Y 4
.F 76/1
Un 34/13/
PT. 2

1017

91/4
F76/1
Un 34/13/pt. 2

25th ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

GOVERNMENT
Storage
DOCUMENTS
SEP 14 1970
THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 21, 28; MAY 12, JUNE 24, JULY 14, AND AUGUST 6, 1970

PART II

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 913780

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
45-302 WASHINGTON : 1970

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402 - Price $1.00

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin
WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio
L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
LEONARD FARBSTEIN, New York
CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR., Michigan
WILLIAM T. MURPHY, Illinois
CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, New Jersey
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania
JOHN S. MONAGAN, Connecticut
DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California
JOHN C. CULVER, Iowa
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
JOHN V. TUNNEY, California
ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR., Texas
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania

E. ROSS ADAIR, Indiana
WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, California
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey
WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
J. IRVING WHALLEY, Pennsylvania
H. R. GROSS, Iowa
E. Y. BERRY, South Dakota
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
F. BRADFORD MORSE, Massachusetts
VERNON W. THOMSON, Wisconsin
JAMES G. FULTON, Pennsylvania
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
JOHN BUCHANAN, Alabama
ROBERT TAFT, JR., Ohio
SHERMAN P. LLOYD, Utah
J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida
WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., Delaware

BOYD CRAWFORD, *Staff Administrator*
ROY J. BULLOCK, *Senior Staff Consultant*
ALBERT C. F. WESTPHAL, *Staff Consultant*
FRANKLIN J. SCHUPP, *Staff Consultant*
HARRY C. CROMER, *Staff Consultant*
PHILIP B. BILLINGS, *Staff Consultant*
MARIAN A. CZARNECKI, *Staff Consultant*
MELVIN O. BENSON, *Staff Consultant*
EVERETT E. BIERMAN, *Staff Consultant*
JOHN J. BRADY, Jr., *Staff Consultant*
JOHN H. SULLIVAN, *Staff Consultant*
ROBERT J. BOWEN, *Clerical Assistant*
JUNE NIGH, *Senior Staff Assistant*
HELEN C. MATTAS, *Staff Assistant*
HELEN L. HASHAGEN, *Staff Assistant*
LOUISE O'BRIEN, *Staff Assistant*
DORA B. MCCRACKEN, *Staff Assistant*
JEAN E. SMITH, *Staff Assistant*
NANCY PEDEN, *Staff Assistant*
PAULA PEAK, *Staff Assistant*
DIANE C. GALLAGHER, *Staff Assistant*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, New Jersey, *Chairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
EDWARD R. ROYBAL, California
ABRAHAM KAZEN, JR., Texas

H. R. GROSS, Iowa
PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida

MARIAN A. CZARNECKI, *Staff Consultant*
JEAN E. SMITH, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

Tuesday, April 21, 1970:

	Page
Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	348

Tuesday, April 28, 1970:

Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director, Commission to Study the Organization of Peace	369
Mr. Harvey W. Greisman, president, Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs	379
Mr. Everett Lee Millard, executive secretary, People First, Chicago, Ill	389
Rev. Dana E. Klotzle, United Nations Representative of the Unitarian Universalist Association	400

Tuesday, May 12, 1970:

Rabbi Gershon B. Chertoff, Temple B'nai Israel, Elizabeth, N.J	412
Mr. Robert H. Cory, Friends Committee on National Legislation	424
Mrs. David G. Bradley, vice president, League of Women Voters USA	430
Mr. Jack McGann, legislative aide, Liberty Lobby	435
Mr. Warren Richardson, general counsel, Liberty Lobby	439

Wednesday, June 24, 1970:

Mrs. Allen Schweizer, Member, Executive Committee, and Chairman of Peace and World Relations, National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods	445
Mrs. Novella Williams, President, Citizens for Progress	453
Mr. Mark Starr, Esperanto League for North America	466
Miss Hazel T. Johns, U.N. Representative, United Church of Christ (Council for Christian Social Action)	472

Tuesday, July 14, 1970:

Mr. Porter McKeever, President, United Nations Association of the USA	480
Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States (Retired) as Chairman of the United Nations Association of the USA (presented by Mr. McKeever)	488
Mr. Robert S. Benjamin, Chairman, Board of Governors, United Nations Association of the USA	491
Mr. Cyrus R. Vance, Chairman, Policy Studies Committee, United Nations Association of the USA	496
Mr. David A. Dull, President, Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs	500

Thursday, August 6, 1970:

Hon. William P. Rogers, Secretary of State	518
Hon. Samuel De Palma, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs	526

APPENDIX—STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

	Page
Statement of the Honorable L. H. Fountain, a Representative from the State of North Carolina	541
Statement of the Honorable Lester L. Wolff, a Representative from the State of New York	542
Statement of the Honorable F. Bradford Morse, a Representative from the State of Massachusetts	543
Statement of the Honorable J. Herbert Burke, a Representative from the State of Florida	544
Statement of the National Council of Catholic Women (Mrs. Norman Folda, President)	545
Letter from Women United for the United Nations (Mrs. John C. Crawley, UN Representative)	546
Statement of William F. Claire, Executive Director, World Federalists, USA	546
Statement by the American Ethical Union	555
Letter from People First Central Committee, USA	557
Statement of the United States Catholic Conference	558
Letter from National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association of the United States of America	560
Statement of the National Board of the YWCA	562
Statement of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. of the United States of America	564

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:00 p.m., in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee will come to order.

During the past two months, this subcommittee has held a series of hearings on the United Nations. Our focus has been to review the strengths and the weaknesses of that organization during the first quarter century of its existence. From that inventory we have projected our thinking to the next decade, specifically how the United Nations can better serve the world community and how the United States can more effectively contribute to, and work with, that organization.

Thus far we have had some 20 witnesses, most of whom have brought to us basic insights on the work of the United Nations and its component parts. A number of them have held, or are holding, important positions as U.S. representatives to the United Nations and the United Nations agencies.

Today we are honored to have as our witness a Member of Congress who is one of the most active members of our Committee on Foreign Affairs, and one of its most distinguished, the Hon. Jonathan B. Bingham of New York. Previous to his congressional service Representative Bingham had an illustrious career in the Executive branch of our Government, much of it associated with United Nations affairs. At one time he was the acting administrator of the Technical Cooperation Administration, then known as the Point IV program. He has served as the U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador; as a member of the U.S. delegation to four United Nations General Assemblies; and as U.S. representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council with the rank of Minister.

I want to place in the record at this point a more extensive biographic sketch of Representative Bingham.

Mr. Bingham, it is a real pleasure to welcome you to this subcommittee and to have the benefit of your thinking on the United Nations and as a friend and distinguished colleague of Congress.

(The biographic sketch referred to follows:)

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, Democrat-Liberal, of the Bronx and Manhattan, N.Y.; born in New Haven, Conn., April 24, 1914, son of the late Senator Hiram Bingham of Connecticut; attended Groton School and graduated from Yale University (Phi Beta Kappa) in 1936 and received law degree in 1939; was admitted to the bar in 1940 and has practiced law in New York City; member of various bar associations; former member of Judiciary Committee of New York City Bar Association; occasional correspondent for the New York Herald Tribune in 1935 and 1938 in Europe, the USSR, and the Far East; during World War II enlisted as a private and was discharged as a captain in Military Intelligence; married to the former June Rossbach; four children—Sherrell (Mrs. James E. Bland), June Mitchell (Mrs. Erik C. Esselstyn), Timothy W., and Claudia R. (Mrs. Robert Hall), special assistant to an Assistant Secretary of State in 1945 and 1946; assistant director, Office of International Security Affairs in 1951; deputy and acting administrator, Technical Cooperation Administration 1951–53; secretary to Governor Averell Harriman of New York 1955–58; U.S. representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations with the rank of Ambassador and as principal adviser to Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson in economic and social affairs 1963–64; member of the U.S. delegation to four United Nations General Assemblies 1961–63; U.S. representative on the United Nations Trusteeship Council with the rank of Minister in 1961 and 1962 and served as president of the Council in 1962; author, "Shirt-Sleeve Diplomacy: Point 4 in Action" (John Day, 1954), also magazine articles; member and officer of various boards and civic and county organizations and is the recipient of awards from various organizations; elected to the 89th Congress November 3, 1964; reelected to the 90th and 91st Congresses.

