annual report in 1956, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) noted with approval the British plans to launch Malaya as an independent nation—plans that led in 1957 to the actual independence of Malaya and its admission to the UN.

The treaty emphasized the duty of members to cooperate in strengthening not only their military defenses but also their economic systems and their defenses against communist subversion. Much of the economic development work involves not only mutual aid but cooperation with the UN and other organizations. In 1957 SEATO reported good progress in defense and in economic prosperity and resolved to continue its program with vigor.

Another regional agreement that affects some important countries in Asia is the Colombo Plan. This technical assistance program was started by members of the British Commonwealth, but from the first it has welcomed other free Asian countries. It works in cooperation with the United States Point Four program and with the Technical Assistance program of the United Nations. Here as well as in the matter of collective security the Asian region is struggling with conditions that invite aggression and that can be corrected only by a long process of upbuilding.

The Organization of American States

The regional organization of the Western Hemisphere has been a natural result of the liberation, more than a century ago, of groups of European colonies, born in weakness and needing the strength of union. First the English colonies after gaining their independence joined to form the United States. Then, in 1826, Simón Bolívar, the great Liberator of the Spanish colonies, called the First Congress of American States at Panama City. Delegates came from Colombia, Central America, Peru, and Mexico, and signed a "Treaty of Perpetual Union."

In the Monroe Doctrine (1823) the United States with the informal backing of British sea power warned the European Holy Alliance, led by Russia, not to try any new colonization in the Americas. For more than a century the Monroe Doctrine was a one-sided defense of the continent. The Latin American countries regarded the United States with suspicion, fearing that in warning the Europeans to keep out it was merely reserving the Western Hemisphere for its own imperialistic ambitions.

These suspicions were increased in the early years of the present century, when several Caribbean republics failed to pay their debts, and the European creditors threatened to land soldiers to enforce payment. President Theodore Roosevelt feared that the Europeans, once ensconced, might decide to stay. He therefore decided to land United States forces and take over the collection of taxes until the debts were properly covered. The Latin American nations resented having the United States act as continental policeman.

President Herbert Hoover abandoned the intervention policy, and the feeling of the Latin Americans toward the United States began to improve. Further improvement of relations, during the administrations of President Franklin Roosevelt and President Truman, led to the formal establishment of the Organization of American States in 1948.

For many years there had been developing an organization of the American Republics, originally designed for the promotion of commerce among the nations of the continent. The first meeting for this purpose was held in Washington in 1889-90, and others were held in later years at which the organization was gradually developed. It was governed by a Governing Board, made up at first of the U.S. Secretary of State and the Washington Ambassadors of the other members, and later composed of special delegates chosen by the member countries. Its headquarters staff was called the Pan American Union, and was housed in a monumental building of that name in Washington.

In 1933, at the Conference of Montevideo, the United States announced that it accepted the principle of non-intervention. From that date the organization began to take a more definite form. In 1945, at Mexico City, the pressures of the war led to the passage of two resolutions: one calling for a closer organization, and the other calling for collective action in defense of any member that might be attacked. The sense of continental unity was so

strong in 1945 that the American states attending the United Nations Conference refused to accept the UN Charter until a clause was added giving their regional organization authority to settle disputes among its members and to provide for its own collective security.

In 1947 at Rio de Janeiro the American states signed the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, which later served in part as model for the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949. At Bogotá in 1948 they adopted a new Charter establishing their association as the Organization of American States, with the Pan American Union as its secretarial body. The main assembly of the Organization, called the Conference, meets about every five years to settle general policies. A Council, formerly the Governing Board of the Pan American Union, manages the Organization's routine affairs.

At the conference of March, 1954, in Caracas, the Organization reviewed the first five years of its existence and passed a number of resolutions to tighten its structure. In one of these the mutual defense treaty of 1947 was specifically applied to communist subversion. The resolution stated that "the domination or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international communist movement, extending to the Hemisphere the political system of an extra-continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

Like the UN, the OAS has certain dependent agencies which give technical services to the members in economic, legal, and cultural fields. It also has a number of specialized organizations affiliated with it, such as the Pan American Institute of Geography and History, and institutes for the protection of women and children, or the development of agriculture. These agencies are coordinated by the Pan American Union, and also cooperate with the corresponding agencies of the UN.

By-passing the UN

With new regional agreements being built up, a great amount of negotiation goes on outside the UN. Friends of the UN often criticize the Powers for "by-passing" the UN, and express the fear that the UN may wither away.

The smaller nations in the Assembly are naturally concerned when the Great Powers discuss matters in special conferences where the rest of the nations have no chance to give their opinions or cast their votes.

On the other hand, Article 33 of the Charter directs the members to try to settle their disputes first of all by "negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." In other words, you must try to avoid appealing to the UN Security Council or the Assembly, but if all other attempts at peaceful settlement fail, then come in and let the world organization judge.

The question about by-passing is a common feature of any system of organizations on more than one level. In human affairs generally, some matters are settled by the family, some by the village or town, some by a country or province, others by a nation or by a regional group of nations or by the human race organized in the United Nations. The exact level where a problem is best handled is often not clear. Continual disputes about "states' rights" are a characteristic of federal governments; continual disputes about "domestic jurisdiction," nationalism, and regionalism may be expected in the UN.

The main principles for understanding such disputes seem fairly clear.

Nationalism, for instance, is the feeling of a people that they are by rights a nation and ought to have their own "sovereignty." They feel oppressed if some other nation rules them. The revolt against colonialism excites the feeling of nationalism, now especially strong in Asia.

Nationalism is not a form of madness. If people have language, customs, and traditions in common they can settle many questions among themselves better than any other people can do it for them. They should be encouraged to do so, provided they do not disturb their neighbors too much.

Regionalism, in the same way, is the feeling of the nations in one part of the world that they have certain regional problems in common, and that they have some principles and standards in common that may outweigh their differences. Such feelings lead the nations to make regional agreements. This way of solving problems also makes sense provided the region does not form an alliance to conquer the rest of the world.

The United Nations is based on the feeling that all human beings are the same in some ways and therefore need an organization in which they can act as one on matters in which they agree as members of the human race. Such matters may include at least the desire to avoid total atomic desolation, and a general desire to promote some kinds of human rights and to increase the level of living. These are the general purposes of the vast majority of sane people. But whether some particular action is best planned on a world-wide scale or in some smaller unit depends on its special character.

The natural principles of human action in large or small groups are fairly plain. But the boundaries between one level of action and the next are apt to be hazy and clouded by the selfish interests of one nation or another. It is only to be expected that people will always argue about where the nation or the region leaves off and the proper field of the United Nations begins.

DISARMAMENT

The idea of an international agreement to reduce military forces was first proposed at a Peace Conference called by the Czar of Russia in 1899. Modern science was developing big guns and steel-clad warships, and these seemed so costly and dangerous that something would have to be done to put a limit on them. From then on the cost and danger have grown until the most advanced hydrogen and cobalt bomb offers the human race the possibility of killing all or nearly all the living things in the world by the poisoned earth and air left over from a short atomic war. The necessity of avoiding suicide is known to all the world, but how to do it is not so simple.

The Peace Conference of 1899 appointed a committee of experts to study the reduction of armies and navies. The committee reported that no agreement was possible at that time.

Another Peace Conference in 1907 agreed to prohibit the use of poison in war but did not try to agree on arms reduction.

After World War I the question was more urgent. The victorious Allies disarmed Germany, and decided to put a disarmament clause in the Covenant of the League of Nations which they were writing along with the peace treaty. Accordingly, Article 8 of the League Covenant provided that the League Council should make plans for arms reduction and offer them to the members for their signature. When these plans were adopted the members would promise to exchange "full and frank information on the scale of their armaments, their naval and air programmes and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes." A Commission was appointed to advise the League on how to bring about the desired agreements.

In December, 1920, the Commission advised that arms reduction at that time would be premature. A new Commission was appointed in 1921, which came up with some further steps in the attempt to think out the disarmament problem.

The new principles, which the League Assembly accepted in 1922, were that no plan would work unless every nation joined, and that the nations must promise to help any country that might be attacked. Details of a proposed treaty of mutual assistance were brought forward in 1923. They included giving the League Council the authority to decide what forces each member should provide for the common defense. They also included the authority to judge, in case of an attack, which nation was the aggressor and which was the victim. The treaty would promise financial help to the victim and economic penalties against the aggressor.

By 1923, then, the main elements of a workable disarmament plan had been named, although naming them was far from being the same as getting the nations to agree to them. These are the main essentials:

1. Full disclosure. No country can have military secrets, or the other countries will be afraid to disarm.
2. Full membership. Every country big enough to be dangerous must be a member of the agreement.
3. Collective security, as it is now called. If any country is attacked the others must be bound by a promise to give immediate help without further argument.
4. Judgment. Some recognized authority must have the information and the means to give an immediate judgment saying which nation is the attacker and which is the victim.

All arguments since 1923 have consisted of repeating the demand for these essentials in one form of words or another, and finding that some country was determined to leave out some necessary feature. Since that would open a loophole through which an aggressor might draw a sudden bead on his innocent victim, the insistence on the loophole has naturally led to disagreement.

After 1923 the nations of Europe saw little hope that the world could soon agree on a disarmament treaty. As a stopgap they tried regional peace agreements, such, for instance, as the Locarno Pacts. But in 1932 a great conference of sixty-one nations met at Geneva. In addition to fifty-six League members, the United States and four other non-members were there.

The Geneva Conference agreed on prohibiting certain weapons such as bombs dropped from airplanes or balloons. It agreed on the principles of arms limitation, of international supervision of the arms business, and of

publicity of arms budgets. But it did not find a practical way to get the nations to act on these principles.

Soon afterward, Japan and Germany resigned from the League of Nations. Then in 1935, when Germany started drafting men for its new Army the League gave up trying to promote disarmament. Hitler was planning conquest. For the time being it was too late for anyone to disarm.

It is sometimes said that it takes two to make a quarrel. This saying is true of nations only provided there are no aggressors. It takes only one nation to march over the border for the purpose of conquering its neighbors. So long as anyone who loves freedom has the means of resistance, there will be war if any one nation starts a military aggression.

On the other hand, if all the freedom-loving nations of the world were so completely disarmed that they could offer no resistance, an aggressor could take them over without a war. This is what the aggressor nations mean by their love of peace. Hitler, for instance, spoke often of his deep desire for peace, meaning that when he decided to march he hoped there would be no resistance. Aggressors are strongly convinced that it takes two to make a quarrel, and that if any nation resists their aggression that nation is a warmonger and is guilty of all the blood of those who suffer.

In 1935, when Hitler was building up his armies and talking of his love for peace, the other nations were afraid of what he might be planning to do. They were too much disturbed to disarm, though at the time not enough disturbed to start a heavy rearmament program. It will always happen that if the peace-loving Powers believe that any strong Power is dreaming of military conquests, they will be afraid to disarm and may on the contrary build up their armaments.

What use, then, is there in talking about disarmament year after year, and conference after conference, when everyone knows there are unspoken conditions in the argument that make it hopeless? The use is in the fact that conditions change, and the long years of discussion will help to bring on the needed change, if war should be postponed long enough.

By talking, the nations make clear to themselves and to any possible aggressor the necessary terms of peace and of disarmament as they are now understood. Much of the work of describing these necessary terms was done before

DISARMAMENT

1923, but many details are still not clear. Some details may be less necessary than others. They might be sacrificed in bargaining, to save the face of a nation that is suspicious and reluctant to yield on more essential points. No free nation wants to demand or to endure any more international control than is really necessary to get the result. Long and seemingly hopeless argument is hammering out the terms that some day may be accepted.

What would make any aggressor willing to accept conditions that would forever disarm his power to conquer his neighbor? This is the key question of the mid-twentieth century. It has several answers.

If any leaders who want to conquer the world should be convinced that the devastation of a war would leave them in worse condition than they are now, a pressure would be set up in their minds toward giving up the dream of a short, easy, victorious war.

When the leaders who dream of conquest try to lull their victims by talk of peace and fail to get the victims to disarm, their confidence is temporarily shaken, and they show it by being unusually polite. If this condition continues a long time, if the free nations continue powerfully armed, the dream of conquest may gradually fade. Then the practical advantages in agreeing to a real disarmament may begin to appeal to men who had previously neglected them.

This principle can be easily illustrated by a bit of history that is now too old to carry any hard feelings. About a thousand years ago the Norsemen found profit in raiding the coasts of Britain. Sometimes they were successful, and sometimes the inhabitants killed them and nailed their hides to the church doors. In those days any agreement for a lasting peace would have seemed impossible. But as time went on, military raids on the British coasts ceased to be profitable adventures, and the Scandinavians forgot the whole idea. There is no raider so fierce that he may not quiet down if he finds there is no profit in the business.

Another reason for hope is the well-known fact that subversion in our time is a powerful technique of conquest. All modern aggressors count more or less on persuasion, the technique of the big lie, and the use of dupes for infiltration of the victim's institutions. The peace-loving nations that hope to resist aggression also count heavily on subverting the power of aggression by campaigns of truth. One of the best hopes of military peace is the belief

on each side that it has a chance to win by propaganda, undermining the other side's will to resist.

Propaganda is cheaper and safer than shooting. Any aggressor who has a deep faith that he can win the world by propaganda and subversion would be glad to do it in that inexpensive way instead of by the simpler but more risky use of armed force against well-armed opponents.

If that be true, the hope of forever postponing a new world war and in the end of abolishing aggressive weapons is that much better than it was in 1935.

