

(Committees--continued):

Regional Arrangements

Chairman: Colombia

Rapporteur: China

MR. STETTINIUS: Does any delegate wish to comment on the report Dr. Belt has just read from the Steering Committee this morning? If there is no objection, the report stands approved as read.

Ladies and Gentlemen, our next order of business is to continue with the statements of the chairmen of delegations. In accordance with special action taken at the meeting of the heads of delegations yesterday and announced at the Fifth Plenary Session, the Chair now recognizes the Prime Minister and the Chairman of the Delegation of the Union of South Africa.

FIELD MARSHAL SMUTS: Mr. President, Fellow Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen: Let me follow the example of other leaders of delegations who have spoken before me, and begin by expressing the warm thanks of my South African colleagues and myself for the invitation of the Government of the United States and the other sponsoring governments, to this Conference. It is our most earnest wish that this Conference may be successful, and provide a land mark in the progress of international relations and for cooperation among the nations toward world peace and security. Thus may San Francisco add to its other glories the greater glory of becoming another milestone in the long march of man to a better future.

Also, like other speakers, I recognize that we meet under the shadow of a shattering loss--the loss of that great leader who called us together. But in a very real sense, he is not gone from us. His immense personality and spirit brood over this land and over the human causes for which he worked. His soul goes marching on as an inspiration to us to continue on the road on which he set us. We owe it to his memory and to his immortal service to the world to make the success of this Conference a worthy monument to his name. As one great American president was the brave pioneer of the Covenant, so may the Charter of the New World Organization be successfully launched under the auspices of another. Of both of them it may be truly said that they gave everything, even their lives, for the great human cause around which we are now gathered at this Conference.

For there can be no doubt any more that for us, for the human race, the hour has struck. Mankind has

arrived at the crisis of its fate, the fate of its future as a civilized world. Even military victory, measureless victory, now crowning our war effort in Europe, is not enough. It must be only the prelude to the greater peace effort before us, which must complete and finalize the present struggle for a free world.

That is what we are aiming at here. This is the inner significance of this great San Francisco Conference.

For a generation now history has been working up to a veritable climax of war, of destructive violence, which now threatens the very foundations of our human future. Two world wars have been fought with ever-increasing destructiveness, until now the ancient homelands and continent of our western civilization are a desolation and a ruin unparalleled in history. Science--the inventive genius of our race--is putting ever new and greater and more terrible resources at the disposal of war.

A third world war may well prove beyond the limits of what civilized society can endure, perhaps even beyond the limits of our continued existence as a human world. It is for us to prevent this monstrous possibility and to make it a moral impossibility. That is the high purpose for which we are gathered here. We the peacemakers, we the peace-builders, dare not disappoint the hopes and prayers of a whole suffering world, centered on us here. Both the past and the future appeal to us. We dare not fail after what the valor of our millions of heroes has achieved. Let us see to it that their devotion and sacrifices and those of many more millions of the civilian populations, are not once more in vain.

Let us see to it that so far as in us lies, we shall call a halt to this pilgrimage of death, this march to suicide of our race--a march in which the innocent suffer far more than the guilty.

I speak here today, Mr. President, as one of the few still surviving from the last Peace Conference at Paris 26 years ago. My mind goes even further back, to the poignant memories of the South African war 46 years ago when, as a young man, I first learnt to know what war means for a small people and all it holds dear. From all this experience sprang my deep interest in the League of Nations and in the Covenant which we made at Paris for keeping the peace in future among the nations great and small.

It was a great and noble effort, much in advance of anything that had been done or even attempted before.

Today it is the fashion to belittle or even sneer at the League of Nations. But in its day it registered a real and great advance, and those who either in this country or elsewhere labored in that noble cause have nothing to regret or apologize for.

Alas, the Covenant proved only a milestone. This new Charter of the United Nations may also prove to be no more than a milestone. We pray that it may have a greater significance, but it may be that we shall in due course travel even beyond this milestone and have to erect further beacons on the road toward world peace, until ultimately the distant frontiers are reached of that new, that newer world, where war among the nations will be only a dim far-off memory of the race.

The League did prove a striking success in all its varied humanitarian activities, and much of what it did in that fruitful field of human service is of permanent value and can only be followed up and carried further forward by this new organization.