STATEMENT OF HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I particularly thank you for those very kind and overly flattering remarks.

If it is agreeable, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read this statement and perhaps interpolate here and there as I go along. I hope that if, you or the other members would like to ask questions as I proceed please do not hesitate to interrupt.

I would first of all like to compliment, you, Mr. Chairman, for convening these hearings in this 25th anniversary year of the United Nations and for the manner in which the hearings have been conducted. You have heard from a number of witnesses with experience at the United Nations with keen insight into its strengths and its weaknesses and with imagination in respect to its future.

To me the salient fact about the United Nations in this 25th anniversary year is the fact that it is still alive. And it's not only alive, but vigorous. By contrast, in its 25th year the League of Nations was at death's door.

To say the very least of it, the United Nations today is an indispensable part of the machinery of international relations in the world. If the United Nations were to be abolished, as some of its critics from the right would like to see happen, the community of nations would have to start again to build an international organization. And in the climate of the early 1970's, the nations would have a harder time than they did in the mid-1940's. The result would almost certainly not be as strong a structure as the founding fathers erected in San Francisco in 1945. Just to mention one thing, the Soviets would probably not agree today to the kind of one-man Secretary General they accepted in 1945. They would probably insist on the troika, the three-headed monster they proposed in 1962, with each of three Secretaries General

having a veto over the other two. I think it is quite clear that this would paralyze the secretariat in many cases and make it virtually impossible to operate.

We could, of course, create a new international organization with far greater powers and without the United Nations' defects. Some, including distinguished members of this committee, favor doing this through an Atlantic Union, but the price would be exceedingly high. Not only would the Communist countries refuse to join but so, in all likelihood, would the many third world states that cherish their neutrality in the cold war. They would surely not join a peacekeeping organization unless both super powers were part of it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I take advantage of the invitation our colleague issued to us to interrupt and raise questions?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. I appreciate the attention that your statement draws to the Atlantic Union proposal. You say the price would be exceedingly high. Now assuming that this federation idea does take form and becomes operative, the price admittedly would be exceedingly high but so would the benefits. Do you feel the price would be out of balance with the potential advantages should such a federation be created?

Mr. BINGHAM. I am speaking here, Mr. Findley, of this idea as an alternative to the United Nations and I don't think that that is your idea as I understand it.

Mr. FINDLEY. No, not at all.

Mr. BINGHAM. When I say the price would be exceedingly high, I mean that if we were to consider this as an alternative, the fact that it did not include the Communist countries and many of the neutral countries would be, to my mind, an intolerable price to pay but in terms of the benefits to be derived from an organization of this character in addition to the United Nations, I don't regard the price as high and I am favorable to that approach.

Mr. FINDLEY. As I have always considered the Atlantic Union proposal it would be created within the United Nations under the provisions of the charter. I have never had any other thought than that the Atlantic Union, if and when it is created probably would be the strongest single pillar of the United Nations and it would stay as a member of this worldwide organization even though Atlantic Union itself were regional in its character.

Do you see why this would not be a possibility?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have some reservations about it, nothing like as strong as I do if it is proposed as an alternative to the United Nations. My reservations about it are that it would have a tendency, I think, to become something of a rich man's club in the world of the nations. I think that depends in how it is worked out. If it could be set up in such a way that it were not a rich man's club, that it would be open to membership on the part of developing countries, and so on, I think it might be very useful and I am certainly sympathetic to the general approach along the lines that you describe.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, do you mind if we pursue this just a bit more?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No, go ahead.

Mr. FINDLEY. I agree with you on that point certainly. It would have to have some standards but I would hope the economic status

of the nation would not be one of the standards for admission. But every proposal that I have heard which has been related to this Atlantic Union concept has insisted that a bill of individual rights and a system of representative government would have to be one of the conditions of the eligibility for membership in the Atlantic Union, and this on the face of it would disqualify the Soviet Union and I think every other Communist government in the world.

This would not necessarily disqualify permanently the people living in those regions, but until such time as they would have the right of self-government and some protection of their own individual rights it would seem to me totally out of the question that they could be brought together in a federal system with our own country. So I think you would have to assume that the Communist countries would not even have the chance to refuse membership, that they perforce would be disqualified because of the totalitarian character of their governments.

Mr. BINGHAM. Would not that qualification, Mr. Findley, bar a number of other governments, western European governments? Greece, for example?

Mr. FINDLEY. It certainly would, and Portugal although I think there is some promising movement in Portugal. Some of the nations of the NATO community are either autocratic in character or unstable as is the case with Italy right now, but certainly this is the group of nations which would be the logical group from which to invite the original members of the union.

I do not want to pursue this beyond your own interests but I would hope that when we can get some movement toward this idea of supernational federation that whatever is done will be done in a way to leave the door open to other countries as they are interested and qualified by the character of their government for membership.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am delighted to hear that. Thank you, Mr. Findley.

Of course what I have said is not to say that the expectations for the United Nations that ran so high in 1945 have been realized. Clearly, the United Nations today does not occupy the central position in U.S. Government thinking about international relations and peacekeeping that it did 20 or 25 years ago. In his Inaugural Address of 1949, President Harry S. Truman summarized four major points of U.S. foreign policy. His Point 4 is remembered and has grown to extraordinary dimensions, but no one remembers what the other three were.

I might say parenthetically, Mr. Chairman, I discovered some years ago that President Truman could not remember what the other three points were, either.

The very first point was continued support of the United Nations and its related agencies. I think it is fair to ask what American President today would give that kind of priority to the United Nations?

What has caused this decline in the United Nations' importance? Was it some defect in the charter that was not detected in 1945?

By hindsight perhaps we can think of some ways in which the charter could have been improved. Possibly some system of weighted voting might have been adopted for the General Assembly that would be more realistic and more practical than the present one-State-one-vote system. Perhaps some provisions should have been incorporated to set a minimum population for States seeking admission.

But these flaws were not basic. The basic flaw is that the United Nations depends for success, at least in the area of major peacekeeping operations, on agreement among all the major powers. This weakness could not have been avoided in 1945 and it cannot be avoided today. If it had not been for the veto power, the Soviet Union would doubtless have not joined the United Nations, and if it had joined it would not have stayed in. The same is true today, and it is true not only of the Soviet Union but I have no doubt it is true of the United States as well.

The underlying weakness of the United States is the concept of national sovereignty. While that concept may seem to many of us a dangerous anachronism, the sad fact of the matter is that national sovereignty is stronger and more prevalent in the world today than it was in 1945.

The blame then for the flaws in the United Nations peacekeeping record attaches not to the United Nations itself, the Charter, the structure of the organization, or the three Secretaries General who have served, but to the member nations and their narrow view of their own self-interest. I want to say that I think the United States has been just as guilty on this on occasions as the other nations have.

Let me cite just one example of what I mean. The United Nations has often been criticized for the speed with which the United Nations forces were withdrawn from the Sinai in 1967. It has been argued that when Nasser started moving his troops in and demanded that the United Nations troops withdraw, Secretary U Thant should have found some pretext for delaying action at least until the Security Council could meet and consider the problem. But under the terms of the agreement whereby the United Nations troops had been placed where they were, Nasser had the legal right to demand their immediate withdrawal.

Thus the real blame for the United Nations withdrawal must be placed where it belongs: at the door of Nasser, who insisted that the troops be withdrawn so he could proceed with his aggressive plans, and at the door of those nations who had agreed in 1956 to such a weak arrangement with regard to United Nations forces. In the future, it is vital that arrangements for the use of United Nations peacekeeping forces be such that they will stay on the job unless their removal is agreed to by all the parties involved.

I might add, parenthetically, that U Thant has been criticized on other occasions for what has appeared to some as excessive caution or excessive neutrality. What is too often forgotten is that of the three Secretaries General to date, U Thant is the only one who has been able to carry out his responsibilities without disastrously offending one of the super powers.

Mr. FINDLEY (presiding). May I interrupt at that point to ask if out of your experience with the United Nations you saw other courses of action open to U Thant at the time that he responded to Nasser's request for withdrawal? What else could he have done? Did he really have an alternative?

Mr. BINGHAM. I was not there at the time, Mr. Findley, and I hesitate to say exactly what he might have done. There are those who say he might have found some pretext for delay, and he might have, but there would have been a risk that United Nations soldiers, troops, forces would have been killed. Nasser's legal right under the

agreement was clear. So I think that while a number of people do feel that the Security Council should at least have been convened, it is hard to see how anything more than a very brief delay could have been achieved.