UN and the Atom

The UN Charter authorized the Security Council to make plans for the regulation of armaments and submit them to the members. The Assembly was also authorized to "consider the principles governing disarmament," and to make recommendations about them to the members.

Then a few weeks after the signing of the Charter the atomic bomb came into action, and the disarmament question was stepped up to a consideration of the life or death of the human race.

On November 15, 1945, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States proposed a UN Commission to study the control of the atom. In December the Soviet Union joined in sponsoring the proposal, and it was adopted unanimously at the first session of the General Assembly in January, 1946.

The Atomic Energy Commission began its work with a plan submitted by Bernard Baruch for the United States. All uranium and other dangerous materials were to be mined, manufactured, and controlled by a single international authority. This authority would release materials for power plants and for medical and industrial purposes, keeping track of their use so that no one could hoard enough to make dangerous weapons. The proposal included setting up a strict system of inspection.

The Commission reported on May 17, 1948, that it was deadlocked. The report said that action was blocked by Soviet insistence on two points. One was that the Soviets refused to accept unlimited inspection on the ground that it infringed national sovereignty; the other was that they demanded prohibition of atomic weapons as a first step before the adoption of a control system.

The General Assembly adopted a resolution approving the principles that the majority of the Commission had

agreed to be necessary. It directed the Commission to go on working on such questions as it considered practical and useful.

In July, the Chinese member of the Commission, who was chairman, called on Canada, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. to consult, as requested by the Assembly. They held ten meetings and came to no final agreement, though they managed to clear up misunderstandings on some details. The Assembly in November, 1949, urged the six Powers to continue their meetings and to discuss a number of suggestions offered in the Assembly debate. The meetings therefore were started again in December, 1949.

In January, 1950, the Soviet representative objected to having Nationalist China sitting in the Six-Power Conferences, and proposed that the conference put the "representative of the Kuomintang group" out of the meetings. When the others voted this proposal down the Soviet delegate walked out. He stated that any action taken by the meeting with the Kuomintang group taking part would be unlawful and the Soviet Union would refuse to recognize it. This incident broke up the Six-Power Conferences.

This was the last of the separate effort in the UN to control the atom.

Guns, Planes, and Ships

The General Assembly in December, 1946, recommended that the Security Council should immediately set to work to draft plans for regulating and reducing ordinary armaments. It also suggested that the Security Council should begin promptly to organize the UN police force as provided in the Charter. At that time it was commonly believed that collective security, one of the necessary bases for general disarmament, could be had by organizing United Nations armed forces to preserve order.

The following February the Security Council appointed a Commission for Conventional Armaments. The Commission passed a resolution in August, 1948, stating its conclusions as to the principles of a system of arms limitation:

The system must start with the adherence of all states that have substantial military resources.

The system depends on international confidence and security, and vice versa.

Confidence and security would depend on control of atomic energy, settlements of peace with the countries defeated in World War II, and reduction of arms to the amounts necessary for fulfillment of the members' obligations "and protection of their rights under the Charter."

The system must provide proper safeguards including international supervision and some means of effective penalties for violations.

On August 1, 1949, the Commission adopted a French proposal for a census of conventional armaments. The Soviet and Ukrainian members opposed the motion on the ground that without first getting an agreement to cut armed forces one-third and to abolish atomic weapons, a census would be meaningless and would serve only for spying out military secrets.

The Commission worked out its census plan in detail and submitted it to the Security Council, where it was taken up on October 18, 1949, and killed by a Soviet veto. The Council then forwarded a record of the discussions to the General Assembly.

The Assembly approved the French plan for a census and called upon the Council to try again, urging all members to cooperate. The Council sent the Assembly resolution once more to the Commission.

When the Commission met in April, 1950, the Soviet member brought up the same question about China that had finished off the Atomic Energy Commission's Six-Power Conference the previous January. The Soviet delegate proposed that the Commission throw out the National Chinese representative, and when that was refused, he walked out. The Commission, however, went on to study various details that would be useful if and when action should become possible.

When the fifth session of the General Assembly opened in September, 1950, the Korean attack was in progress, and the North Atlantic Powers were starting to build up their defenses in earnest. The Soviet Union proposed the one-third reduction as before. The Assembly adopted instead a resolution calling for prompt action against aggression and for a UN system of control and inspection with a view to gradual arms reduction. The Assembly also appointed a Committee of Twelve to consider how to coordinate the two Commissions on armaments and whether to merge them.

The Committee of Twelve recommended in October, 1951, to the Sixth Assembly that a new Disarmament Commission should be established to deal with all kinds of armed forces and weapons. A similar proposal was made by France, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Assembly adopted the resolution of France, the United Kingdom, and the United States on January 11, 1952. The Disarmament Commission created by this resolution was composed of all the members of the Security Council together with Canada when she is not on the Council.

The Commission met on February 4, 1952, and adopted a French plan of work which was a compromise between plans offered by the United States and the U.S.S.R. The French plan called for a study of the following points which all members agreed to be necessary for a successful program: disclosure and verification of all armaments and armed forces; regulation of armaments and armed forces, including abolition of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and controls to ensure this abolition; limitation of ordinary arms, and controls to prevent secret violations of the agreement.

Although the Commission agreed on the necessary main features of a workable disarmament program, it was unable to come to unanimous agreement on the order in which the steps would be taken.

The United States insisted that disclosure and verification must be done by stages, starting with the least secret matters, and then as knowledge and confidence increased, working up to the more secret weapons and establishments.

The Soviets continued to insist on having all the Powers disclose all their "official data" at one time, without verification by unlimited inspection. They also insisted that before disclosing any facts the nations should sign an agreement to prohibit atomic weapons and to reduce all ordinary arms by one-third. Thus the familiar impasse continued. On the other hand, no one walked out.

Another point that came up in the Commission and in the Security Council was that of germ warfare, for the Soviet Union accused the United States of dropping disease germs from airplanes in Korea.

In June, 1952, the U.S.S.R. representative on the Security Council asked the Council to bring up the Geneva Protocol of 1925, prohibiting bacterial weapons, and to

urge all nations to ratify it. The Protocol had been signed by forty-two states, but six of them, including the United States, had failed to ratify.

The United States delegate stated that after the Protocol was signed the Soviet Union had ratified it with the reservation that it would be free to use bacterial weapons in retaliation if an enemy should use them first. The United States had then refused to ratify the Protocol on the ground that it was useless in view of the Soviet reservation.

The U.S. delegate testified, on behalf of the UN Command in Korea, that the United States had not at any time used bacterial weapons in the fighting there. But, he said, the Soviet Union, by accusing the United States of using such weapons, had freed itself of the Geneva Protocol according to its own terms of ratification. The United States therefore objected to any action of the Security Council implying that it was guilty of this kind of warfare. The Security Council rejected the Soviet motion with only the Soviet delegate voting in favor of it.

In the Commission, the Soviet Union proposed an immediate discussion of its charges against the United States. The Commission rejected this proposal, and merely added the words "including bacterial weapons" in its description of the weapons of mass destruction.

In May and June, 1954, as the Commission was making no progress, a subcommittee of Canada, France, the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States met in private in London. The British and French offered detailed proposals covering the abolition of atomic weapons, reduction of armed forces, and establishment of controls. In September in the Assembly the Soviet delegate approved these proposals as a basis for negotiations, but it was clear that some important details, especially as to timing, would need further argument.

The following year in July the President of the United States and the heads of the British, French, and Soviet governments met in Geneva, and arranged for a meeting of their foreign ministers to take place in October. Neither of these meetings resulted in a final agreement. The principal new point brought up was President Eisenhower's proposal that the United States and the Soviet Union exchange complete blueprints showing all military establishments, and that they allow each other's planes to fly overhead and observe. The Soviets afterward accused the United States of wanting to substitute air inspection for

disarmament, since the President's proposal did not include the paper abolition of atomic weapons. The Americans argued that it had been intended only as a first step.

In November, 1955, the Disarmament Commission reported to the Assembly, stating the positions that had been taken by the Powers. Many details were practically the same for all, and the Soviets went further than before, in agreeing to the establishment of control posts and unlimited right of the control organization to inspect. But a serious technical stumbling block appeared in the disclosure—agreed by all sides—that there was no known method of detecting hidden stores of atomic weapon materials such as plutonium. The United States announced that it had assigned teams of scientists to search for a practical detection system, and gave notice that meanwhile it must reconsider some of its previous proposals.

The Assembly directed the Disarmament Commission to go on trying, giving priority to the Eisenhower proposals and to Bulganin's proposed control points, together with all the disarmament that could be effectively inspected.

During 1956 the discussions continued in the Commission and its Subcommittee, but without reaching an agreement. The Commission reported to the Assembly and the Security Council at the end of the year. The proposals made to the Assembly contained much the same details as before, with a few notable changes. The United States suggested that all future testing of long-range missiles, including earth satellites, should be placed under international inspection to ensure that future inventions would be devoted exclusively to peaceful purposes. The Soviets again proposed the prohibition of nuclear weapons, the discontinuance of testing, and the liquidation of all military bases in foreign states. Britain and France, while favoring a general disarmament agreement, were ready to agree to partial measures if not inconsistent with a practical over-all plan. Canada, Japan, and Norway urged immediate steps toward stopping nuclear tests, with a view to holding down the total amount of radiation in the world.

The Assembly on January 25, 1957, adopted a resolution sponsored by twelve members including France, Britain, the United States, and the Soviet Union, requesting the Disarmament Commission and its Subcommittee to continue work. At the Subcommittee meetings in London,

the Western delegates made some concessions to meet Soviet objections. They agreed to move beyond a "first-stage" treaty, and proposed specific target levels for further stages of disarmament. They agreed to start with limited inspection zones. They agreed to reduce stocks of weapons by transferring materials to peaceful uses under international supervision, and to transfer more than the Soviets would. They also agreed that on ratification of a first-stage disarmament program nuclear tests would be stopped for two years.

On their side the Soviets accepted the idea of limited first-stage agreements. They appeared willing to accept the idea of air and ground inspection, by zones, to guard against surprise attack; and they seemed ready to abandon at last their demand for abolition of nuclear weapons, since it was recognized that no way of verifying the abolition was available. The Soviet delegate also agreed to a system of inspection posts to check on the stopping of nuclear tests, and to the proposal that international storage depots should be used for the deposit of arms given up under a disarmament plan.

Toward the end of the meeting, the Western members put forward a set of definite proposals and the Soviet delegate rejected them. The meeting broke up with no agreement, leaving the impression that the Soviet Union had decided for the time being not to continue the negotiations. After the Soviets had launched the first earth satellites, they resigned from the Disarmament Commission.

Atoms for Peace

On December 8, 1953, President Eisenhower addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations. He called attention to the dangers of total destruction by atomic and hydrogen bombs, and suggested a new "Atoms for Peace" plan for easing the suspicions that were preventing agreement on controls.

The President proposed that the Powers having nuclear materials contribute some of them to a pool to be used for the peaceful development of atomic energy. He suggested that the program should be operated by an International Atomic Energy Agency, to be sponsored by the United Nations.

The Soviet Government made an immediate effort to tie the President's plan into the disarmament problem. It

wanted all countries taking part to agree first to the prohibition of atomic weapons. It also wanted the new agency to be controlled by the Security Council, where it would be subject to the veto. The United States insisted on keeping it free of such entanglements.

On December 4, 1954, the Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution endorsing the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency. The resolution did not tie the agency to the disarmament problem, but merely recommended that it should affiliate with the UN.

In 1955 a world conference on the peaceful uses of the atom was held in Geneva, and in 1956 representatives of the twelve nations that already had some atomic resources met from February to April in Washington. The founding statute of the Agency, which includes a provision for inspection to make sure that stocks of nuclear fuel provided by the Agency would not be used for making weapons, was signed by eighty nations in October, 1956.

With the United States ratification on July 29, 1957, the number of members necessary to establish the Agency was completed. The IAEA opened for business on October 1 at its headquarters in Vienna. To start it on its way, the United States pledged 5,000 kilograms (about 11,000 lbs.) of uranium 235, the Soviet Union pledged 50 kilograms, and other members smaller amounts. Much larger quantities will be used every year after the program gets under way, but it will take several years of technical progress before great amounts of atomic power can be produced, even in the leading countries.

Meanwhile, a Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation was set up to coordinate information obtainable from member countries and from FAO, WHO, UNESCO, and other organizations. Even if a nuclear war can be avoided there will still be a serious question about the disposal of radioactive wastes from atomic power plants. There is some hope of developing new forms of atomic power that will not produce poisonous ashes, particularly if hydrogen power can be harnessed, but for the time being the dangers are a matter for anxious discussion in the United Nations.

The separation of peaceful atomic developments from the weapons problem is designed to contribute to the pressures for a peaceful solution. That is why the proponents of Atoms for Peace refused to accept the proposal to connect it with the discussion of atomic disarmament.

As Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., the United States delegate, said on November 15, 1954:

Disarmament is one element in the building of peace. At least one other element is a new world outlook which may get us into the habit of working together and thus, eventually, of trusting each other. We think that this "Atoms for Peace" proposal will lead the world away from war because it is a new prism through which we can look at the problems of the world. It is a new place at which to begin.

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

When the League of Nations was founded in 1919, it had an important new feature. The League was designed to be a continuing organization of the nations for peace and progress along every line of action. There had been international organizations for limited purposes, such as the Universal Postal Union. There had been great peace conferences and disarmament conferences, but they met, discussed, passed resolutions, and dissolved. The League was intended to be permanent, carrying on a growing body of tradition that the members would come to treat with respect. The League was destroyed in World War II, but the idea had taken root.