It failed, and failed badly only in one respect, but that the most important of all. It did not prevent war; it did not prevent lawless aggression, which has finally reached its climax in this most terrible of world wars. It is therefore here that our new task begins. And it may be useful if from this point of view we compare for a moment the differences in fundamental structure between the Covenant of the League and the Charter prepared at Dumbarton Oaks.

Of course the two documents emerge from two different worlds. A far-reaching revolution has been taking place since 1919, and it is still going on. No one foresaw or could have foreseen, at the last Peace Conference, the great political changes which have come over the world and world affairs in the years since. We planned for the world we knew, and as we saw it, and we planned in a justifiable spirit of optimism. Nobody, for instance, expected that the United States would refuse to enter the League of Nations and allow it to drift on the rocks in the dangerous post-war seas, as in the absence of the United States it was bound to do.

Nobody foresaw the rise of the vast ideologies which have since rocked our world on its foundations. Nobody realized the vast dangers of the future, even of the near future. We lived and thought in a political world and did not foresee the economic and social upheavals which were to

change the very basis of our society. There were great men in those days, but they were not great prophets and certainly not demi-gods. Today we see some of the dangers ahead far more clearly. We now see that measures of conciliation and appeasement are not enough, that war has to be prevented at all costs, even at the cost of war itself, if necessary. The Covenant did not undertake to prevent war at all costs but merely to create measures of delay and attempts at arbitration and negotiation and conciliation and finally to invoke economic sanctions to frighten off the aggressors.

The Dumbarton Oaks Charter, on the other hand, realistically recognizes that war must be prevented at the start, and that no half measures to that end will suffice. That being so, it also recognizes in the same spirit of realism, that a new responsibility for peace must be placed on the great powers. They have the power, and must in the first place bear the responsibility for using that power to prevent war. No doubt this enhances their importance and functions, vis-a-vis the smaller powers; but this disparity in function follows almost as a logical result from the new burden for peace imposed on them. Yalta has added the further corollary of unanimity among them to this special function for peace imposed on them. There is thus, the further obligation of unity of decision and action placed on them; in action, in enforcement measures for preventing war they must be unanimous and act, or not act, together. This may be only a temporary and passing phase, and it may in time become unnecessary to make such drastic provision for keeping the great powers together. The habit of cooperation among them may be expected to create trust and dispel suspicion between them. But who, with knowledge of the divisions of the last quarter of a century, and their dire results, and with thought of the possibilities of mischief in the years before us, will venture to say that such drastic provision for unity is not necessary today? We know that unanimity is at present insisted on, and moreover, the right of unanimity now asked may come to operate as a duty to unanimity, and thus tend to keep together the great powers, whose falling out among each other would in any case be the greatest danger and menace to world peace in future. I am not an apologist for Yalta, but knowing what the abstention of the United States has meant for the failure of the League of Nations, and knowing what similar abstention or later disagreements among the great powers may mean in the future failure of the World Organization, I cannot say that the Yalta recommendation is too heavy a price to pay for the new attempt to eliminate international war from our human affairs.

I am not at present discussing the Yalta resolution but merely pointing out its relation to the new set-up under the Charter compared with that of the Covenant. The Charter, unlike the Covenant, in prohibiting all international war and thus involving enforcement action to prevent it, creates a special position for the great powers calling also for special voting relations between them, which were not necessary under the Covenant.

This unequivocal prohibition of war, and this recognition of the special position of the great powers resulting therefrom, are the two major departures of the Charter from the League Covenant. There is a third difference - one of omission and not of provision in the Covenant. It is no less far-reaching than the other two, perhaps even more so. It refers to the economic and social set-up in the Charter which has nothing corresponding in the Covenant.

I have already referred to the unforeseen economic and social developments of the post-war world since the last peace. They must profoundly influence our views as to the future course of events and its possible repercussions on the peace of the world. The framers of the last peace lived, as I have said, in a political world and were dominated by a political outlook and point of view. They thought political solutions would suffice. No wonder that their plans were upset by the catastrophic economic developments which disrupted national and world economics in the era between the two wars. The chaos of currencies, exchanges, and tariffs, and all the strange and curious devices intended to cope with them, are too well-known to everyone to call for more than mere mention. Their disastrous economic and social consequences are no less well-known. Together with the new ideologies, resurrected from the past and from the Nazi underworld, they contributed in large measure to the crisis which produced the war. It soon became evident that the economic chaos and the social unrest and suffering resulting from it were no less fruitful sources of war than the ordinary forms of aggression so familiar to the political world. To these were added the new forms of propaganda through radio, infiltration, fifth column and secret sabotage, and similar innovations. In some respects aggression was becoming more psychological than physical, more insidious and dangerous, and much more difficult to cope with along the old political lines. The whole technique of aggression and attack was largely transformed, and came to by-pass the accepted procedures known to international law and relations. The confusion was extreme, and the results specially disastrous to