Mr. FINDLEY. Thank you.

Mr. BINGHAM. U Thant has had the courage to criticize one or both of them or to act in a way that displeased one or both of them, and he has skillfully defended and protected the office of Secretary General against the Soviet Union's attacks. But he has never carried his disagreement with any member state to the point of endangering his own usefulness. Both Trygvie Lie and Dag Hammarskjold, for all their great qualities, found that their usefulness was virtually at an end the day the Russians refused to deal with them further as Secretary General.

It would then be foolish to tear apart the United Nations and try to start over again from scratch. (Incidentally, I would have the same feeling about the U.S. Constitution. There is a grave doubt whether in the climate of today we could adopt the essentials of that great document, especially the Bill of Rights.)

Obviously, then, for those of us who believe that the future of mankind lies in the gradual evolution of a system of world law and peace through law, the only real alternative is to seek to strengthen the United Nations and the other international organizations that we have, to build a structure block by block as opportunity affords, rather than attempting suddenly to create a whole new structure.

Perhaps I should add there that we can, in addition, build new international organizations that will strengthen this structure. I am not suggesting that we have to work with the organizations that we have. All I am saying is that I think at the center of the structure will be the U.N. rather than some alternative organization.

What then can be done as we look to the future of the United Nations and its related agencies?

In seeking answers to this question we must first, it seems to me, recognize this basic principle: That to achieve any substantial improvement in the United Nations or its system we will have to have the concurrence of the great powers, and more particularly of the Soviet Union.

In the peacekeeping field, progress is bound to be modest and slow, especially as long as the Soviets and the French maintain their present opposition to an organization with vitality of its own. But the U.S. Government, I believe, ought to be continually pressing for improvements, particularly for the kind of improvements that might be expected to obtain the support of the vast majority of the members of the organization.

If the United States will place itself squarely and persistently behind proposals that have great merit and worldwide appeal, it can make an ally of the force of public opinion in many countries. We have been too cautious, too often, for too long in this regard. It is high time that the United States exercised the moral leadership of which it is capable to call for specific steps that will lead toward a system of world law and a world at peace under law.

A modest and limited proposal of this kind was contained in the recommendations of the United Nations Association panel headed by President Kingman Brewster of Yale for the strengthening of standby

United Nations peacekeeping forces and for the creation of a peace fund of initially $50 million. As you know, last year 21 Senators and 59 Representatives urged the Secretary of State in a joint letter to support these recommendations at the United Nations General Assembly. Unfortunately, no such action was taken.

Mr. FINDLEY. May I interrupt at that point to raise a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Getting back to the situation that U Thant faced in the Sinai, would this proposal, in which I join incidentally, have made the situation any different?

Mr. BINGHAM. Only, Mr. Findley, if the agreement or if the provision for the troops in the area had been a stronger arrangement. The trouble in 1967 was that, as I have indicated, the troops were there under an agreement between the United Nations and the United Arab Republic which said that either party could terminate the arrangement at any time. There were no U.N. troops stationed on the Israeli side of the line and Israel was not a part of the agreement which brought the peacekeeping force to the area. The U.N. troops in Arab-held territory were there with the consent of the United Arab Republic, and the U.A.R. took the position it could effectively revoke that consent at any time. That certainly was not a good arrangement. I would hope that any future peacekeeping arrangement would avoid such an agreement.

The advantages of the proposal of the Brewster panel would be twofold: First of all that we would have readily available forces that could be called upon to serve the United Nations on an emergency and authority notice, and secondly that a fund would be available—a small fund to be sure, but a small fund would be available to finance those operations without getting into all the difficulties that we ran into in the case of the financing of the Congo operation and, incidentally, also the financing of the UNEF, the United Nations Emergency Force, I think it was, that was stationed in the city. The financial arrangements were never satisfactorily completed with regard to either of those operations.

Mr. FINDLEY. But you think in the future, the peacekeeping force should be made available only if the local parties give up their right to determine when the forces should leave?

Mr. BINGHAM. I would not go that far because I can conceive of a situation where the great powers would agree—where the Security Council, let's say, would agree that there should be a peacekeeping force in the area even though the parties did not want it there or even though one of the parties did not want it there. That would be up to the Security Council to decide. It would be necessary under the provisions that bind the Security Council or the great powers to agree but it would not be necessary for the individual states to agree.

Mr. KAZAN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes.

Mr. KAZAN. Is that what the present situation is?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. Kazen. The United Nations observers stationed along the canal, of which there are about 100, are there with the consent of both Egypt and Israel. They were stationed there following the Security Council concensus of early July 1967. They are stationed on both sides of the canal. Either side could request and, in

fact, require that the observers be withdrawn from its side of the line but only if both sides asked that the observers be removed would they have to leave the entire area. Similarly, the Secretary General could order the observers out and he suggested last July that he might have to do just that due to the heavy crossfire which was endangering their lives and has resulted in one death since 1967. The situation is similar along Israel's other three frontiers, except that along the ceasefire line with Jordan both parties have refused observers and none are present. On the Lebanese border, observers are present but there are only six and they operate only on the Lebanese side.

Mr. KAZEN. What authority does the peacekeeping force have?

Mr. BINGHAM. It has whatever authority the Security Council by resolution may grant to it or it can be in position by agreement of the parties, but in the normal case the Security Council has to adopt a resolution with the concurrence of all the permanent members that provide for the way in which the peacekeeping force will function and what its responsibilities are.

Mr. KAZEN. Would you go so far as to say that they would have the right to repel by force the armed forces of either country between whom they are to keep the peace?

Mr. BINGHAM. That could be the case if that were the decision of the Security Council. In the Congo you will recall there was certainly very definitely conflict at various times with various parties but the most extensive conflict in the Congo was with the dissident government of Katanga under Mr. Tshombe, and there were hostilities between that government and the United Nations force composed of troops of many nations. It was, by the way, I think an extraordinary operation, extraordinary in its organization and in the eventual success achieved.

I think it is fair to say that the Congo was saved as a nation by what was done. I think what was done also prevented a great international conflict from potential development there. It could easily have become an East-West conflict.

Mr. KAZEN. Well, if we ever get to the point where they are given that authority and there is conflict and there will be shedding of blood as far as the peacekeeping forces are concerned, do you think that the countries all over the world would agree to such a thing?

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; I think it is possible. I think that the whole notion of collective security which was basic to the League of Nations and which the League of Nations was never able to put into effect lay behind the principle of the founding of the United Nations and that if you have a clear case of aggression the United Nations forces must be prepared under proper resolution to meet them.

The other case, of course, that I neglected to mention that is perhaps the largest scale United Nations operation of all is in Korea. The entire Korean operation was under the banner of the United Nations and was carried on pursuant to Security Council resolution. The reason of course that it is an exceptional case is that the Soviets had taken a walk at the time that was decided upon and therefore were not there to exercise their veto. I think they learned their lesson unfortunately at that time and they will probably never take that kind of a walk again.

Mr. KAZEN. I wonder if you would clarify for the committee some of the language that you used on page 3 and the suggestions that you

make. I unfortunately do not grasp what you are trying to tell the committee.

In the last paragraph, and I quote:

> But the United States government ought to be continually pressing for improvements, particularly for the kind of improvements that might be expected to obtain the support of the vast majority of the members of the organization.

If you expect to get the vast majority of the members of the organization behind anything, it must then be a popular subject.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. KAZEN. So why is that a new innovation? Isn't this what is usually done anyway?

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you for the question. I think perhaps this was not clear.

What I am trying to say there is this: that on many of these things we do have the opposition—sometimes vigorous, sometimes less vigorous—of the Soviet Union or of France, both of which are less than enthusiastic about strengthening the United Nations as an organization.

What I was trying to say here is that if we come up with proposals that will be popular among the members and keep hammering away at them, I think we can eventually break down the opposition of the Soviets and the French though not necessarily. They are very stubborn and very determined sometimes but they do respond to the overwhelming sentiment of the organization on occassion.

I would give this as an example. I mentioned earlier the Soviets' demand for a troika in place of the single Secretary General back in 1952. For a while they said they would never agree to a single Secretary General, they were very tough about it. On this occasion the other members of the United Nations almost without exception, except for the Communist bloc which of course went along with them, were strong in their feeling that there had to be a single Secretary General and they let the Soviets know that in no uncertain terms. They continued their fight for a while and eventually they gave up. There was a facesaving device involving the appointment of a number of advisers to the Secretary General from different areas but it was only a facesaving device, they really gave up on their position.