In particular, the people of the United States, more than half of whom had wanted to join the League in 1920, were determined in 1945 to join a new United Nations Organization.

The nations that met at San Francisco early in 1945 came with the purpose of setting up a permanent world organization with a more complete program of work than the League had had. None of them wanted to create a world government, however. For that reason it is not realistic to judge the United Nations by the standards used in classifying governments, such, for instance, as democratic representation, law enforcement, or the taxing power. Instead of hunting for traces of government, it is better to take the organization as it is and see what it is supposed to do, and how it is equipped to do it.

The General Assembly

The General Assembly is the central, or principal, organ of the UN, and is made up of all the member nations. Each member can send five representatives to the Assembly, but in any case each member has only one vote.

The General Assembly elects its own President and Vice-Presidents for each session. While the Secretary-General is the chief UN official, the President of the As-

sembly is the most prominent individual in the United Nations while the Assembly is in session. Both these officials have so far been chosen with great care and success and have exerted a powerful influence for the advancement of the UN, an influence based not only on their positions but on their own characters.

The Assembly appoints committees of many kinds to prepare the work for its regular sessions.

The seven Main Committees discuss items on the agenda and recommend action. Every member nation can have a representative on each of these Committees.

There are smaller Committees on credentials, budget, and other "housekeeping" details. There are also special committees to deal with problems such as Korean reconstruction or the treatment of refugees.

The Assembly adopts the general budget of the UN and assesses the members for their shares of the budget according to their ability to pay. Such factors as national income, average income per person, temporary dislocation of national income, and ability to obtain foreign money, are taken into consideration. The UN budget for 1957 was \$50,815,700, and the assessments ranged from 33 1/3 per cent of the total for the United States and 13.96 per cent for the Soviet Union down to 0.04 per cent for several of the small countries such as Haiti and Iceland. The fact that every member has to pay what the Assembly demands or resign does not make the Assembly a government. The same power is found in any private club.

The General Assembly may consider any questions related to peace and security and to the promotion of world prosperity and justice, except matters that are being acted upon by the Security Council, and matters that are strictly the internal affairs of member nations. In practice, if the Security Council votes and action is blocked by a veto, the question is then open for the Assembly to take it up. As for the definition of "internal affairs," there have been many disputes. Powers that hold colonies, for instance, often take the position that the affairs of the colonies are internal and not open to UN discussion. The smaller nations, especially those recently freed from colonial status, want to discuss the complaints of dependent territories. The tendency is for the UN to take more and more interest in the dependent areas.

All UN agencies report directly or indirectly to the General Assembly, and it may discuss their activities and

recommend changes. The Assembly decides important questions—including those on UN organizational matters such as the election of members to the UN or to the Security Council and Trusteeship Council—by a two-thirds vote.

The Security Council

The Security Council is made up of eleven members. Five of these are permanent members, being the five Great Powers as of 1945—China, France, the United Kingdom, the United States, and the U.S.S.R. The other six are elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms, three each year.

The original intention was that the Security Council should have a military force at its command, which it could use to keep order among the nations. In signing the Charter, the members agreed to obey the decisions of the Council, which therefore has in theory certain legislative powers within the field of its job as policeman.

In practice, however, the Council has not been able to agree on how to organize a UN police force. Moreover, except in the case of Korea, it has not been able to agree on the use of force. Its legislative powers therefore have almost dried up. In their place, the Assembly has enlarged its ability to make recommendations, backed only by moral force, which appears to be more potent than UN police power.

The Security Council requires a vote of any seven out of the eleven members to pass a decision on what is called a “procedural” matter—any internal question not directly affecting outside interests. “Substantive” matters require a vote of seven, including all five permanent members. This is the so-called “veto” of the five Great Powers. If a member is a party to a dispute, however, it must abstain from voting; in practice, an abstention by a permanent member is not regarded as a veto.

Any nation, whether a member of the UN or not, may bring to the attention of the General Assembly or the Security Council any dispute that seems likely to lead to a breach of the peace. Both bodies have wide powers under the Charter to attempt peaceful methods of settlement before using force or the recommendation of force.

The Council has a right of veto on the admission of new members to the UN, which it has often used.

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

ECOSOC is made up of eighteen member states, elected by the General Assembly for three-year terms in groups of six each year. This is the general committee of the Assembly to promote higher standards of living, better health, respect for human rights, and international co-operation in education and the arts.

ECOSOC has created many commissions and committees to study and report on various subjects ranging from the economic condition of Europe to the international opium trade. It is the UN body that makes agreements with the specialized agencies, such as the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) or the Universal Postal Union (UPU), subject to the approval of the General Assembly.

ECOSOC is also authorized to recognize non-governmental organizations having technical knowledge that may help it in its work. More than a hundred such organizations have been given what is called "consultative status." They are permitted to send observers to public meetings of the Council and its commissions. They may also speak at such meetings and present written statements which will be circulated as documents of these bodies.

The consulting organizations include, for example, the International Chamber of Commerce, International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, International Association of Juvenile Court Judges, Rotary International, Salvation Army, and International Islamic Economic Organization.

In addition to the organizations with regular consultative status more than a hundred and seventy others are on a register for occasional consultation on special points.

ECOSOC reports regularly to the General Assembly and often brings forward questions upon which the Assembly may wish to pass resolutions.

The other main UN organs are the Trusteeship Council, described in Chapter 6, and the International Court of Justice, described in Chapter 7.

The Secretary-General

The Secretary-General is the chief administrative officer of the United Nations, and he also has important political responsibilities.

The Secretary-General is "appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council." This means that before being voted upon by the General Assembly, the name of a proposed Secretary-General must be approved by the Council subject to the veto of any one of the five permanent members. This requirement enhances the importance of the Secretary-General, for he has been accepted by all the Great Powers, at least at the time of his election. He is therefore in a position to stand above the conflict and to mediate in times of severe tension.

The Charter gives the Secretary-General the privilege of coming before the Security Council to present for its consideration any matter that in his opinion may threaten the peace. The first Secretary-General, Trygve Lie, developed this privilege to include direct mediation among delegates to bring reconciliation of conflicts, when no other person was in a position to take the initiative. As his successor said in 1957: "I believe . . . that the Secretary-General should . . . help in filling any vacuum that may appear in the systems which the Charter and traditional diplomacy provide for the safeguarding of peace and security."

The Secretary-General serves a term of five years and until his successor is elected. By action of the Assembly Secretary-General Trygve Lie was continued in office for three years, when it became apparent that the Security Council was having trouble agreeing on whether to re-elect him or choose someone else. On his resignation before the end of this period he was succeeded by Dag Hammarskjöld of Sweden, who was re-elected to serve a second term beginning in April, 1958.

Every year the Secretary-General makes a report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization. He also acts as administrative officer for the meetings of the Assembly, the Security Council, the Trusteeship Council, and ECOSOC. In these jobs he employs various members of the Secretariat, of which he is the executive head.

The Secretariat

In the UN headquarters in New York is a staff of about 3,500 people working directly under the Secretary-General. There are other headquarters, in Geneva, Bangkok, The Hague, Montreal, Santiago de Chile, etc., where

specialized agencies or branches of the UN have other hundreds of employees.

There is no place in the world where people from so many different nations work in the same organization as at the UN in New York. UN employees come to the Secretariat from nearly every country on earth, including some countries that do not belong to the UN. But they do not represent their countries. According to Article 100 of the Charter, the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any other authority external to the Organization. Moreover, each member undertakes not to seek to influence its own nationals who are on the staff.

The delegates to the Assembly represent their countries and get instructions from home; their countrymen on the staff do not.

How about the betrayal of secrets? There are no secrets that involve the security of a country. Tourists are not allowed loose in the Secretariat office building because they would interfere with the work; but the information in the building is open to delegates from all countries.

The UN buildings contain nearly all the equipment and services that the Organization needs. There is even a fire department to take care of small fires, though in case of a serious fire the New York City Fire Department would come to help. There are restaurants, a bank, a library, and a post office, though the delegates and staff have to find lodgings outside. For example, Parkway Village, in the suburbs, houses many staff members, and has an international school which their younger children may attend, and a market that sells food from some foreign countries.

The UN post office is operated by the United States Post Office; but it has its own stamps and gets an income of a million dollars a year from selling stamps to collectors.

The staff has an elaborate job to do in managing the meetings in the New York Headquarters. The topics to be discussed must be examined and the necessary background material made ready for delegates to use when they need it. All the necessary interpreters have to be on hand to translate all the languages that the delegates at any meeting will speak. There will be stenographers to record the proceedings in English, French, Spanish, Chinese, and Russian. The speeches are also piped to a recording room where they are permanently recorded.

The "simultaneous interpreters" sit in soundproof booths overlooking the meeting, listening to the speaker and translating at the same time. Thus the headsets by every seat can be turned to give the proceedings in English, French, Spanish, Chinese, or Russian by setting the dial. In the meetings of the Security Council and the Disarmament Commission two "consecutive interpreters" also listen to the speaker. When he has finished they repeat the whole speech, with appropriate emphasis and gestures, in English and in French, if he has spoken in any other language.

The United Nations *Journal* prints summaries of the day's meetings in English and French. It is printed during the night to be available the next day.

The Department of Public Information publishes books, pamphlets, and magazines describing the work of the UN; it directs the headquarters bookstore, and has sales outlets all over the world. It has shown documentary films in over ninety countries, with sound tracks in more than two dozen languages. The DPI issues press releases, but these are not exclusive; it gives every facility to newsmen to write their own dispatches from "United Nations, N. Y."

Radio news broadcasts by the UN staff go out in thirty-four languages telling what happened during the day. The UN reporters do not "slant" the news to favor any side of an argument, so their reports are well received all over the world.

The records of the UN proceedings are preserved in a file room on the nineteenth floor with special protection against fire. On another floor are safes holding more than three thousand treaties, for under the Charter all treaties must be registered with the UN and published by it. If a treaty is not registered, no UN organ will recognize it as binding.

The UN Headquarters staff does a considerable amount of scientific and statistical work that is not covered by any of the agency staffs in other parts of the world. The New York staff has made studies, for instance, of the rights of women, the newest methods of house construction, the growth of national populations, and a proposal for a set of standard road signs that can be understood without words. The staff collects information for all the UN organs and agencies. It also handles the expenses and draws up the budget for the Secretary-General to present to the Assembly.

About a million tourists visit the New York Headquar-

ters every year. Guides are provided to show groups of tourists around. You can be admitted to the galleries of the meeting halls as long as there are vacant seats.

The guards will not allow you to make a speech from the galleries. They do not have the right to arrest people but they can put disorderly tourists out into New York, U.S.A.

Costs of the UN

The UN, being an organization that deals mainly in moral force and the exchange of knowledge, costs almost nothing in comparison with international enterprises that have to meet material needs. The regular UN budget is about \$50,000,000 a year. The United States pays about \$17,000,000 of this, or about 10 cents per person. Some of the other nations pay a little more per person for their assessments.

For comparison, the original Marshall Plan was estimated to cost \$24,000,000,000. The UNICEF budget runs about \$20,000,000; relief for Arab refugees in Palestine ~~\$25,000,000~~, and for rehabilitation purposes, another \$15,000,000 (or a total of \$40,000,000); and the Expanded Program for Technical Assistance about \$30,000,000 a year. The pledges for relief and rebuilding in South Korea up to early 1958 amounted to \$627,000,000. Of that figure, \$479,000,000 was distributed by the Unified Command in response to an appeal made by the United Nations Security Council in June 1950. These funds are raised by special contributions from governments and private givers, and are not paid directly by the UN. All the specialized agencies have their own membership, which may differ from that of the UN, and assess their own dues, getting no subsidies from other UN funds except the Technical Assistance Fund.

The UN activities that are agreed by the members to be essential for protecting and building the peace are rapidly rising in cost, and the small budgets of the Organization and its affiliated agencies need to be considerably increased. The amounts needed are small compared with the national budgets of the members, but there are always political obstacles to such appropriations, which can be overcome only by wide and hearty public support.

The biggest costs of international action are, of course, the costs of armament. They are coordinated by the regional organizations and paid for by the nations outside

the UN budget. In this setting it is evident that if the UN could profitably use twice as much money, the members could afford to supply it with no noticeable effect on their finances.

Amending the Charter

The Charter provided that the Assembly and Security Council must consider in 1955 whether to hold a special Convention for amending the Charter. This is one of the two ways in which amendments can be submitted to the members. The other is for the Assembly to approve an Amendment by a vote of two-thirds of the membership.

But in any case a proposed Amendment must go to the members for ratification and cannot come into force until it is ratified by two-thirds of the members including the Big Five. That is, the veto may stand in the way of final ratification.

But the Charter, though hard to amend by formal voting, is flexible, like the Constitution of the United States. Just as the people of the United States have quietly mummified the Electoral College and have built up the political parties, not mentioned in the Constitution, so the UN, finding the Security Council often unable to act, has been shifting its duties to other organs not paralyzed by any veto power.

The most important informal changes from the original UN, as conceived at San Francisco, include the following:

The UN armed forces, provided in Article 43, have practically been dropped. (The UNEF used in Egypt is quite a different thing.) Articles 44 to 48, giving details of how the UN forces shall be used, are dead, at least for the present. Article 106, authorizing the Big Five to act as a temporary Security Council, never has come alive because of the quick-growing disagreements among the Big Five. Article 23 provides that the Assembly shall elect the temporary members of the Security Council with due regard to their contributions to peace. This requirement turned out not to be practical.