the peace-loving peoples. These results have been among the most potent causes of the present war. As a consequence, the new Charter, in dealing with and coping with the prevention of war, will provide means and methods for the control of these new forces which have entered the international field; and the proposed new Economic and Social Council will thus, from this and other points of view, become one of the most important organs of the New World Organization. In close cooperation with the other agencies set up in the economic field, such as the existing I.L.O., the Monetary Fund, the International Bank, the Food and Agricultural Council, and other bodies which are certain to be created, this new Council will enable the United Nations to have a far firmer grip of the new forces and conditions and techniques leading to social and economic unrest and subversion than the League of Nations ever had. The social and economic causes of war may thus come to be controlled at the source, so to say.

May I, in conclusion, add one more point in reference to the general aspects of the Charter, as compared with the Covenant. The new Charter should not be a mere legalistic document for the prevention of war. I would suggest that the Charter should contain at its very outset and in its preamble, a declaration of human rights and of the common faith which has sustained the Allied peoples in their bitter and prolonged struggle for the vindication of those rights and that faith. This war has not been an ordinary war of the old type. It has been a war of ideologies, of conflicting philosophies of life and conflicting faiths. In the deepest sense it has been a war of religion perhaps more so than any other war of history. We have fought for justice and decency and for the fundamental freedoms and rights of man, which are basic to all human advancement and progress and peace. Let us, in this new Charter of humanity, give expression to this faith in us, and thus proclaim to the world and to posterity, that this was not a mere brute struggle of force between the nations but that for us, behind the mortal struggle, was the moral struggle, was the vision of the ideal, the faith in justice and the resolve to vindicate the fundamental rights of man, and on that basis to found a better, freer world for the future. Never have all peace-loving peoples been so deeply moved. This is what our men and women feel they are fighting for on the war fronts, and have been laboring and slaving for on the home fronts in these long years of steadfast endurance. Let us put it into the Charter of the United Nations as our confession of faith and our testimony to the future. Our warfare has been for the eternal values which sustain the spirit of man

in its upward struggle toward the light. Let us affirm this faith of ours, not only as our high cause and guiding spirit in this war but also as our objective for the future. The peace we are striving for, and are taking such pains to safeguard, is a peace of justice and honor and fair-dealing as between man and man, as between nation and nation. No other peace would be worth the sacrifices we have made and are prepared to make again and the heavy responsibilities we are prepared to take under this Charter.

We shall persevere in that faith until it is established for all mankind beyond any doubt of peradventure. Let us proclaim that faith in this great historic Charter.

MR. STETTINIUS: Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now resume the alphabetical order in calling upon the following speakers, representing the various delegations. The Chairman of the Delegation of Ethiopia has designated the Minister of Ethiopia to Washington, to speak on behalf of that Delegation.

The Chair now recognizes His Excellency, the Ethiopian Minister to the United States.

MR. TEWELDE MEDHEN: Mr. Chairman, Fellow Delegates:

It is with profound emotion that I, as representative of Ethiopia, address this historic gathering of nations convened to establish a new and effective organization for the preservation of collective security and world peace.

Today, I stand before you, representing an Ethiopia which has triumphed over the cruel hardships inflicted at the hands of a powerful adversary, an Ethiopia risen by the unflinching courage of its patriots, by the blood of its sons, and by the heroic sacrifices, never to be forgotten, of the British people who have so generously poured out their lifeblood for the liberation of our Empire.

Today, Ethiopia stands before the world as the first of the United Nations to be liberated; now, fortunately, joined by a host of nations who, likewise through the steadfast courage of their patriots and the prodigal sacrifices of the liberating armies of the great powers, now resume their place in the Council of Nations.

Ethiopia, and all the recently liberated countries of Europe, owe a lasting debt to the four great powers without