So what I am trying to say there is that if we have good plans, good programs, we ought to keep hammering away at them and try and develop as much support for them from other countries as we can and not be too afraid that the Soviets or the French will say "No." That was what I was trying to get at.

Mr. KAZEN. It would take the reorganization of the rules and the charter to do a lot of these things, would it not?

Mr. BINGHAM. In some cases I don't think anything I have proposed here would require an amendment to the charter. I have mentioned that there might have been some improvements in the charter for weighted voting, for example. I don't think we will ever get that now. We might have gotten it in 1945.

So I don't think anything I have proposed here would require an amendment to the charter. Certainly all of them would require the action by somebody or other, it might be the Security Council or the General Assembly or the Economic and Social Council. Certainly all of them would require some actions by the nations involved.

Mr. KAZEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FOUNTAIN (presiding). Did you finish your statement?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, I did not.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. You may proceed.

Mr. BINGHAM. It is true that many governments might be reluctant to make contributions to such a peace fund, and I was referring to the peace fund of the Brewster panel, as long as France and the U.S.S.R. will not make even their promised voluntary contributions toward the Congo deficit. However, the sum required is not so vast that a systematic worldwide drive for private contributions might not be successful. I believe there might be a generous response from foundations and others in this country to such a drive if contributions to the United Nations were made tax deductible, and I shall shortly be introducing legislation to achieve that objective.

Treating private contributions to the United Nations and its related agencies as tax deductible would make sense whether or not the proposed United Nations peacekeeping fund is set up. It should be possible, in my judgment, for those so inclined to make tax deductible gifts to the World Health Organization, for example, or to the United Nations Development Program. Action on legislation providing such tax deductibility would be a splendid gesture for the Congress to make in this 25th anniversary year and the revenue loss would be insubstantial. (There would be no revenue loss to the degree that foundations would be encouraged to make gifts.)

I might point out that foundations of course can contribute to the United Nations or its related agencies today because they don't have to contribute only to tax deductible operations but I have observed that the foundations are a little nervous about doing that kind of thing. I believe that that nervousness would disappear if the gifts were made tax deductible for purposes of individual giving.

In some areas the prospects for strengthening the United Nations system are very bright indeed. Some situations seem by their very nature to demand that international machinery be created adequately to cope with the problems that may otherwise become dangerous and intractable. One such is the vast seabed with its enormous resources. Thanks to the initiative of the State of Malta, a United Nations committee has been studying the possibilities of creating an international structure to prevent chaotic and dangerous competition among nations in the exploitation of these resources.

While the problems are complex and many difficult legal questions are raised, the objective seems clear and the opportunities for constructive action are enormous. We simply must not allow the situation to continue as it is now, where national enterprises are competing without restraint in this area. Such unregulated competition is bound to lead to confrontation and possibly conflict. The United States has every reason to press for (a) a relatively strict definition of the continental shelf and adjacent areas where a nation will have exclusive rights and (b) an international agency affiliated with the United Nations to regulate and license exploitation of the ocean bottom beyond those limits. The revenues derived from the licensing should be used for agreed international purposes, such as the United Nations Development Program and/or a peacekeeping fund.

Another huge problem area which simply calls out for international regulation is the protection of the environment. We have recently

become aware of the desperate danger to our planet from the indiscriminate exploitation of its resources and the poisoning of its air and water, not to speak of serious overcrowding. This danger cannot be effectively met by nations acting alone. The problems must be attacked on an international basis. It is fortunate that a world conference on the environment is scheduled for Stockholm in 1972 and that a United Nations Committee is working on preparations for that conference.

Since the problems are worldwide, it seems clear to me that all the nations of the earth should be invited to this conference. That would include mainland China as well as Nationalist China, East Germany as well as West Germany, both Koreas and both Vietnams. When we begin to think about a problem like the survival of our planet, narrow political considerations ought to be laid aside. I earnestly hope that this committee in its report will see fit so to recommend.

If the various divided nations were invited to the World Conference on the Environment, this would not be a binding precedent for the United Nations itself but with respect to the parent organization and related agencies the principle of universality is a valid one as well. Several years ago I urged that the United States announce a policy of being willing to have Peking take China's seat in the United Nations, provided Taiwan is not thrown out. As a practical matter, such an attitude on our part would probably not bring Peking in so long as that regime remains intransigent in its opposition to any recognition or membership for Taiwan. However, by such a declaration the United States would gain respect not only among other peoples of the world but among our young and many others here at home.

Now that Chancellor Willy Brandt has begun to make overtures toward East Germany, apparently based on the assumption that there is no short-term prospect of reunification, it would seem logical that both Germanys might be admitted to United Nations membership. Assuming, which I for one do not, that reunification is desirable, such reunification could still take place at a later date. Even if both Germanys had been previously admitted to the United Nations, their memberships would then be merged into one as was the case when Egypt and Syria briefly formed a federation.

Similarly, if peace can be restored in Vietnam, there is no reason why both North and South Vietnam should not have United Nations membership, and this should be stated as U.S. policy. (To be recalled in this regard is the offer of substantial postwar aid to North Vietnam extended by President Johnson in 1965.) If United Nations machinery is to be used in effectuating and policing a peaceful settlement that might ultimately be worked out for all of Indochina, it would seem virtually essential for all the states involved to be members of the organization.

Also, in Korea, if the Pyongyang regime would indicate a willingness to settle down and abandon its aggressive tactics, the way would be opened for United Nations membership for both Korean regimes and for a permanent settlement to replace the present unsatisfactory truce.

The addition of all these countries would not make it any easier for the United Nations to function effectively as a peacekeeping organization; it might, I suppose, in some cases make the task more

difficult. But to the extent that the United Nations is an essential part of our international machinery, to the extent that it is a forum for meetings, for discussion, for debate, for contact, for communication—in all of these respects and in many of the other respects in which the United Nations should be a worldwide organization, I think the principle of universality makes total sense.

There are many other areas in which the United Nations system could be strengthened. The United Nations development program and the various specialized agencies that are engaged in the essential work of development for the less fortunate areas of the world have an enormously important role to play. While multilateralism is clearly an advantage in developmental work, the quality of multilateralism alone is not enough. The effort should be constant to make the procedures more effective and less bureaucratic, and recommendations such as those contained in the extensive report by Sir Robert Jackson on the United Nations development program should be taken very seriously.

In its support for the United Nations development program, as well as other United Nations activities, the United States must continue to supply a large percentage of the funds. If we are truly interested in the tasks to be accomplished and in strengthening the agencies that are engaged upon them, we must be relatively openhanded. We cannot afford to be deterred by the meager or restricted character of the contributions of other nations that are not at all interested in the achievement of the same objectives. I might say we could do better to follow the examples of the nations that have contributed very generously to the United Nations in proportion to their resources such as Canada and some of the Scandinavian countries.

Considering their importance, the various international organizations are operating on a veritable shoestring. The contributions the United States is called upon to make are miniscule in relation to not only our national budget but the budgets of our States and major cities. To seek to make minor economies in an area where the stakes are so inordinately high is shortsighted indeed.

The United States should also take the lead in advocating that any international organization should extend itself to assist the United Nations itself. For example, the United States should come out firmly in favor of the idea that Intelsat should set aside a few of its many communication channels for the United Nations to use free of charge. This position has, as you know, been supported by our colleagues on the Subcommittee on National Security and Scientific Developments chaired by Mr. Zablocki, and by 13 Senators and 44 Representatives in a joint letter to the Secretary of State but appropriate action by the State Department and by Comsat, which of course is the U.S. member of the Intelsat Corp., has not been forthcoming.

The International Court of Justice today is in a sad state of desuetude with no cases pending before it. This is a discouraging symptom of the unwillingness of nations to submit their disputes to an international tribunal for determination.

A drive should be undertaken to give life to the International Court, and the United States should set an example by repealing the obnoxious Connally amendment which reserves to the United States

the right to determine what questions are domestic and hence not subject to the International Court's jurisdiction.

Apart from the International Court, steps could be taken toward a system of worldwide obedience to law by arranging for many international disagreements, which today have to be settled through diplomatic channels, to be resolved through the use of judicial process in the various countries involved.