On the positive side, several additions have been made to the original Charter. One was the agreement in the Security Council that when a permanent member fails to vote, that is not a veto. The Assembly has repeatedly pressed the Council to classify more topics as not subject to veto.

The increased influence of the Secretary-General has

made this office more important than as originally conceived. Another change is the Assembly's insistence on discussing the treatment of dependent territories, a subject not positively allowed by the language of the Charter except in the Trusteeships.

The Uniting for Peace resolutions drastically changed the relationships originally intended to be established by the Charter between the Security Council and the Assembly.

Another example of how the UN is able to meet an unforeseen responsibility is the way it took over the problem of the Italian colonies. It was strictly the right of the conquering powers—Britain, France, the United States, and the U.S.S.R.—to settle the future of Libya, Somaliland, and Eritrea. After three years of negotiating and inability to agree, the four powers agreed to let the Assembly decide. In 1957 there were clear signs of a demand that the UN take sovereignty over various wild areas, including the sea bottom, the South Polar Continent, and outer space. In general, however, the Assembly may only make recommendations, and the nations concerned will afterwards decide whether to accept them or not.

A number of supplementary agreements among various member states have spelled out some details not covered in the Charter but consistent with it. One is the treaty with the United States defining the legal position of the Headquarters district in New York. Most important are the regional treaties supplementing UN efforts to keep the peace, such as the North Atlantic Treaty and the Organization of American States. There is also a Convention on Privileges and Immunities, defining the rights of UN officials, property, funds, and communications.

There is within the UN a strong resistance to formal amendment of the Charter, and since 1955 the calling of a special convention has been repeatedly postponed. At the same time, the Organization is able to change its ways of operating to meet unforeseen dangers and problems.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

President Eisenhower, in a speech of welcome to the United States Committee for United Nations Day on September 23, 1953, said of the United Nations:

With all its defects, with all the failures that we can check up against it, it still represents man's best organized hope to substitute the conference table for the battlefield.

It has had its failures, but it has had its successes. Who knows what could have happened in these past years of strain and struggle if we hadn't had the United Nations? I think it is far more than merely a desirable organization in these days. Where every new invention of the scientist seems to make it more nearly possible for man to insure his own elimination from this globe, I think the United Nations has become sheer necessity.

When the victorious nations met at San Francisco in 1945 to organize for peace there was one choice that had already been made—they had chosen to set up a world-wide organization, a new and better organized League of Nations. Everyone knew that there were serious differences among the nations on various questions. If the nations were going to set up a world-wide organization, its charter would have to be loose enough to tolerate nations with deeply antagonistic views. On the other hand, if they had intended to found a true federal government with full power to enforce its laws against any rebellious state, then the UN would have to be composed entirely of nations that were agreed on the most controversial issues. In other words, the UN could have had a stronger charter, if only one class of nations, such as the "Western World," or the Americas, had been in it. Such a like-minded combination might have been able to do without the veto, as the Organization of American States has done. But it would not have been any kind of a world organization.

The decision to hold the San Francisco meeting was a decision to create a world organization that would include all the hostile camps that might be destined to take form.

However much division might come into the world—over communism, or colonialism, or race and religious conflicts, or the difference between rich and poor countries—so long as the UN goes on there would be a place where the contending parties could argue in the presence of others who are more concerned for peace than they are for the victory of either side. Such a relationship might not prevent the fatal World War III, but in the opinion of the statesmen of all parties, such an organized arguing place is the best hope of preventing it.

With that belief in the desperate necessity of having a world-wide United Nations, the delegates at San Francisco created "as strong an organization as all of them could agree upon and as, in their judgment, could, in practice, be effective at this stage in the history of the world." These are the words of Trygve Lie, the first Secretary-General of the UN.

The Charter binds all the members, including the Great Powers, to work for peace and not to use or threaten force on their own account against any nation. It binds the members to help the UN in suppressing aggression and to give no help to the aggressors. If all the Great Powers would faithfully keep these promises there would be no world war, even if some small nation might occasionally have to be reduced to order. But if one of the Great Powers should break the peace and if the others should decide to resist by force, no possible world organization could suppress the Powers on either side of such a conflict.

What a world organization can do, and what it is doing fairly well, is to lead the Great Powers to look before they leap. If the small nations do not like what the Powers are doing, they can say so and the Powers feel called upon to answer. While they argue, it is possible that crisis after crisis can come and go without quite heating up to the explosion point. If the UN is to act as a forum for arguing among hostile nations, it cannot use force against any nation that is big enough to blow up the forum itself. This is the reason that the United States insisted on the "veto," and the other Great Powers joined in demanding it as a condition of signing the Charter.

The Veto

The veto embodied in the Charter prevents the Security Council from using force against anyone except by a vote of seven out of the eleven members, including the

"concurring votes" of all of the five permanent members.

The veto is a recognition of the fact that the limit of the UN's power to use its own police force is a limit short of world war. If the disagreements among the Great Powers should ever reach the point where one of these Powers must be disciplined by military action, the UN would no longer be in the picture, and the fatal third war would already be beyond hope of remedy. The veto is a safeguard against fatally big ideas in the UN itself—big ideas of enforcing peace in a situation where no human agency could enforce it. The UN is warned that its job of keeping the peace does not include any kind of disciplinary action that would bring on the world war.

The police powers of the Security Council, therefore, cannot be used in such a way as to corner one of the Great Powers and force it to fight. The veto is a built-in protection against UN action that would surely start a new world war.

Experience has shown that the Assembly, in which there is no veto, can "act" in cases where the Security Council must not "act," simply because the Assembly's action is purely moral and advisory. World opinion is a strong force, but it does not kill soldiers or civilians, and therefore does not have to be answered by a shooting war.

It is true that in several ways the UN as a peacemaker has not worked out as the San Francisco Conference expected. On the minus side there were two serious disappointments: the failure to settle World War II; and the excessive use of the veto.

Remains of World War II

One disappointment is that the peace treaties to end World War II did not come through quickly. It was expected that the victorious Powers would impose peace on the defeated Axis and the UN could start from there. But as it has worked out, the Powers have not been able to agree on peace terms for the principal Axis countries. Treaties were signed only with the East European allies of Germany that came under Soviet control, and these treaties have been a continual bone of contention between the Western Powers and the Soviet Union.

The years went by and the Powers could not agree on treaties for Japan or Germany. In Japan there were no Soviet troops, and so the Western Powers could make their own peace with that country, leaving it still at war with

the U.S.S.R. (Later the Soviet Union also made peace with Japan and that country was admitted to the UN.) In Germany part of the country is under Soviet control, and that control cannot be lifted except by a peace in which the Soviet Government will join. The Western Powers have made as much peace as they can with the part of Germany not controlled by the Soviets. The Germans find it a poor substitute for freedom and reunion.

These stubborn remains of World War II create problems that threaten world peace—problems such as the Berlin blockade and the disputes about how to unify Germany. These problems concern the UN, although in theory it was not intended that the UN should take an interest in the defeated countries until peace had been signed. The UN Assembly does not hesitate to urge the Powers to hasten the final peace treaties. In time its constant moral pressure may be the force that overcomes the last obstacles to the final ending of the war.

Too Many Vetoes

The second disappointment in the peace machinery has been the frequent use of the veto by the Soviet representative in the Security Council. At San Francisco, the Great Powers all agreed in insisting on the right of veto. None of them wanted to be committed without its own consent to fighting a war even to enforce peace. They went further. They also agreed that the right of veto in the Council should apply to everything except procedural questions. The theory advanced by the Great Powers in support of such sweeping rights of veto was that once the Security Council takes jurisdiction over any international dispute, even in an effort to reach a peaceful settlement, a chain of events is set in motion that may end with military enforcement action. They made one exception. This was the proviso that if one of them were a party to a dispute, it must abstain from voting while the Council tries to reach a peaceful settlement.

The veto in this form was accepted with a good deal of reluctance by the smaller countries. Unfortunately there are many cases where the veto can be used that do not fit the arguments for it that were advanced at San Francisco. For example, most of the vetoes cast by the Soviet Union have been against the admission of various countries to membership in the United Nations. In some other deci-

sions, the Soviet delegate has voted "No" to a proposal that happened not to conform to the Soviet line of policy.

On the other hand, the Soviet veto of various disarmament proposals, although it has been distressing to the other members, is not necessarily an abuse of the veto power. Any disarmament treaty, to be effective, must be willingly and loyally accepted by all the Great Powers. If the terms of a proposed treaty are not acceptable to any Power, it can of course prevent that treaty by merely refusing to sign. The veto, therefore, is no more than notification of the plain fact that the proposals are not unanimously accepted. This may be an unpleasant fact, but the veto is not what makes it so.

In the Assembly the smaller nations, who naturally resent the veto power, have a majority of the votes, and the Assembly has voted from time to time to admonish the Powers about their use of the veto. It is hard to see how anything more effective for changing the use of the veto could be found. There is no force on earth capable of making a Power give up what it regards as its legal rights, unless it may be the force of world opinion.

There are, of course, many people who would like to see the Charter amended so as to restrict or abolish the veto power. The Charter cannot be amended according to its own terms except with the concurrence of the Big Five—that is, any amendment can be vetoed. This also has reason, for if the smaller nations could unite to change the Charter over the objections of any Great Power, that Power would be likely to resign, and for practical purposes there would be no United Nations. Here, also, the veto represents the unpleasant difference between the real world and a much more orderly but imaginary one.

Propaganda

Once the fundamental decision was taken to set up a world-wide organization, another unpleasant consequence necessarily followed. In the UN there has to be free speech. Everyone who belongs has a right to say whatever he wants to say, right or wrong, honest or dishonest. That is, the UN can be used by adversaries as a platform for their propaganda. Their opponents sometimes feel that if only they could be thrown out how it would clear the air! No more big lies, no more campaigns of hate and vilification. Peace and quiet would settle over the Council and

the Assembly. But it would be the same kind of peace and quiet that we find in the inner councils of a nation at war, where the enemies are outside and only friends are inside.

It is not a black mark against the United Nations that in its halls the most flimsy arguments and the most subtle deceptions can be laid before the meeting and solemnly put into the official record. This is one of the principal advantages of the UN. If there is any nation in the world that is putting out dishonest propaganda, the place where that propaganda is most likely to be poisonous is in private arguments, among ignorant or ill-balanced people. It has little chance of deceiving UN delegates, who have heard all sides many times over.

On the contrary, in the UN, if there is any dishonest propaganda afloat, the author of it must bring it in under the withering inspection of men of all nations and religions, including his own allies. Or if he tries to hide anything, his opponents will drag it in. The fearful heat of world moral judgment is proved by the desperate efforts of those who are in the wrong to defend themselves by arguments which they hope will cover them.

No Great Power would dare to state its sovereign will in the United Nations Assembly and then sit tight and wait for the lesser nations to cringe before it. No matter how arrogant a Power may be in its actions, it has to talk. The smaller nations do not cringe. They rise and say what they think.

So long as men can do wrong and tell lies, one of the greatest values of a market place of opinion is that such men are on view in the market. In the long run, open disagreements openly arrived at are more likely to be settled according to the moral judgment of mankind than secret plottings covered by a veil of silence.

World Government?

The question is often raised whether the UN is a sort of baby world government that in time will grow up to rule the nations with a world system of law, a world police, and a world income tax. Those who are impatient to see a world government criticize the UN for failing to be one or to show signs of growing into one.

Those who fear the thought of a world government criticize the UN for being the entering camel's head in the

door of the tent that in time will be followed by the whole beast.

Any positive statement on this question has to be hedged around with qualifications because the meanings of the necessary words can be easily misinterpreted. What, for instance, is a government? If you consider a city government, a provincial or state government, and a national government, they are plainly not the same thing, especially in their relation to that final authority called "sovereignty." In the United States, for instance, the final authority to use force against the citizen—that is, the police power—rests in some cases with the state and in others with the federal government. It is not a simple matter to picture what a world government would be like if there were to be one.

Another fact that needs to be considered is that in the long run all governments that are freely set up by the people "depend on the consent of the governed." The UN was not designed to pave the way for any dictator to conquer the world. If any world government should grow up under the benevolent auspices of the UN, it would depend on the consent of the people of the world. So far as anyone can see now, the people of the world are not prepared to give the UN or any other authority enough powers to add up to a recognizable federal government of the world.

During the Suez and Hungarian crises of 1956-57 there was some criticism of the UN on the ground that it had a "double standard" of judgment, since it procured the withdrawal of the Israeli, French, and British troops from Egypt but did not get the Soviet troops out of Hungary. This criticism may have been based upon an unspoken and perhaps unconscious assumption that the UN ought to act like a world government—judging the nations under world law and forcing them to obey the law. That is not what the UN is for, and the people of the world have given it no such authority.

The UN applied a single standard of moral judgment in its requests and recommendations on the Suez situation and on Hungary. It expressed the moral judgment of the majority of the nations, but it had not been given the legal right or the power to force anyone to obey. The Soviet Government refused to comply with the UN requests, and the only penalty was the condemnation expressed in the Report on Hungary as accepted by the Assembly.

The fact that the UN is not authorized to make war on

the Soviet Union in Hungary's behalf reflects, as the Secretary-General declared in his annual report, "the profound will of the peoples of the world to avoid a general war." It is much easier for private persons to call for "enforcement" of what they are sure is right than for the responsible leaders of the nations to find a path through the minefields of the world with some hope of avoiding total disaster.