I might give an example of that. If the chauffeur attached to an embassy has an automobile accident, that dispute cannot be, in the normal course, resolved in the courts of the country to which that embassy is attached but has to be taken up through diplomatic channels. There are many other examples of disputes that could be resolved in the courts if we had a mind to proceed that way. The leading exponent of this view is Prof. Roger Fisher of the Harvard Law School.

Although the U.S. record of support for the United Nations is generally a good one—probably the best of any of the great powers—and U.S. delegations have contributed mightily to the drafting and adoption of the several United Nations conventions, the American record for ratification of those conventions is abysmal. While it is the Senate that has not ratified, part of the fault lies with the executive branch which has failed in successive administrations to press hard enough for ratification of the Genocide Convention and others.

A long overdue step was taken this year when, in response to a message from President Nixon, the Senate did ratify the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, I have attended a number of your hearings. While many of the distinguished witnesses presented valuable testimony, I feel that the statement presented by Prof. Richard N. Gardner of Columbia University, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, deserves to be singled out as especially noteworthy. His many imaginative suggestions for forward steps toward international cooperation in such fields as space, population control, the environment and communications are worthy of the most careful study by this subcommittee.

The task of preserving a world community through peaceful cooperation and by building a network of relationships, which in the end will create a community of world interests, is a long and arduous one. The impatient and the fainthearted will drop by the wayside. But the task is not impossible; it can be accomplished, painstakingly and step by step. This committee's deliberations and its ultimate report will, I am confident, contribute to that end.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Congressman Bingham, for an extremely well thought out and enlightening statement.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Certainly I will say that any statement of yours is always especially noteworthy.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Bingham, do you regard the United Nations as an organization which will protect the concept of national sovereignty or have the effect of weakening it?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have never thought of it as either one. I think that certainly the United Nations is not necessarily incompatible with the concept of international sovereignty, in fact it is founded on that

concept being preserved. I do feel, as I said, that excessive application of the principle of national sovereignty on the part of the members has caused the United Nations many of its troubles. Too often the countries are concerned only with their own short-range national interests and are not enough concerned with the long-range goal which they share of trying to build a strong international organization.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have listened to a great deal of testimony and it is a very interesting set of hearings that we have had. I find a paradox running through the hearings.

On pages 5 and 6 you speak of the admission of Communist China and North Vietnam and North Korea and point out that their admission might make the peacekeeping task of the United Nations more difficult. On the other hand the principle of universality seems sensible and is often advocated. That is a paradox, for it might be better to have an organization that would have more modest goals which has a chance to have real achievement rather than a universal organization always doing less and always being measured against a failure to live up to the high expectations that we all have.

Mr. BINGHAM. Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we certainly should not abandon the most important and most difficult goal of all which is that of maintaining the peace. In spite of the difficulties this was the main purpose the U.N. was created for, and if we had more time I think one could point to many greater successes that have been achieved by the U.N. that are not often recognized.

Prof. Henkin of the Columbia Law School has pointed out in his book *How Nations Behave* that the record of obedience to international law in recent years is much better than is generally recognized. There have been very few cases of outright aggression in the old-fashioned sense and I certainly would not be for saying that we should give up on trying to use an international organization for the preservation of peace.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Well, I completely agree with you. I think while we talk of high expectations, as some of our other witnesses have pointed out, the fact is that here we are in the 25th anniversary of the United Nations and that in itself would have been an impossible expectation in the late forties when the United Nations was born. Some of the great successes of the United Nations, I think, point out the fact that by attempting and persevering it has made accomplishments. As you point out, this is not for the impatient or the weak.

The United Nations still has a great role to play. If the world is going to have some future, then that future depends on the same power of the United Nations and those members who make it work, while complaining about it occasionally or being dissatisfied with it occasionally. Yet that is the very nature of the United Nations. Impatience and intolerances, and stresses and strains, are argued out there rather than by nations resorting to arms.

Mr. BINGHAM. I might point out, Mr. Chairman, I did not mention this in my statement but as of course you are aware there is a U.N. force today in Cyprus and if it were not there I am sure we would have bloody civil war going on in Cyprus. So when we say that the U.N. has not lived up fully to the hopes that some people had for it in 1945, that is not to say that it has not had great successes, it has.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. I think this is perhaps what we should stress in this 25th year of the United Nations, the successes.

As a Representative of New York and one who has given an extremely fine statement here on the United Nations, would you care to comment on the expansion program of the United Nations?

Mr. BINGHAM. They do need more space. I am not familiar with the plans in great detail, but I think, we of the Congress should be prepared to extend as we have before a helping hand for the needs of the U.N. Some of the space will be provided by additional facilities to be constructed by the United Nations itself, other useful facilities are going to be provided if the arrangements can be worked out by a United Nations development program in another block which, as I understand it, will not require government financing.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You feel that we should encourge the United Nations to remain in New York?

Mr. BINGHAM. I certainly do. In spite of the problems there I think it is a great thing for New York City from the point of view of just having a great many visitors come. It is a fantastic thing, Mr. Chairman, to see the American tourists flocking through the United Nations day after day, and I think they get a sense of it. I think that is a fine thing.

While the U.N. has on occasion been an expense to the city of New York, it has also by and large I think been an attraction and I think it has been economically beneficial to the city. There is a move on among some of the member states to move the United Nations out of New York. This would be, I believe, a blow not only to the city but to this country.

We have difficulties there, difficulties of proper housing for delegates. Some of the delegates unfortunately have been the victims of criminal attacks and have felt that they were not being fairly and adequately protected, but these difficulties can be overcome. It is interesting that many large numbers of New York residents and residents of the metropolitan area have over the years extended a great deal of hospitality to United Nations delegates and secretariat members, and this has been done on an organizational basis. This is a very fine thing indeed and I think these people have learned a lot about the organization and about the countries from which these people come.

I might say that in my years there I tremendously enjoyed my friendships that I developed with members of the secretariat and delegates from other nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Bingham.

Mr. Fountain.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Congressman, for a very thought-provoking statement. I wish we had time to discuss many of your recommendations, but whether we agree with all of them or not I think they indicate that you have given a lot of thought and consideration to them. I think all of us have somewhat the same goals in mind; it is a question of how we arrive at them.

Personally I think the greatest weakness among the U.N.'s many weaknesses—and I am not underestimating its accomplishments, I think we are all mindful of those—is the fact that we don't have weighted voting or some other formula such as you referred to. But it seems to me that the continued growth of the United Nations in its membership, with very small countries—population wise—being

admitted with the same voting power will ultimately make the whole institution a farce in terms of its power and influence.

Mr. BINGHAM. Could I comment on that, Mr. Fountain?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. This is a matter to which I have given a great deal of thought and I can assure you that there were times when it was frustrating indeed to be engaged in deliberations where this type of one-state one-vote prevailed. On the other hand, there are several points to be made.

First of all, this applies only in the General Assembly and in its constituent committees. We do have a kind of recognition of the fact that some powers are bigger and more important than others, more influential than others in the structure of the Security Council, the structure of the Trusteeship Council and the structure of the Economic and Social Council and the many committees that exist. The United States whenever it wants to be a member of a committee can be a member of a committee and it is a member of the committee. That is not true of the smaller members, they compete for these positions and they rotate. So there is that to be said about it.

Another thing of course is that our influence at the United Nations is not measured by our vote, it is much more measured by our degree of prestige, our performance, and on many occasions other states would follow our lead. We don't have an automatic bloc of votes as the Soviet Union does. I mean we cast one, they cast eleven. We don't have that but we do have people who are influenced by our position.

I think in setting up any new organizations—for example, if we set up a committee as has been proposed on financing of peace-keeping operations, that committee ought to be set up in such a way as to reflect the fact that some members are going to contribute a lot more than other members and we can do these things. I don't think we are ever now going to be able to get away from the one-state-one-vote principle in the General Assembly because I think it is too precious for the states concerned.

I just say in conclusion that we have here in the U.S. Congress a situation in the other body which is logically pretty indefensible. Why should the Senator from Alaska have the same vote as the Senator from New York? You have a different ratio there of whatever it is, probably 100 to 1 in size.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I agree, but I think our founding fathers made that compromise in an effort to please each State and make each feel equal to the others. The entire State is represented in the Senate.