The peoples of the world are not prepared to give any central world authority the final sovereign powers that characterize a federal nation like the United States—such as the final power to tax the citizen, to punish citizens for crimes, to draft them for the World Army, and to control the rules of trade regardless of the desires of the nations. In general, they are not ready to let any central legislature make international law without the consent of the nations.

If the world's peoples should ever be ready for such a federal government, it would be when they have decided that the conflicts among peoples, classes, races and religions are no harder to compromise than they are in a federal government such as the United States. That will be a long time, if ever.

But there are some parts of the relations among sovereign states that can be administered by a world authority with the consent of each nation that accepts the authority. For instance, everyone recognizes that the mails must be carried between countries under rules established for the world. The Universal Postal Union was the first world authority to be set up, and all civilized nations have to belong to it. Equally good reasons have led to the creation of the other specialized agencies governing the relations of their members along certain lines of action.

These organizations are voluntary arrangements, and are not imposed on unwilling countries by any supergovernment. The nations organize certain activities in order to prevent confusion and prohibitive costs of doing business. The specialized agencies are useful in themselves and they also are useful in bringing even unfriendly nations to sit together for a practical purpose.

The same general principle applies to international law, as it is called. The United Nations cannot pass an international law binding on any nation without its specific assent, except in the rare case where the Security Council, with all the permanent members consenting, can order a pair of smaller nations to stop fighting and start talking. The As-

sembly can pass a resolution advising the nations what to do, but if the nations refuse, the only punishment is a resolution of the Assembly condemning their refusal. This moral power is a strong power but it is not law.

The UN can cause international law to be created by the free consent of the nations in at least two ways.

The Conventions that the UN offers to the nations become international law for all the nations that ratify them. A treaty is a piece of international law, enforced not by any international police but by the moral penalties of dishonor that fall on treaty-breakers. The day of 100 per cent obedience to international law by all the nations may be as far off as the day when all men honor their personal promises, but there is nevertheless a moral penalty for broken faith that is not to be despised.

In another way the United Nations can be said to sponsor the making of law. In the International Court of Justice, those nations that voluntarily submit themselves to the Court can be judged like the citizens of any sovereign state. If a nation is accused by another nation or by the UN of violating its treaty obligations, the Court may judge not only the facts but the interpretation of the treaty, and its interpretation will then be the law.

Is this then the subtle beginning of a world government that will take away the sovereignty of the free nations? The question sounds ominous, but in fact it has no immediate meaning. What instruments of agreement the nations freely decide to adopt among themselves are surely within the sovereign power of each nation that chooses to join. The moral obligation to honor promises freely made is no tyranny. If the obligation of honor is imposed by any Power higher than the nations, that Authority is not one that God-fearing men dare resent. And back of that moral Authority is the hard fact that peaceful agreement and co-operation are the way of life, in a world where the Last Judgment is more than likely to happen soon, and a way of life is desperately wanted.

Who Can Belong?

The question of admitting new members to the United Nations is not so much a legal matter of interpretation of the Charter as a question of what sort of institution the United Nations is intended to be.

When the Charter was written in 1945, the obligation

of the members to work sincerely for peace was emphasized. Surely all peoples want peace, and all nations worthy of membership in the new league for peace must be peace-loving. The defeated Axis Powers, of course, were to be suitably re-educated and purified, until they too became peace-loving and fit to join with the decent nations. Everyone knew there would be quarrels, but it seemed reasonable to say in Article 4 of the Charter that membership is open to all other "peace-loving" states if they accept the obligations of the Charter and in the judgment of the Organization are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

Before the Charter was signed a question arose about the Ukraine and Byelorussia, which to the rest of the world appeared to be not free states able to accept any obligations to the UN but mere provinces of the Soviet Union subject to the federal government in Moscow. To the Soviet delegates, on the other hand, it seemed plain enough that Canada, Australia, and the other Dominions would be under the orders of the British Government, and that all the Latin American states were mere satellites of the United States that would have to vote as ordered by Washington. These suppositions may not have all been true, but they had to be taken into account, and so the original members included some that in the judgment of most of the Organization were hardly "able and willing" to carry out the obligations of free Charter members.

During the first ten years, however, only nine additional countries were added to the original fifty-one Charter members. No state can be admitted without the "recommendation" of the Security Council. The Soviet delegate vetoed all applicants that were in any way objectionable to his country, such as the Republic of Korea, Libya, Italy, and Japan. The majority of the Council turned down all those that it regarded as under Soviet control, such as Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria.

In 1946 the United States suggested a compromise by which the candidates of both factions would be admitted, but the Soviets refused. Later the Soviets wanted a "package deal," and the Western nations refused. Finally in 1955 it was arranged, and sixteen nations were admitted at one time. Later additions brought the total membership to eighty-two in 1957. Still excluded by Soviet objections were South Viet Nam and the ROK, and by Western objections North Viet Nam, North Korea, and Outer Mongolia, as well as Communist China.

The repeated Soviet effort to get the UN to seat Communist China has aroused a specially violent controversy. On one side are those who feel that so long as China is at war with the UN in Korea, subject only to a truce which it is seriously accused of violating, it is not eligible to representation. United States opinion has been strongly expressed against seating Communist China, at least until the government shows a more peaceful disposition. On the other side are the nations that believe China would be more peaceful inside the UN trying to argue its policies in the Assembly than outside "trying to shoot its way in." India is a conspicuous leader on this side of the argument.

There is wide agreement that in the long run the UN ought to include all the independent nations of the world. But how many shortcomings to overlook for the sake of universal membership will long be a matter of dispute. In view of the fact that most nations have some faults in their UN behavior, and that no nation however proudly sovereign is absolutely independent, the arguments are bound to contain much cloudy judgment about where to draw the line. There is, however, no doubt that the central philosophy of the UN, accepted by all the members, includes the belief that some day its membership should include every nation on earth.

One Member, One Vote

The Assembly of the United Nations, where every member state has one vote, is analogous to the Senate of the United States, in which the states, large and small, have an equal voice. Is this democratic?

The democracy of the United Nations, like that of the United States, is affected by the peculiarity of having to take account of the rights of large and small states as well as the rights of people. The UN is in the main a democracy of nations, not of individual human beings. In a rough way there is a touch of popular democracy in the Council, where the veto gives the biggest nations—at least in a military sense as of 1945—a bigger voice than the smaller ones. There have been proposals that the Charter should be amended to "weight" the votes of the members in the Assembly according to their population, but it is not clear how to draw an acceptable amendment.

In the Assembly, where most of the vitality of the UN has become concentrated, Costa Rica and Lebanon have

as many votes as the United Kingdom and the United States. This is not democratic in the sense of giving every human being equal voting weight in the Assembly.

If the Assembly were a legislature with power to make laws binding on the nations, the strong nations would of course not consent to be members, any more than the big states of the United States would consent to be governed by the U.S. Senate alone, without the balancing force of the House of Representatives where they are represented in proportion to their population. But the UN Assembly was not set up to make world law. It is an organization set up to discuss world affairs and express as nearly as possible the moral judgments of the world. Voting is a part of this expression but not the chief part. The moral force in the Assembly, by which it can hurt a nation that is doing wrong and help one that is doing right, depends in the last analysis not on the final vote alone but even more on what was said, who said it, and what the people of the world think of the arguments put forward and of the parts played by the nations concerned.

Necessarily a strong nation has a greater weight in the arguments than its one vote would seem to indicate, since its actions and intentions are of greater weight in the making of world events. Moreover it is evident that in the UN the members often vote in groups, either following a strong nation that represents the position they favor, or uniting behind some regional or political interest that they have in common. These groupings and evidences of leadership are not invariable except in the Soviet bloc; they normally shift according to the question at issue. In fact, the moral effect of the Assembly's action depends partly on what groupings have been shown in the voting and in the discussion.

With the addition of numerous Asian and African states since 1954, there has been some uneasiness lest an "Afro-Asian bloc" should take to voting against the West, because of resentments brought down from the heyday of colonialism. The record in 1957, however, showed no sign of such bloc voting. For instance, in the Assembly vote on admitting Communist China, 10 African and Asian states voted with the United States, 10 against, and 6 abstained. On condemnation of Soviet acts in Hungary, 15 voted with the United States, none against, and 11 abstained. Apparently, when the Western nations are surely right they will draw strong support in Asia and Africa; on

a more doubtful question they will find the vote normally divided.

It should be clear that there is more in making and applying the judgment of mankind than can be registered by giving either every nation or every individual an equal vote. It may also be worth noting that for the making of peace, the moral position of the small nations is on the face of it better than that of the Great Powers. No one can wreck the world except some Great Power. No little nation, however belligerent, can start a world war if the Great Powers refuse to join. The responsibility for peace therefore rests entirely on the strongest nations, and the pure desire not to be destroyed in other people's quarrels rests in its most undiluted form among the small nations.

It is more than a mere accident that in the United Nations, where men from all sorts of countries meet to discuss human affairs, the small countries so often contribute statesmen of a much greater relative importance than the size of their country. Great men can occur anywhere, in a big or a little country, but they cannot be seen in their full size except on a world stage. The UN provides that stage, and so brings to the help of hard-pressed humanity men who would otherwise have little chance to become known.

The Great Revolutions

The United Nations is not the cause of the great revolutions that are going on at present, though it may well be the ship that will carry the human race alive through the troubled waters. The world is going through at least three different waves of progress at the same time. There have also been waves of backwash toward savagery.

The oldest wave of progress is the anticolonial revolution, now nearing its end. The vast majority of the peoples who came under foreign domination in the four hundred years after the discovery of America are now independent nations, and nearly all the rest are being groomed for independence. The fact that India, Indonesia, and Pakistan are members of the UN does much to give their new governments confidence and dignity, abroad and at home.

The disturbances caused by the anticolonial revolution have not yet calmed down. There are still resentments among those who were recently under foreign rule as well as among the 170 million who have not yet become self-

governing. These resentments appear in the UN disputes over the treatment of dependent territories.

The next oldest world revolution is the outburst of scientific knowledge and invention that began seriously to transform human society in the Western world during the nineteenth century. This revolution has opened a magical world of rapidly expanding production. There are limits to this expansion but they are not easily understood by millions of hungry people who never before had any hope of escape from lifelong misery. The knowledge of the magic of science has called forth an insistent demand for a share in this magic. The strains that come from impatience cannot be avoided. Impatient people may grasp at false promises and be led into new slavery in search of the bright vision of enough to eat.

The dark sides of the scientific revolution are also to be taken into account. Science has almost no moral principles. It will serve a Hitler almost as well as it will serve a free democracy, enough to create terrible dangers. And science has given us the atom and a hilltop view of the end of the world.

Another ominous aspect of scientific progress is that science will not only serve fairly well an intelligent dictator; it will also undermine any government that is unduly influenced by a selfish and corrupt ruling class. Factories can be built in such a country, and enough progress can be made to stimulate the expectations of the people. But if the government is too weak to collect heavy income taxes and to reform an oppressive landholding system, business and industry cannot prosper. Such countries are frequently in danger of revolution and dictatorship. A dictator can at least promise to "make the trains run on time." But thereafter may follow political tyranny and unrest.

Technical assistance to countries of all sorts will produce results of different kinds. In the long run it is a hard fact that successful use of science to raise the standard of living depends on honest and intelligent management both of industry and of politics. While some nations go on to illustrate this hard fact by racking internal disorders, it is well to have the UN holding up a moral standard for mankind. And that brings us to the third revolution that is sweeping the world.

The third revolution is closely related to the other two. It is the growing demand of oppressed peoples for justice

and for democracy in government. In past ages millions of human beings took what came and never dreamed of any escape from whatever masters fate had set over them. That is not so true today. The change from foreign rule to independence has taught men that their foreign masters were not permanent. They think that perhaps their home-grown landlords and money-lenders may also be subject to overthrow. And the coming of the scientific revolution has forced the process of "fundamental education." People who never before knew of any life beyond their village are learning to read and are listening to the radio in the village square. Those who sat in darkness are beginning to see a light, and they will not be quiet. In their own lives are unhappy experiences that they have long resented without hope of escape. Now they have names for wrongs, and angers that call for rights. They want some voice in choosing their governments and in consenting to the laws that will define their rights. This change also disturbs the waters where humanity must navigate.

There are bound to be true prophets and false prophets; true roads toward freedom and false trails leading into slavery. There is progress toward the real future of useful science, political democracy and decent human relations, and there are misguided doctrines that lead to tyranny and cruelty. All these rolling seas of hope and fear are part of the great discoveries and hopes of humanity. They may be more than all the resources of human wisdom and good will can master. Our race, and with it all living things on earth, may be doomed to die for our failure to control the fearful forces that we have uncovered. But the Atomic Age has gone on year after year without the sound of the last trumpet, while in the committee rooms of the United Nations men struggle and search for the way to chain the deadly forces and stave off the doom. Every year, while the instruments of destruction grow more deadly, the knowledge of the danger and the determination to avoid it take a sterner hold upon all the governments of the world.

If there is any hope of avoiding the end of the world, and if there is any way that the human race can ride out the great revolutions of our days and live, those ways are most likely to be found in the slow, painful, but determined labors of the United Nations of the world.