I'm disturbed by the fact that neither Russia nor the United States, and maybe no other major power, will ever agree to give the organization the kind of power it needs if it is to exert great influence.

Its decisions and the actions by its committees just don't have any impact—and that's frequently in our best interest. One committee on which I served in 1967 passed resolution after resolution with no seeming impact. The debate was interesting, enlightening and even inspiring at times, because the member states debated as if they thought the outcome of their decision on the resolution would determine the fate of the world. Of course after the resolutions were passed, that was usually the end of them.

In the committees many of the representatives took great delight in acting contrary to the wishes of either Russia or the United States.

This was where they had the votes. Of course, on the Security Council there was a tendency for the smaller countries to aline themselves with either Russia or the United States, and in too many instances the votes were obviously political.

These things do have an impact on the strength and influence of the United Nations. You said you thought Nasser was responsible for what happened between Israel and the Arab world, and that he had the legal right to demand withdrawal of the U.N. troops. I don't know. That may be true under the language of the agreement which put the troops there. But I have always felt and still feel that had Mr. U Thant refused to withdraw U.N. troops and called a meeting of the General Assembly or maybe the Security Council and possibly delayed the showdown until the big powers and even the rest of the world could speak out—that the 6-day war would have been prevented. I don't think Nasser would have started war in effect against the rest of the world. Neither would Israel have done so. But when the troops were withdrawn, I think about the only face-saving alternative Nasser had was to carry out the threats he made by moving his own forces into the area.

Mr. BINGHAM. Would you not agree, Mr. Fountain, that aside from that question—and that is a question which people will be arguing about, I think, for many years—would you not agree that it would be a better arrangement, if you are going to have U.N. troops, that they be there under a provision which provides that they cannot be withdrawn at the demand of one party?

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I quite agree there should be a distinct situation but I think in the interest of peace in the world as such and the need for it as such, that it should be paramount to the recognition of even the legal right of one nation even if Nasser had the legal right to request the withdrawal of those troops.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am sure you have heard U Thant probably speak on this subject. He says that he had the responsibility for the lives of those U.N. troops, that there were not very many of them there, the Egyptian forces were already moving in and he felt that with the documents as clear as they were that he did not have the right to expose those U.N. forces to possibly being killed.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. That is why I think he should have sought a meeting of the General Assembly, or preferably the Security Council, before making a decision.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Fountain.

Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Bingham, I believe you said each government had one vote in the United Nations.

Mr. BINGHAM. In the General Assembly, Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. How about Russia with three votes?

Mr. BINGHAM. As a matter of fact, sir, Russia effectively controls 11 votes in the General Assembly and it is true that it has the two extra votes that were agreed to in 1945 for the Ukraine and White Russia.

Mr. GROSS. When they start out with three, where do they get the other eight?

Mr. BINGHAM. Well, Poland, Czechoslovakia——

Mr. GROSS. From the satellite countries. I see.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mongolia.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I see where they get them. From a technical standpoint I just wanted to correct you that Russia does have three votes in the General Assembly.

You speak of the prestige of the United States in the United Nations. That prestige is largely represented, is it not, by the dollar sign? How much they can bilk us out of?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, sir, I don't believe it is. As a matter of fact, if I might answer that question, I think that for delegates from small countries to go to the U.N. and compare the behavior of the United States and of the Soviet Union is one of the greatest educations that you could possibly provide to those members. I have seen time and again nation's delegates who came to the U.N. thinking that the Soviets were pretty good guys have their eyes opened by the Soviets' performance.

I think of an occasion in the Trusteeship Council where the Soviet delegate wanted to bring out in the Council's report the possibility that the inhabitants of the Island of Rongelap might get leukemia from the fallout of our H bomb test when there was no evidence to show that they would get leukemia. All he would accomplish by that would be a propaganda victory over the United States but the poor people on the islands would suffer. Believe me, the delegates on that Trusteeship Council were quite capable of understanding what that Soviet delegate was doing to the human beings on those islands.

So I say that this is the great thing that happens every year, and that the performance of the Soviet Union is in many respects so bad and so completely hypocritical that the eyes of many of the delegates are opened when they come there.

Mr. GROSS. What do you suppose Mr. Ball was talking about when he appeared before this committee not long ago and spoke about the—I cannot quote him, the transcript will show—high price we have to pay at times in the United Nations to get the results that we seek? What do you suppose he was talking about? We have not any real estate to give away. What do you suppose he was talking about?

Mr. BINGHAM. I don't know what he was talking about. I do know that over the years the voting in the Security Council has been adverse to the Soviet Union so many times that they have had to cast over a hundred vetoes. We have only had to cast one in 25 years which indicates that the voting tends to go our way, not their way.

Mr. GROSS. Of course we have a big fat checkbook. There is not much in the bank except borrowed money but we have a big fat checkbook that we can use on occasions, and I am sure this has a good deal to do with our prestige in the United Nations as elsewhere in our dollar diplomacy around the world.

I thought that this session of the committee probably would be dedicated to the oncoming attempt to take another swipe at the U.S. Treasury for more millions of dollars to expand the U.N. in New York. I assume you are all for that, to put up some more buildings for the U.N.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think they need that space; yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; along with some nice high-rise apartments in that area so that they can roll out of bed and go to what they call work at the U.N. without even having to bother with that broken-down transportation system in New York City.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I agree that——

Mr. GALLAGHER. I hope you are not asking him to defend the city's transportation system. He is our colleague.

Mr. GROSS. We are going to lock horns over this issue sooner or later, Mr. Bingham, because I am not about to vote to give the United Nations at least $20 million to start some buildings down there.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think there are two different projects, Mr. Gross. I am sorry to say I am not an expert on this, by any means, but I think the apartments will be constructed under another arrangement and will not require U.S. Government funds.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes. The initial request for U.S. Government contribution to U.N. Headquarters expansion will be $20 million.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad you said initial request. That takes pretty good care of it.

I did not mean to interrupt you, Mr. Bingham. Do you have anything more?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, sir.

I did want to say that I believe the transportation system in New York City definitely needs improvements and I think the Federal Government should do more to help it. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLAGHER. You are on a new spending spree, Mr. Gross. We were not even going to get into that.

Mr. GROSS. That comes under the general heading of leading with your chin, Mr. Chairman.

New York is not alone in its transportation problems, including the area we are in right here.

You said something about the crime. I don't know just how you alluded to it a while ago in response to a question. We have that here, too, you know.

I once said when New York was having difficulty providing police protection for the United Nations that you ought to take that torch out of the hands of the Statute of Liberty and substitute a tin cup as far as the Federal Government is concerned.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The Statue of Liberty is in my district, Jersey City.

Mr. GROSS. That is all right; it goes for Jersey City, too, if you want to include it.

That is all.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Incidentally, when Congressman Broomfield and I were there one morning, the entrance to the U.S. mission building right across from the U.N. was all roped off. I was about to walk under the rope when someone pulled me back and pointed to a long metal tube just to the left of the door about 25 feet away and almost up against the building. The tube contained a bomb and apparently it had been placed there during the night. It took them 4 or 5 hours to get the thing removed. After removal, it exploded in some other part of New York. So, Mr. Gross, it really would have cost something, I guess, if that bomb had exploded in front of the U.S. mission just across from the U.N. We could have lost two Congressmen.

Mr. GROSS. There have been some pretty good bombings since then in New York.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Kazen.

Mr. KAZEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bingham, you say that the United States in our support for United Nations Development Fund, as well as other United Nations activities, must continue to supply a large percentage of the funds. If we are truly interested in the tasks to be accomplished and in strengthening the agencies that are engaged in these various fields, we must be relatively open handed.

Doesn't the same apply to every country that belongs to the U.N.? I mean, why is it that we should always be called upon to take the lead since we apparently have the same interest that every other country in the world has?

Let me put it the other way around. Certainly they should have the same interests that we have in worldwide development and peace and everything else. Why is it that we should always take the lead when actually it is more to their benefit in many areas as far as the work of the agencies is concerned? It is more to their benefit than ours.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Kazen, many western countries do provide a arger proportion of their national income for these programs than we do, so that in terms of our gross national product we are not asked to contribute more than is a reasonable amount. What I was getting at here is that, again referring to the Communist countries, they are very stingy with regard to these programs and the Soviets, for example, contribute only in rubles, not in convertible currencies, which means that those contributions are of limited value.

Mr. KAZEN. There is another issue.

Mr. BINGHAM. What I am saying is I don't think they have the same objectives we do in terms of wanting to help these programs. I think that, as a matter of fact, they do not look too good in the eyes of the other members because they are so chintzy. My point there was that I don't think we should be chintzy just because they are.

Mr. KAZEN. That is right, but what I was questioning was your statement that we should not be deterred by the meager, restricted character of contributions of other nations that are not at all interested in the achievement of the same objectives. I thought that once they belonged to the United Nations and they set up these agencies that would benefit many parts of the world that then they would certainly fall into the spirit of what the United Nations is and should be interested.

Mr. BINGHAM. Maybe they should, Mr. Kazen, but I am talking specifically and mainly about the Soviet Union and they maybe should have these same objectives but often they don't.

Mr. KAZEN. Maybe I should have started by asking you what you meant by other nations.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Soviet and the other Communist countries. I am not referring to Yugoslavia there, which has been a better member than they.

Mr. KAZEN. On the subject of the International Court of Justice and the Connally amendment, you will find a lot of people that would disagree with the position that you have taken here.

Mr. BINGHAM. I know that.

Mr. KAZEN. Where are your going to draw the line, as far as nationality is concerned, as to whether or not countries far removed from ours should make the decisions for us as to what is within the jurisdiction of the United States as a sovereign Nation and what is our own business and not that of anybody else in the world? I must say

that you put your opinion in pretty strong language, but you will get an argument on that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Kazen.

With reference to the Connally amendment, Mr. Yates and I have a proposal about proceeding for the first time with a criminal jurisdiction to the International Court in Geneva. This would relate to the question of air piracy and we suggest that might be a place where crimes of this nature may well find a suitable jurisdiction. It might be a pilot program for perhaps enlarging that scope.

Mr. GROSS. Could I ask one more question if you are ready to close?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Was there any discussion of this Military Staff Committee?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. Gross; there was not.

Mr. GROSS. Has that made any contributions to the peacekeeping activities of the U.N.?

Mr. BINGHAM. I believe it has on occasion, Mr. Gross. I have never been very close to that operation. We always had representatives from the armed services who were liaison with the Military Staff Committee, and I personally never worked with them so I don't have too much basis for judgment. I believe they were involved at any time that the United Nations had military responsibilities, and presumably that is true, for example, today with regard to Cyprus. Honestly, I don't know too much about it so I should not attempt to give you the answer.

Mr. GROSS. Have you ever heard of a time since the organization of the United Nations when a representative of a Communist country was not one of the officials of the Military Staff Committee?

Mr. BINGHAM. I believe they always are on that committee, yes, sir. I believe as a permanent member of the Security Council they have that right.

Mr. GROSS. Which makes a mockery of the allegation that the Korean war was a U.N. police action, does it not?

Mr. BINGHAM. Well, as I said earlier, the Korean war was a United Nations operation but——

Mr. GROSS. It was what?

Mr. BINGHAM. It happened only because the Soviets had taken a walk at the time the Security Council met so they failed to veto it.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the fighting of that war. The fighting of that war could not have been carried on through the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, could it?

Mr. BINGHAM. The Security Council delegated the responsibility for command in that war to the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The fact of the matter is that no matter how much of a peacekeeping force you might have, you could not fight a war of any magnitude in which Russia or the Russian satellites took an opposing position; you could not fight it through the United Nations; could you?

Mr. BINGHAM. That is absolutely correct, sir. I have said that earlier in my testimony that the U.N. can function only on the basis of agreement among the major powers and that is the hypothesis on which it was founded; that they would have to agree. And when they

don't agree on a major matter, then there is not much that the U.N. can do about it.

Mr. GROSS. So we would be serving ourselves well if we would insist that it be trimmed down to what it is, a debating society, and cut down the appropriations for the United Nations and put it on that basis rather than to rely upon it as anything of value insofar as preserving the peace of the world is concerned. You could not fight a war through the Military Staff Committee unless the Russians were joined in that war.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Gross, let my statement stand on that. I think that there are many ways in which an organization can be useful and in the peacekeeping field where the great powers are in agreement, and I would cite Cyprus today as such a case. We are in agreement with the Soviet Union that it is advisable to have troops, U.N. troops, in Cyprus to keep the Greek population and the Turkish population from killing each other. So it is useful. If we did not have the U.N., you would have to invent some other organization to send into Cyprus.

Mr. GROSS. I don't know if we would have to invent anything or not. If they cannot get along, let them fight it out and get it over with. I don't know of any reason why. I don't know why there should be a force over in the Middle East. When the 6-day war started over there they said to the U.N. force "Get the hell out of the way or we will run over you," and they got; didn't they? They didn't prevent anything.

Mr. BINGHAM. I know I am not supposed to be asking questions, Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. Go ahead.

Mr. BINGHAM. Would you be happy to see a war between Greece and Turkey?

Mr. GROSS. No; I don't want to see a war any place, having served in combat. No man could want war who has ever gone through that experience. After all, with 6 percent of the world's population, we can't police and finance the world. We are going broke trying to do it.

If they want to fight, then I assume that they are going to have to settle some of these controversies on their own. I am sick and tired of this country being mixed up in every quarrel that goes on around the world and acting as the policeman.

Mr. BINGHAM. We don't have any troops in Cyprus, Mr. Gross.

Mr. GROSS. What is that?

Mr. BINGHAM. We don't have any troops in Cyprus, they are troops of other nationalities.

Mr. GROSS. No; but we are contributing to the hiring of mercenaries, and when countries start hiring mercenaries to do their fighting there is something going on in that country and you better believe it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Bingham, for an excellent presentation.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me so much time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 3:35 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.)

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:40 p.m., in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee will come to order.

We meet this afternoon in continuation of our hearings on the United Nations.

Beginning in February of this year this subcommittee has been engaged in an in-depth study of the United Nations system. This undertaking corresponds with the 25th anniversary of the United Nations organization and is designed to provide us with guideposts regarding the future role of that organization and of its relationship to U.S. foreign policy.

Today we are pleased to have a number of witnesses from the private sector who have requested an opportunity to present their views on these subjects to the subcommittee.

Our first witness needs no introduction. He is Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger, executive director of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, who has been associated with U.S. support for the United Nations since the beginning of that organization. He is a gentleman of considerable scholarship whose insights regarding the past achievements and future prospects of the U.N. system deserve our close attention.

Mr. Eichelberger, we have your statement before us. You may either read it or we may admit it to the record and you could summarize it. We will be pleased to hear you under any circumstances.

STATEMENT OF CLARK M. EICHELBERGER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE

Mr. EICHELBERGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to appear before you and your committee. I have been before the committee quite a number of times in days gone by. I am aware of how many members of your committee found themselves on delegations of the United States to the General Assembly and the contribution they have made.

Mr. Fascell is responsible for a most penetrating study as a result of his experience in the General Assembly last year. He was very sharp in his criticism, but nevertheless very justified and held out a very hopeful note for what this country and what the nations must do to strengthen the United Nations.

I am not going to read my statement. I may summarize it a bit, but I would like to make a few other comments. I am more interested in the questions that might come from the discussion.

I should like to say that I am executive director of the Commission To Study the Organization of Peace, which was organized in 1939 to study what should take the place of the League of Nations. I was a member of a committee that very quietly met under the chairmanship of Sumner Welles and produced a rough working draft of a charter. I was at San Francisco.

The point I would like to make which I don't think I made strong enough in my written statement is this: If the San Francisco conference had not met before the war ended, I doubt that it would have been possible to have had a conference to write the Charter of the United Nations and, if so, it would have produced of a military alliance that the Soviet Union wanted without the machinery of economic and social cooperation and the many things that you pointed out in your report, Mr. Fascell.

I remember talking to President Roosevelt not so long before he died. He was obsessed with the danger of reaction hitting the new world organization as it hit the League of Nations. He wanted a conference to meet before the war ended and a provisional organization set up.

When President Truman turned away from having taken the oath of office, the first question he was asked was, Will the San Francisco conference meet the date set? He replied, "Yes." That was very wise, one could see a reaction setting in at the San Francisco conference. For illustration, the conference had to mark time for a week or so while President Truman could send someone to Moscow to talk the Russians out of the double veto and so on.