APPENDIX A

I. PRINCIPAL ORGANS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1. THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Main Committees

- First Committee—Political and Security (including the regulation of armaments)
- Special Political Committee (to assist the First Committee)
- Second Committee—Economic and Financial
- Third Committee—Social, Humanitarian and Cultural
- Fourth Committee—Trusteeship (including Non-Self-Governing Territories)
- Fifth Committee—Administrative and Budgetary
- Sixth Committee—Legal

Procedural Committees

- General Committee
- Credentials Committee

Standing Committees

- Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions
- Committee on Contributions

Subsidiary and Ad Hoc Bodies

- Interim Committee of the General Assembly
- United Nations Emergency Force
- Advisory Committee on the UNEF
- Committee on the Financing of the UNEF
- Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary
- Disarmament Commission
- Subcommittee on Disarmament
- Panel for Inquiry and Conciliation
- Advisory Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy
- Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation
- Peace Observation Commission
- Balkan Subcommission
- Collective Measures Committee
- Panel of Military Experts

United Nations Commission to Investigate Conditions
for Free Elections in Germany
United Nations Commission for the Unification and
Rehabilitation of Korea
United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency
United Nations Conciliation Commission for Palestine
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine
Refugees in the Near East
Negotiating Committee for Extra-Budgetary Funds
United Nations Good Offices Commission (on the ques-
tion of the treatment of people of Indian origin
in the Union of South Africa)
Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for
Refugees
Ad Hoc Committee on a Special United Nations Fund
for Economic Development
Ad Hoc Commission on Prisoners of War
United Nations Advisory Council for Somaliland
Good Offices Committee on South West Africa
Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing
Territories
Subcommittee on the Revision of the Questionnaire
(relating to Trust Territories)
Committee on Applications for Review of Administrative
Tribunal Judgments
Advisory Committee for the United Nations Memorial
Cemetery in Korea
Board of Auditors
United Nations Administrative Tribunal
United Nations Staff Pension Committee
Investments Committee
International Law Commission
Committee on Arrangements for a Conference for the
Purpose of Reviewing the Charter
Special Committee on Defining Aggression

2. THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Military Staff Committee
Disarmament Commission
Collective Measures Committee

Standing Committees

Committee of Experts
Committee on the Admission of New Members

3. THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

Functional Commissions and Sub-Commissions

Transport and Communications Commission

Statistical Commission

Population Commission

Social Commission

Commission on Human Rights

Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination
and Protection of Minorities

Commission on the Status of Women

Commission on Narcotic Drugs

Commission on International Commodity Trade

Regional Economic Commissions

Economic Commission for Europe

Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East

Economic Commission for Latin America

Standing Committees

Technical Assistance Committee of the Council

Committee on Negotiations with Inter-Governmental
Agencies

Council Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations

Interim Committee on Programme of Conferences

Special Bodies

Permanent Central Opium Board

Drug Supervisory Body

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

Administrative Committee on Coordination

Interim Coordinating Committee for International
Commodity Arrangements

Technical Assistance Board

Commission on International Commodity Trade

4. THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

Standing Committees

Standing Committee on Administrative Unions

Standing Committee on Petitions

5. THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

6. THE SECRETARIAT

Secretary-General

Executive Office of the Secretary-General

Office of Legal Affairs

Office of the Controller

Office of Personnel

Office of Under-Secretaries without Department
Department of Political and Security Council Affairs
Department of Economic and Social Affairs
Department of Trusteeship and Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories
Department of Public Information
Department of Conference Services
Office of General Services
Technical Assistance Administration

II. SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AFFILIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

International Labor Organization (ILO)
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Bank)
International Finance Corporation (IFC)
International Monetary Fund (Fund)
World Health Organization (WHO)
Universal Postal Union (UPU)
International Telecommunication Union (ITU)
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

Two other proposed agencies had not at the end of 1957 been ratified by the number of states necessary for their establishment. They were:

Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO)
International Trade Organization (ITO)

The main objectives of ITO, however, have been embodied in an international commercial treaty known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). A permanent Organization for Trade Cooperation (OTC) to administer GATT has been provided for, to come into being when it has been accepted by countries accounting for a high proportion of world trade.

APPENDIX B

CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

SIGNED AT THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE
ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION,
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, ON JUNE 26, 1945.

WE, THE PEOPLES OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DETERMINED

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

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

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

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

AND FOR THESE ENDS

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

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

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

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

HAVE RESOLVED TO COMBINE OUR EFFORTS TO ACCOMPLISH THESE AIMS.

Accordingly, our respective Governments, through representatives assembled in the city of San Francisco, who have exhibited their full powers found to be in good and due form, have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

CHAPTER I

PURPOSES AND PRINCIPLES

Article 1

The Purposes of the United Nations are:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;

3. To achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

4. To be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends.

Article 2

The Organization and its Members, in pursuit of the Purposes stated in Article 1, shall act in accordance with the following Principles.

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members.

2. All Members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights and benefits resulting from membership, shall fulfil in good faith the obligations assumed by them in accordance with the present Charter.

3. All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

5. All Members shall give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter, and shall refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations is taking preventive or enforcement action.

6. The Organization shall ensure that states which are not Members of the United Nations act in accordance with these Principles so far as may be necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security.

7. Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII.

CHAPTER II

MEMBERSHIP

Article 3

The original Members of the United Nations shall be the states which, having participated in the United Nations Conference on International Organization at San Francisco, or having previously signed the Declaration by United Nations of January 1, 1942, sign the present Charter and ratify it in accordance with Article 110.

Article 4

1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

2. The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Article 5

A Member of the United Nations against which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the rec-

ommendation of the Security Council. The exercise of these rights and privileges may be restored by the Security Council.

Article 6

A member of the United Nations which has persistently violated the Principles contained in the present Charter may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

CHAPTER III

ORGANS

Article 7

1. There are established as the principal organs of the United Nations: a General Assembly, a Security Council, an Economic and Social Council, a Trusteeship Council, an International Court of Justice, and a Secretariat.

2. Such subsidiary organs as may be found necessary may be established in accordance with the present Charter.

Article 8

The United Nations shall place no restrictions on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in its principal and subsidiary organs.

CHAPTER IV

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Composition

Article 9

1. The General Assembly shall consist of all the Members of the United Nations.

2. Each Member shall have not more than five representatives in the General Assembly.

Functions and Powers

Article 10

The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the

present Charter, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations to the Members of the United Nations or to the Security Council or to both on any such questions or matters.

Article 11

1. The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both.

2. The General Assembly may discuss any question relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council, or by a state which is not a Member of the United Nations in accordance with Article 35, paragraph 2, and, except as provided in Article 12, may make recommendations with regard to any such questions to the state or states concerned or to the Security Council or to both. Any such question on which action is necessary shall be referred to the Security Council by the General Assembly either before or after discussion.

3. The General Assembly may call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security.

4. The powers of the General Assembly set forth in this Article shall not limit the general scope of Article 10.

Article 12

1. While the Security Council is exercising in respect of any dispute or situation the functions assigned to it in the present Charter, the General Assembly shall not make any recommendation with regard to that dispute or situation unless the Security Council so requests.

2. The Secretary-General, with the consent of the Security Council, shall notify the General Assembly at each session of any matters relative to the maintenance of international peace and security which are being dealt with by the Security Council and shall similarly notify the General Assembly, or the Members of the United Nations if the General Assembly is not in session, immediately the Security Council ceases to deal with such matters.

Article 13

1. The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of:

a. promoting international cooperation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification;

b. promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, and assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

2. The further responsibilities, functions and powers of the General Assembly with respect to matters mentioned in paragraph 1 (b) above are set forth in Chapters IX and X.

Article 14

Subject to the provisions of Article 12, the General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

Article 15

1. The General Assembly shall receive and consider annual and special reports from the Security Council; these reports shall include an account of the measures that the Security Council has decided upon or taken to maintain international peace and security.

2. The General Assembly shall receive and consider reports from the other organs of the United Nations.

Article 16

The General Assembly shall perform such functions with respect to the international trusteeship system as are assigned to it under Chapters XII and XIII, including the approval of the trusteeship agreements for areas not designated as strategic.

Article 17

1. The General Assembly shall consider and approve the budget of the Organization.

2. The expenses of the Organization shall be borne by the Members as apportioned by the General Assembly.

3. The General Assembly shall consider and approve any financial and budgetary arrangements with specialized agencies referred to in Article 57 and shall examine the administrative budgets of such specialized agencies with a view to making recommendations to the agencies concerned.

*Voting**Article 18*

1. Each member of the General Assembly shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. These questions shall include: recommendations with respect to the maintenance of international peace and security, the election of the non-permanent members of the Security Council, the election of the members of the Economic and Social Council, the election of members of the Trusteeship Council in accordance with paragraph 1 (c) of Article 86, the admission of new Members to the United Nations, the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership, the expulsion of Members, questions relating to the operation of the trusteeship system, and budgetary questions.

3. Decisions on other questions, including the determination of additional categories of questions to be decided by a two-thirds majority, shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Article 19

A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contributions to the Organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of the contributions due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless, permit such a Member to vote if

it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the Member.

Procedure

Article 20

The General Assembly shall meet in regular annual sessions and in such special sessions as occasion may require. Special sessions shall be convoked by the Secretary-General at the request of the Security Council or of a majority of the Members of the United Nations.

Article 21

The General Assembly shall adopt its own rules of procedure. It shall elect its President for each session.

Article 22

The General Assembly may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

CHAPTER V

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Composition

Article 23

1. The Security Council shall consist of eleven Members of the United Nations. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America shall be permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect six other Members of the United Nations to be non-permanent members of the Security Council, due regard being specially paid, in the first instance to the contribution of Members of the United Nations to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the Organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

2. The non-permanent members of the Security Council shall be elected for a term of two years. In the first election of the non-permanent members, however, three shall be

chosen for a term of one year. A retiring member shall not be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. Each member of the Security Council shall have one representative.

Functions and Powers

Article 24

1. In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its Members confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf.

2. In discharging these duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations. The specific powers granted to the Security Council for the discharge of these duties are laid down in Chapters VI, VII, VIII, and XII.

3. The Security Council shall submit annual and, when necessary, special reports to the General Assembly for its consideration.

Article 25

The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.

Article 26

In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Article 47, plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments.

Voting

Article 27

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members.

3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of seven members, in-

cluding the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.

Procedure

Article 28

1. The Security Council shall be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Each member of the Security Council shall for this purpose be represented at all times at the seat of the Organization.

2. The Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which each of its members may, if it so desires, be represented by a member of the government or by some other specially designated representative.

3. The Security Council may hold meetings at such places other than the seat of the Organization as in its judgment will best facilitate its work.

Article 29

The Security Council may establish such subsidiary organs as it deems necessary for the performance of its functions.

Article 30

The Security Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

Article 31

Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council may participate, without vote, in the discussion of any question brought before the Security Council whenever the latter considers that the interests of that Member are specially affected.

Article 32

Any Member of the United Nations which is not a member of the Security Council or any state which is not a Member of the United Nations, if it is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute. The Security Council shall lay down such conditions as it deems just for the participation of a state which is not a Member of the United Nations.

CHAPTER VI

PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Article 33

1. The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Article 34

The Security Council may investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 35

1. Any Member of the United Nations may bring any dispute, or any situation of the nature referred to in Article 34, to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may bring to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly any dispute to which it is a party if it accepts in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of pacific settlement provided in the present Charter.

3. The proceedings of the General Assembly in respect of matters brought to its attention under this Article will be subject to the provisions of Articles 11 and 12.

Article 36

1. The Security Council may, at any stage of a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 or of a situation of like nature, recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment.

2. The Security Council should take into consideration any procedures for the settlement of the dispute which have already been adopted by the parties.

3. In making recommendations under this Article the Security Council should also take into consideration that legal disputes should as a general rule be referred by the parties to the International Court of Justice in accordance with the provisions of the Statute of the Court.

Article 37

1. Should the parties to a dispute of the nature referred to in Article 33 fail to settle it by the means indicated in that Article, they shall refer it to the Security Council.

2. If the Security Council deems that the continuance of the dispute is in fact likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, it shall decide whether to take action under Article 36 or to recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate.

Article 38

Without prejudice to the provisions of Articles 33 to 37, the Security Council may, if all the parties to any dispute so request, make recommendations to the parties with a view to a pacific settlement of the dispute.

CHAPTER VII

ACTION WITH RESPECT TO THREATS TO THE PEACE, BREACHES OF THE PEACE, AND ACTS OF AGGRESSION

Article 39

The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security.

Article 40

In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making the recommendations or deciding upon the measures provided for in Article 39, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. Such provisional measures shall be without prejudice to the rights, claims, or position of the parties concerned. The Security Council shall duly take account of failure to comply with such provisional measures.

Article 41

The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and it may call upon the Members of the United Nations to apply such measures. These may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations.

Article 42

Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockade, and other operations by air, sea, or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

Article 43

1. All Members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members or between the Security Council and groups of Members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Article 44

When the Security Council has decided to use force it shall, before calling upon a Member not represented on it to

provide armed forces in fulfilment of the obligations assumed under Article 43, invite that Member, if the Member so desires, to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces.

Article 45

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, Members shall hold immediately available national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in Article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 46

Plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 47

1. There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

2. The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives. Any Member of the United Nations not permanently represented on the Committee shall be invited by the Committee to be associated with it when the efficient discharge of the Committee's responsibilities requires the participation of that Member in its work.

3. The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible under the Security Council for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council. Questions relating to the command of such forces shall be worked out subsequently.

4. The Military Staff Committee, with the authorization of the Security Council and after consultation with appropriate regional agencies, may establish regional subcommittees.

Article 48

1. The action required to carry out the decisions of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security shall be taken by all the Members of the United Nations or by some of them, as the Security Council may determine.

2. Such decisions shall be carried out by the Members of the United Nations directly and through their action in the appropriate international agencies of which they are members.

Article 49

The Members of the United Nations shall join in affording mutual assistance in carrying out the measures decided upon by the Security Council.

Article 50

If preventive or enforcement measures against any state are taken by the Security Council, any other state, whether a Member of the United Nations or not, which finds itself confronted with special economic problems arising from the carrying out of those measures shall have the right to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Article 51

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Measures taken by Members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council and shall not in any way affect the authority and responsibility of the Security Council under the present Charter to take at any time such action as it deems necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

CHAPTER VIII
REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Article 52

1. Nothing in the present Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations.

2. The Members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

3. The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

4. This Article in no way impairs the application of Articles 34 and 35.

Article 53

1. The Security Council shall, where appropriate, utilize such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state, as defined in paragraph 2 of this Article, provided for pursuant to Article 107 or in regional arrangements directed against renewal of aggressive policy on the part of any such state, until such time as the Organization may, on request of the Governments concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.

2. The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter.

Article 54

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements or by regional agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

CHAPTER IX

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL
COOPERATION*Article 55*

With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:

- a. higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;
- b. solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and
- c. universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Article 56

All Members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization for the achievement of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

Article 57

1. The various specialized agencies, established by inter-governmental agreement and having wide international responsibilities, as defined in their basic instruments, in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields, shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations in accordance with the provisions of Article 63.

2. Such agencies thus brought into relationship with the United Nations are hereinafter referred to as specialized agencies.

Article 58

The Organization shall make recommendations for the co-ordination of the policies and activities of the specialized agencies.

Article 59

The Organization shall, where appropriate, initiate negotiations among the states concerned for the creation of any new specialized agencies required for the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in Article 55.

Article 60

Responsibility for the discharge of the functions of the Organization set forth in this Chapter shall be vested in the General Assembly and, under the authority of the General Assembly, in the Economic and Social Council, which shall have for this purpose the powers set forth in Chapter X.

CHAPTER X

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

*Composition**Article 61*

1. The Economic and Social Council shall consist of eighteen Members of the United Nations elected by the General Assembly.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3, six members of the Economic and Social Council shall be elected each year for a term of three years. A retiring member shall be eligible for immediate re-election.

3. At the first election, eighteen members of the Economic and Social Council shall be chosen. The term of office of six members so chosen shall expire at the end of one year, and of six other members at the end of two years, in accordance with arrangements made by the General Assembly.

4. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one representative.

*Functions and Powers**Article 62*

1. The Economic and Social Council may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations with respect to any such matters to the General Assembly, to the Members of the United Nations, and to the specialized agencies concerned.

2. It may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

3. It may prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly, with respect to matters falling within its competence.

4. It may call, in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international conferences on matters falling within its competence.

Article 63

1. The Economic and Social Council may enter into agreements with any of the agencies referred to in Article 57, defining the terms on which the agency concerned shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations. Such agreements shall be subject to approval by the General Assembly.

2. It may coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies through consultation with and recommendations to such agencies and through recommendations to the General Assembly and to the Members of the United Nations.

Article 64

1. The Economic and Social Council may take appropriate steps to obtain regular reports from the specialized agencies. It may make arrangements with the Members of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies to obtain reports on the steps taken to give effect to its own recommendations and to recommendations on matters falling within its competence made by the General Assembly.

2. It may communicate its observations on these reports to the General Assembly.

Article 65

The Economic and Social Council may furnish information to the Security Council and shall assist the Security Council upon its request.

Article 66

1. The Economic and Social Council shall perform such functions as fall within its competence in connection with the carrying out of the recommendations of the General Assembly.

2. It may, with the approval of the General Assembly, perform services at the request of Members of the United Nations and at the request of specialized agencies.

3. It shall perform such other functions as are specified elsewhere in the present Charter or as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.

*Voting**Article 67*

1. Each member of the Economic and Social Council shall have one vote.

2. Decisions of the Economic and Social Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

*Procedure**Article 68*

The Economic and Social Council shall set up commissions in economic and social fields and for the promotion of human rights, and such other commissions as may be required for the performance of its functions.

Article 69

The Economic and Social Council shall invite any Member of the United Nations to participate, without vote, in its deliberations on any matter of particular concern to that Member.

Article 70

The Economic and Social Council may make arrangements for representatives of the specialized agencies to participate, without vote, in its deliberations and in those of the commissions established by it, and for its representatives to participate in the deliberations of the specialized agencies.

Article 71

The Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence. Such arrangements may be made with international organizations and, where appropriate, with national organizations after consultation with the Member of the United Nations concerned.

Article 72

1. The Economic and Social Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.

2. The Economic and Social Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

CHAPTER XI

DECLARATION REGARDING
NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES*Article 73*

Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount, and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories, and, to this end:

- a. to ensure, with due respect for the culture of the peoples concerned, their political, economic, social, and educational advancement, their just treatment, and their protection against abuses;

b. to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions, according to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and their varying stages of advancement;

c. to further international peace and security;

d. to promote constructive measures of development, to encourage research, and to cooperate with one another and, when and where appropriate, with specialized international bodies with a view to the practical achievement of the social, economic, and scientific purposes set forth in this Article; and

e. to transmit regularly to the Secretary-General for information purposes, subject to such limitation as security and constitutional considerations may require, statistical and other information of a technical nature relating to economic, social, and educational conditions in the territories for which they are respectively responsible other than those territories to which Chapters XII and XIII apply.

Article 74

Members of the United Nations also agree that their policy in respect of the territories to which this Chapter applies, no less than in respect of their metropolitan areas, must be based on the general principle of good-neighborliness, due account being taken of the interests and well-being of the rest of the world, in social, economic, and commercial matters.

CHAPTER XII

INTERNATIONAL TRUSTEESHIP SYSTEM

Article 75

The United Nations shall establish under its authority an international trusteeship system for the administration and supervision of such territories as may be placed thereunder by subsequent individual agreements. These territories are hereinafter referred to as trust territories.

Article 76

The basic objectives of the trusteeship system, in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations laid down in Article 1 of the present Charter, shall be:

a. to further international peace and security;

b. to promote the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the trust territories,

and their progressive development towards self-government or independence as may be appropriate to the particular circumstances of each territory and its peoples and the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned, and as may be provided by the terms of each trusteeship agreement;

c. to encourage respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, and to encourage recognition of the interdependence of the peoples of the world; and

d. to ensure equal treatment in social, economic, and commercial matters for all Members of the United Nations and their nationals, and also equal treatment for the latter in the administration of justice, without prejudice to the attainment of the foregoing objectives and subject to the provisions of Article 80.

Article 77

1. The trusteeship system shall apply to such territories in the following categories as may be placed thereunder by means of trusteeship agreements:

- a. territories now held under mandate;
- b. territories which may be detached from enemy states as a result of the Second World War; and
- c. territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration.

2. It will be a matter for subsequent agreement as to which territories in the foregoing categories will be brought under the trusteeship system and upon what terms.

Article 78

The trusteeship system shall not apply to territories which have become Members of the United Nations, relationship among which shall be based on respect for the principle of sovereign equality.

Article 79

The terms of trusteeship for each territory to be placed under the trusteeship system, including any alteration or amendment, shall be agreed upon by the states directly concerned, including the mandatory power in the case of territories held under mandate by a Member of the United Nations, and shall be approved as provided for in Articles 83 and 85.

Article 80

1. Except as may be agreed upon in individual trusteeship agreements, made under Articles 77, 79, and 81, placing each territory under the trusteeship system, and until such agreements have been concluded, nothing in this Chapter shall be constructed in or of itself to alter in any manner the rights whatsoever of any states or any peoples or the terms of existing international instruments to which Members of the United Nations may respectively be parties.

2. Paragraph 1 of this Article shall not be interpreted as giving grounds for delay or postponement of the negotiation and conclusion of agreements for placing mandated and other territories under the trusteeship system as provided for in Article 77.

Article 81

The trusteeship agreement shall in each case include the terms under which the trust territory will be administered and designate the authority which will exercise the administration of the trust territory. Such authority, hereinafter called the administering authority, may be one or more states or the Organization itself.

Article 82

There may be designated, in any trusteeship agreement, a strategic area or areas which may include part or all of the trust territory to which the agreement applies, without prejudice to any special agreement or agreements made under Article 43.

Article 83

1. All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council.

2. The basic objectives set forth in Article 76 shall be applicable to the people of each strategic area.

3. The Security Council shall, subject to the provisions of the trusteeship agreements and without prejudice to security considerations, avail itself of the assistance of the Trusteeship Council to perform those functions of the United Nations under the trusteeship system relating to political, economic, social, and educational matters in the strategic areas.

Article 84

It shall be the duty of the administering authority to ensure that the trust territory shall play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security. To this end the administering authority may make use of volunteer forces, facilities, and assistance from the trust territory in carrying out the obligations towards the Security Council undertaken in this regard by the administering authority, as well as for local defense and the maintenance of law and order within the trust territory.

Article 85

1. The functions of the United Nations with regard to trusteeship agreements for all areas not designated as strategic, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the General Assembly.

2. The Trusteeship Council, operating under the authority of the General Assembly, shall assist the General Assembly in carrying out these functions.

CHAPTER XIII

THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

*Composition**Article 86*

1. The Trusteeship Council shall consist of the following Members of the United Nations:

- a. those Members administering trust territories;
- b. such of those Members mentioned by name in Article 23 as are not administering trust territories; and
- c. as many other Members elected for three-year terms by the General Assembly as may be necessary to ensure that the total number of members of the Trusteeship Council is equally divided between those Members of the United Nations which administer trust territories and those which do not.

2. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall designate one specially qualified person to represent it therein.

*Functions and Powers**Article 87*

The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Trusteeship Council, in carrying out their functions, may:

- a. consider reports submitted by the administering authority;
- b. accept petitions and examine them in consultation with the administering authority;
- c. provide for periodic visits to the respective trust territories at times agreed upon with the administering authority; and
- d. take these and other actions in conformity with the terms of the trusteeship agreements.

Article 88

The Trusteeship Council shall formulate a questionnaire on the political, economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants of each trust territory, and the administering authority for each trust territory, within the competence of the General Assembly shall make an annual report to the General Assembly upon the basis of such questionnaire.

*Voting**Article 89*

1. Each member of the Trusteeship Council shall have one vote.
2. Decisions of the Trusteeship Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

*Procedure**Article 90*

1. The Trusteeship Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure, including the method of selecting its President.
2. The Trusteeship Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include provision for the convening of meetings on the request of a majority of its members.

Article 91

The Trusteeship Council shall, when appropriate, avail itself of the assistance of the Economic and Social Council and of the specialized agencies in regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned.

CHAPTER XIV

THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Article 92

The International Court of Justice shall be the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. It shall function in accordance with the annexed Statute, which is based upon the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and forms an integral part of the present Charter.

Article 93

1. All Members of the United Nations are *ipso facto* parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

2. A state which is not a Member of the United Nations may become a party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice on conditions to be determined in each case by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

Article 94

1. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to comply with the decision of the International Court of Justice in any case to which it is a party.

2. If any party to a case fails to perform the obligations incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court, the other party may have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment.

Article 95

Nothing in the present Charter shall prevent Members of the United Nations from entrusting the solution of their differences to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

Article 96

1. The General Assembly or the Security Council may request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question.

2. Other organs of the United Nations and specialized agencies, which may at any time be so authorized by the General Assembly, may also request advisory opinions of the Court on legal questions arising within the scope of their activities.

CHAPTER XV

THE SECRETARIAT

Article 97

The Secretariat shall comprise a Secretary-General and such staff as the Organization may require. The Secretary-General shall be appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. He shall be the chief administrative officer of the Organization.

Article 98

The Secretary-General shall act in that capacity in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, of the Economic and Social Council, and of the Trusteeship Council, and shall perform such other functions as are entrusted to him by these organs. The Secretary-General shall make an annual report to the General Assembly on the work of the Organization.

Article 99

The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security.

Article 100

1. In the performance of their duties, the Secretary-General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the Organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their position as international officials responsible only to the Organization.

2. Each Member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary-General and the staff and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Article 101

1. The staff shall be appointed by the Secretary-General under regulations established by the General Assembly.

2. Appropriate staffs shall be permanently assigned to the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, and, as required, to other organs of the United Nations. These staffs shall form a part of the Secretariat.

3. The paramount consideration in the employment of the staff and in the determination of the conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible.

CHAPTER XVI

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 102

1. Every treaty and every international agreement entered into by any Member of the United Nations after the present Charter comes into force shall as soon as possible be registered with the Secretariat and published by it.

2. No party to any such treaty or international agreement which has not been registered in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article may invoke that treaty or agreement before any organ of the United Nations.

Article 103

In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail.

Article 104

The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such legal capacity as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and the fulfilment of its purposes.

Article 105

1. The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each of its Members such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfilment of its purposes.

2. Representatives of the Members of the United Nations and officials of the Organization shall similarly enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the independent exercise of their functions in connection with the Organization.

3. The General Assembly may make recommendations with a view to determining the details of the application of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article or may propose conventions to the Members of the United Nations for this purpose.

CHAPTER XVII

TRANSITIONAL SECURITY ARRANGEMENTS

Article 106

Pending the coming into force of such special agreements referred to in Article 43 as in the opinion of the Security Council enable it to begin the exercise of its responsibilities under Article 42, the parties to the Four-Nation Declaration, signed at Moscow, October 30, 1943, and France, shall, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 5 of that Declaration, consult with one another and as occasion requires with other Members of the United Nations with a view to such joint action on behalf of the Organization as may be necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Article 107

Nothing in the present Charter shall invalidate or preclude action, in relation to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory to the present Charter, taken or authorized as a result of that war by the Governments having responsibility for such action.

CHAPTER XVIII

AMENDMENTS

Article 108

Amendments to the present Charter shall come into force for all Members of the United Nations when they have been adopted by a vote of two thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

Article 109

1. A general conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council. Each Member of the United Nations shall have one vote in the conference.

2. Any alteration of the present Charter recommended by a two-thirds vote of the conference shall take effect when ratified in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two thirds of the Members of the United Nations, including all the permanent members of the Security Council.

3. If such a conference has not been held before the tenth annual session of the General Assembly following the coming into force of the present Charter, the proposal to call such a conference shall be placed on the agenda of that session of the General Assembly, and the conference shall be held if so decided by a majority vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any seven members of the Security Council.

CHAPTER XIX

RATIFICATION AND SIGNATURE

Article 110

1. The present Charter shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

2. The ratifications shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, which shall notify all the signatory states of each deposit as well as the Secretary-General of the Organization when he has been appointed.

3. The present Charter shall come into force upon the deposit of ratifications by the Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, and by a majority of the other signatory states. A protocol of the ratifications deposited shall thereupon be drawn up by the Government of the United States of America, which shall communicate copies thereof to all the signatory states.

4. The states signatory to the present Charter which ratify it after it has come into force will become original Members of the United Nations on the date of the deposit of their respective ratifications.

Article 111

The present Charter, of which the Chinese, French, Russian, English, and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall remain deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof shall be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other signatory states.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the representatives of the Governments of the United Nations have signed the present Charter.

DONE at the city of San Francisco the twenty-sixth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and forty-five.

Note: The Statute of the International Court of Justice is an integral part of the Charter of the United Nations. It has been omitted here, however, since, in a book of this size, space for appended material is limited.

INDEX

- Adenauer, Konrad, 71
 Afghanistan, 20, 55, 56
 Airways, 16
 Albania, 91, 100-101
 Algeria, 99
 American Federation of Labor, 75
 Anglo-Iranian Oil Company, 102-103
 Arabs, 94-98
 Argentina, 51
 Arid Zone Research, 38
 Asiatic Land Tenure and Representation Act, 70
 Aswan Dam, 95
 Atom control, 134 *f.*
 Atomic Energy Commission, 134
 Atoms for Peace, 140-142
 Australia, 72, 73, 79, 91, 124
 Austria, 69
- Bacterial warfare, 137-138
 Bangkok, 57
 Bank, *see* International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
 Baruch, Bernard, 134
 Belgium, 79, 83, 91, 116 *f.*
 Benelux, 120, 122
 Bennett, Dr., 20
 Berg, Paal, 76
 Berlin blockade, 93
 Bernadotte, Countess, 68
 Bernadotte, Count Folke, 94
 Bogotá, 58
 Bolívar, Simón, 125
 Bolivia, 72
 Braille Council, World, 36
 Brazil, 71, 77
 Bretton Woods Conference, 41, 45, 52
 Britain, 45, 79, 80-81, 85, 95, 116 *f.* *See also* United Kingdom
 Bulganin, Nikolai A., 139
 Bulgaria, 72-73, 91
 Bunche, Ralph, 94
 Burma, 17, 20, 21, 78
- Cambodia, 125
 Canada, 45, 89, 117
 Canals, 16
 Ceylon, 28, 73
 Chile, 23, 58, 83
 China, 68, 69, 107 *f.*, 135
 Clark, Mark W., 108
 Collective Measures Committee, 113
 Colombia, 81-82
 Colombo Plan, 25, 28, 45, 125
 Common Market, the, 122-123
 Conference on Natural Resources, 19
 Conference on Trade and Employment, 51
 Copyright Convention, International, 35
 Corfu Channel dispute, 100-101
 Corn, 15
 Council of Europe, the, 119
 Coupons, UNESCO, 37
 Covenants, UN, 63-64
 Cuba, 87
 Culture, 30-40
 Czechoslovakia, 100, 111
- Damodar Valley Corporation, 44
 Declaration of Human Rights, 60-63
 Denmark, 42, 69, 73, 77, 117
 Disarmament, 130-142
 Dixon, Sir Owen, 89
 Dulles, John Foster, 40, 124
- ECAFE, *see* Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East
 ECE, *see* Economic Commission for Europe
 ECLA, *see* Economic Commission for Latin America
 Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), 20, 75, 146
Economic Bulletin for Europe, 59

- Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE), 57
 Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), 58-59
 Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), 58
Economic Survey of Europe, 59
 Education, 30-40
 Egypt, 21, 34, 81, 94-96, 103
 Eisenhower, Dwight D., 40, 138 *f.*, 153
 Employment, right of, 62
 EPU, *see* European Payments Union
 Ethiopia, 16, 111
 Euratom, 122-123
 European Community for Coal and Steel, 121 *f.*
 European Defense Community, 118
 European Investment Bank, 123
 European Payments Union (EPU), 121
 Ewe people, 80-81
 FAO, *see* Food and Agriculture Organization
 Federal Reserve Banks (U.S.), 48
 Finland, 123
 Fish farming, 18
 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), 14, 20-21, 53, 141
 Ford Foundation, 25
 Formosa, 21
 France, 42, 51, 58, 79, 80-81, 85, 93, 95, 98-99, 116 *f.*
 Freedom of information, 64-65
 Fulbright, J. William, 31
 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), 51-52
 General Assembly, 13, 20, 22, 143-145
 Geneva Conference (1932), 131
 Genocide, 65, 104
 Germany, 132
 Germany (East), 67, 71-72
 Germany (West), 67, 68, 71-72, 117-118, 121 *f.*
 Ghana, 78, 81
 Gift Projects, 37
 Gold Coast, 80-81
 Graham, Frank P., 90
 Greece, 91-92, 117
 Greenland, 77
 Guerrero, José Gustavo, 68
 Haiti, 18, 56
 Hammarskjöld, Dag, 147
 Hawaii, 84
 Hitler, Adolf, 61, 111, 118, 132
 Hoover, Herbert, 126
 Human Rights, 60-77
 Hungary, 69, 72-75
 ICAO, *see* International Civil Aviation Organization
 Iceland, 71, 117
 Idris I, King, 85
 IFC, *see* International Finance Corporation
 IMCO, *see* Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization
 India, 14, 20, 23, 28, 34, 39, 41, 44, 51, 55-56, 70, 78, 88-91
 Indian Iron & Steel Company, 44
 Indians (U.S.), 87
 Indochina, 124-125
 Indonesia, 17, 18, 23, 25, 78, 91
 Inland Water Transport Tour, 17, 57
 Insect control, 30
 Inter-American Economic and Social Council, 58
 Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), 57
 International Atomic Energy Agency, 140-142
 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, 41-45
 International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), 15, 16, 55-56
International Cloud Atlas, 56
 International Court of Justice, 70, 101-103, 161
 International disputes, 88-105
 International Finance Corporation (IFC), 45
 International Labor Organization (ILO), 22, 75-76
 International Law Commission, 103-105

- International Monetary Fund, 41, 45-51
 International Refugee Organization, 68
 International Telecommunication Union (ITU), 53-54
 International Telegraph Union, 53
 International Trade Organization (ITO), 51
 Iran, 16, 102-103
 Iraq, 79
 Ireland, 119
 Israel, 56, 78, 94-96. *See also* Palestine
 Italy, 79, 81-82, 85, 117
 ITO, *see* International Trade Organization
 ITU, *see* International Telecommunication Union

 Jamaica, 84
 Japan, 14, 19-20, 57, 67, 77, 111, 124, 132
 Jarring, Gunnar, 90
 Jordan, Kingdom of, 44-45
 Jordan River, 98

 Kabul, 55
 Kádár, Janos, 73-74
 Kashmir, 56, 88-91
 Khine, Aung, 68
 Korea, 75, 85, 106-115, 124

 Labouisse, Henry R., 97
 Land reform, 19-20
 Laos, 125
 Latin America, 15, 34, 58, 84, 125-127
 League of Nations, 15, 18, 21, 22, 83, 112, 130 *f.*, 143
 Lebanon, 70, 99
 Libya, 56, 85-86
 Lie, Trygve, 111, 154
 Lincoln, Abraham (quoted), 32
 Locarno Pacts, 131
 Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr., 142
 London Conference, 31
 Lowdermilk, Walter, 98
 Luxembourg, 42, 116 *f.*

 MacArthur, Douglas, 108
 MacKenzie, Sir Clutha, 36
 McNaughton, General, 89
 Malaya, 78, 125

 Manchuria, 111
 Maritime Conference, 57
 Marshall Plan, 42, 120-121
 Mexico, 15, 16, 34, 79
 Mindszenty, Josef Cardinal, 72
 Money and Trade, 41-52
 Monroe, Doctrine, 126
 Morocco, 24, 78, 99, 103
 Mudaliar, Sir Ramaswami, 76
 Mundt, Karl E., 31
 Mussolini, Benito, 111

 Nagy, Imre, 73
 National Commission for UNESCO, 39
 Nationalism, 128
 NATO, *see* North Atlantic Treaty Organization
 Netherlands, the, 42, 58, 71, 85, 91, 116 *f.*
 New Zealand, 13, 79, 83, 124
 Non-Self-governing Peoples, 78-87
 Non-Self-governing Territories, 84
 North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 116-118
 Norway, 69, 76, 117
 Nürnberg trials, 104

 OAS, *see* Organization of American States
 OEEC, *see* Organization for European Economic Cooperation
 Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), 120-121, 124
 Organization of American States (OAS), 125-127

 Pacific Charter, 124
 Pakistan, 17, 55-56, 57, 70, 71, 78, 88-91, 124
 Palavicini, Felix Fulgencio, 76
 Palestine, 68, 93-94. *See also* Israel
 Panama, 41
 Pan American Union, 126
 Papanek, Jan, 100
 Peace Observation Commission, 113
 Pelt, Adrian, 85
 Philippines, 70-71, 78, 82, 87, 124

- Point Four Program (U.S.), 20, 25, 45, 125
 Poland, 71
 Portugal, 117
 Prisoners of war, 67-68
 Puerto Rico, 84, 87
- Race Conflicts, 70
 Radio frequency allocation, 53-54
 Refugees, 68-69
 Regional arrangements, 116-129
 Regionalism, 128
 Rice Research Station, 14
 Ridgway, Matthew B., 108
 Rockefeller Foundation, 25
 Romania, 72-73
 Roosevelt, Franklin D., 126
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 126
- Sahara, 39
 Samoa, 83
 Santiago, 58
 Schuman Plan, 121-122
 Science, 30-40
 SEATO, *see* Southeast Asia Treaty Organization
 Self-determination, 86-87
 Sérot, Colonel, 94
 Shanghai, 69
 Singapore, 57
 Slavery, 75-76
 Somaliland, 79, 81-83, 85
 South Africa, 70-71, 72
 Southeast Asia, 13, 124
 Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, 124-125
 Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, 125
 Soviet Union, *see* Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
 Spaak, Paul-Henri, 118
 Special UN Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED), 45
 Suez, 51, 94-96, 115
 SUNFED, *see* Special UN Fund for Economic Development
 Sweden, 69
 Syria, 99
- TAA, *see* Technical Assistance Administration
 Taft, Robert A., 31
 Taft, William Howard, 112
 Tata Iron and Steel Co., 44
- Technical Assistance Administration (TAA), 23, 25-26
 Technical services, 53-59. *See also* Name of service
 Tennessee Valley Authority, 44
 Thailand, 17, 20, 57, 74, 124
 Togoland, 79-81
 Trade, Money and, 41-52
 Truman, Harry S., 25, 107 *f.*, 117, 124, 126
 Trusteeship, 78 *f.*
 Tuberculosis, 23-24, 86
 Tunisia, 28, 73, 78, 85, 98-99
 Turkey, 28, 56, 85, 86, 117
- UNCURK, *see* United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea
 UNEF, *see* United Nations Emergency Force
 UNESCO, *see* United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization
 UNICEF, *see* United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
 Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 68, 71, 74, 75, 76, 77, 93, 106 *f.*, 124
 United Kingdom, 51, 58, 93, 100-101, 102-103, 117, 124. *See also* Britain
 United Nations, 143-152; admission of new members, 161 *f.*; agencies, 20-25; and anti-colonial revolution, 165 *f.*; and League of Nations, 18; and scientific revolution, 166; costs, 144, 150; democracy in, 163-165; General Assembly, 143-145; philosophy of, 153-167; police powers of, 155; propaganda in, 157-158; Secretariat, 147-150; Secretary-General, 146-147; Security Council, 145; veto in, 151, 154 *f.*
 United Nations Commission for the Unification and Rehabilitation of Korea (UNCURK), 108
 United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Or-

MUSSOORIE

This book is to be returned on the date last stamped

[illegible]

341.231
341.231
341.231

107245
अवधि संख्या

Acc No. ~~3773~~

पुस्तक संख्या

Book No. _____

वर्ग संख्या
Class No. _____

लेखक

Author _____

शीर्षक

Title _____

341.231

~~3773~~

Coy

LIBRARY

Rev. ed. LAL BHADUR SHASTRI

National Academy of Administration

MUSSOORIE

Accession No. _____

107245

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.

Help to keep this book fresh. clean & moving