So we were very fortunate indeed that the conference met before the war ended. There were certain political problems that arose so quickly afterward, that the United Nations was absolutely essential, such as the presence of Soviet troops in Iran and so on. The United Nations was faced immediately with great human, social, and scientific revolutions.

John Foster Dulles said that no one at San Francisco knew that this country was experimenting with atomic bombs; and if so, no one could tell about it. So we entered the atomic age, later on the age of outer space.

Forty percent of the world had been under the colonial system. These people wanted self-government. People wanted something better in life. I think the United Nations was absolutely essential in that situation. We had suddenly become a world community faced with world revolutionary forces.

If there had not been that point of concentration, I wonder what the world would be like today. Sporadic fighting is going on all the time, yes. But at any particular time enough people wanted to respect the obligations of the charter to prevent a world war. Some observers believe the most important thing the United Nations did was to make it possible for the people that had wanted to throw off the yoke

of colonialism to do so in a comparatively peaceful manner by entering the family of nations through the United Nations.

I think communism would have had its greatest chance for a world revolution if some of the colonial people had not found independence peaceably and entrance into the family of nations through the United Nations. I know, Congressman, you faced the problem of altogether too many speeches and too many representatives of small states saying exactly the same thing in their General Assembly debates. But I am certain we would agree that that is much better than to have blocs of states fighting for their independence outside of an organized world society.

One of the great things the United Nations has done is to begin our world parliamentary system. I am amazed how some representatives of the new states without much background are able to adjust themselves to that system. Here the United States and the British with their sophistication and background in the parliamentary system can help these people very much.

I think the United Nations made it possible for the world to approach some of the scientific problems more easily. A statesman from one of the Asian countries asked me the other day, "What American Presidents made the best speeches before the General Assembly?" He answered his own question, "Two, President Eisenhower in his 'Atoms for Peace' speech and President Kennedy in his 'Outer Space' speech. Both dealt with a great scientific problem, projected a program in which the United States must play its part and take a lead."

So I think this point of concentration, the United Nations, has been absolutely essential. Now Congressman Fascell well points out some of the problems facing the United Nations today. Its vast machinery continues, including its specialized agencies. It is so ingrained in the world that it will be there.

But I share the worry about the lack of political success of the United Nations today. I think that must be overcome. One of the greatest problems is that the great powers do not fulfill their United Nations responsibilities fully. They can bypass the United Nations. The Soviet Union bypassed the United Nations in the Czechoslovakia invasion. The French today are in a terrible moral slump as a result of what they suffered in the war and they cannot be counted upon.

Let us face it. I am not here to discuss the merits of the conflict in Vietnam. One could make a very good case for the reasons why we intervened. One could make a different case. But the problem is that for 8 years the most important member of the United Nations has been waging war with 500,000 people on an issue that did not involve the United Nations and the world community.

One of the greatest questions that the world faces is how to bring the problems of Southeast Asia into the United Nations. A great mistake in the beginning was made when the French were permitted to reestablish their colonial system in Indochina; something that President Roosevelt was against and which occurred after his death. From that time until today many of the problems of that vast area have not been solved within the framework and principles of the Organization.

Now the United Nations will be as essential in the future as it has been in the past. Is there anybody who will doubt that the prob-

lems confronting the world in the next 25 years will be greater than in the last 25 years? Ninety percent of all the scientists that the world has ever known are alive today. Those men are going to confront the world with great scientific achievements and great advances.

Computers and similar inventions pose a threat to our human rights and privacy. We are scarcely ready to face them and control them.

If the arms race is not stopped shortly, it may go beyond the point of no return. Suddenly we are aware of the whole problem of the human environment. How many years can we go on before the threat to our environment will be beyond the point of no return? In U Thant's statement which I quoted in my prepared text, he gives the world 10 years to pull itself together, to build a global partnership, or it will be too late to arrest the forces of destruction.

Mr. GALLAGHER. May I ask you at this point about the impact of technology on democratic institutions and human values? Talking of the U.N., what assessment do you make as to the impact that technology is going to have on the question of war or peace and on democratic institutions throughout the world?

Do you feel the vast knowledge that we are acquiring creates a mystique of science so that the average person hesitates to even question scientific achievements and scientific assessments? Can this be manageable?

Mr. EICHELBERGER. I think you have raised a fundamental question.

Congressman Fascell raised it in his statement. The forces of science know no frontiers. The scientific achievements you speak of can only be manageable on a world scale. That is why I think we need a world society for which the United Nations is a visible expression.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What can the United Nations do along this line?

Mr. EICHELBERGER. It has called a conference on the human environment for 1972. Interest in the subject is mounting. Many groups are preparing material to submit to the conference. Certainly there is more interest in the subject and a desire to do something about it.

It may very well be that dealing with the problem of human environment is the thing that will restore the moral force and unity of the United Nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I ask beyond the question of environment. I really think if we want to do something about the problem of the environment, we have the technology and know-how. I am speaking of the effect on human rights, on democratic institutions. These questions impinge upon the relationship of Japan throughout the Far East with its vast electronic output, the influence that the United States has on Canada, whether we are going to be involved in an electronic imperialism of some kind.

We may not really need armies. The nations are so impacted by the economics of other nations, particularly through electronic interference with their economic policy. I am talking about computers now.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. You paint the most alarming picture of the threat of science to the future that I have heard.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I worry about it. I am interested in what your thinking is on it.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. My only thinking is that by constant discussion and conversation the world may be able to meet these problems. They cannot be met regionally, they cannot be met by a few nations by themselves. I think at this last session of the General Assembly there was a considerable discussion of the threat of applied science to human rights.

Our organization issued a report a few years ago pointing out the threat of modern science to human rights. It attracted more attention around the world than anything we have published except this last report of ours—"The United Nations: The Next 25 Years."

You are right, the world has to concern itself with that problem. I see no other place to do it but in the United Nations where you can have a world system to do it. When I speak of the United Nations, I am certainly not talking about perfection. I am not talking about a system that is perfect by any manner of means.

I am talking about the machinery, the universal point of concentration, global partnership, and the need of strengthening world law. Think what the world will be faced with in the next 25 years. The exaggerated sovereignty that some nations talk about today just can't be. Our society must exist to protect the individual and to protect the Nation; but national sovereignty as expressed by some nations today, for illustration the nations of the Middle East, is not possible if we are to have peace.

I think we are running into a very revolutionary period. I want to see the United States play a stronger and stronger role.

Mr. FASCELL. I gather this is what we want to do; that is, have a back-and-forth discussion?

Mr. EICHELBERGER. That is what I want, yes.

Mr. FASCELL. One of the problems on this very important point that you and the chairman are discussing right now, is a question of philosophy. Like so many other things in life, what is the human decision and how do you use the tool?

The next question is: What do you do with the gun? The problem of the assimilation of knowledge; of science and technology might be one that is almost insoluble. You could get into an escalation of machines. The U.N. is caught up in this problem right now.

Do they keep pace or don't they? Regardless of whatever philosophy might be evolved as a result of objective independent study, the truth of the matter is that the U.N. can no longer do with quill pens what everybody else is going to be doing with a computer.

So, sooner or later something is going to give.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. Right.

Mr. FASCELL. Once you get into that escalation, and that is exactly what it is because there is always a new generation of machines, and there are now even self-adjusting machines. There are some machines which are alleged to be on the verge of deductive and analytical reasoning. So I quite share your concern, Mr. Chairman, also yours, Mr. Eichelberger.

It seems to me one of the many issues that confront us, at least from an administrative standpoint, is how is the machine to be used for uses beyond simple office procedures.

That thought raises a question I really want to get to. Right now 80 percent of U.N. effort is social and economic development. I have felt that while this is essential and certainly humanitarian, it has tended to atrophy into a political mechanism. This undoubtedly has occurred because social and economic development problems lend themselves to solutions calling for cooperation and providing a sense of accomplishment.

Political problems on the other hand are less likely to find an aura of cooperation and any significant accomplishment is much more complex and difficult.

Another question I raise is whether we have not based our whole concept of social and economic development through the U.N. on a wrong concept as to what are the real needs of humanity. I am not disregarding the purely humanitarian aspects of economic development in terms of providing clothing, food, jobs, capital formation, industry, and other economic benefits.

I am questioning the focus. We are beginning to learn that lesson, let us say, in the United States as a result of years and years of thrust of our own programs since World War II. I am just wondering whether we are in the right approach at the United Nations level where because of the natural desire to get along, 80 percent of our effort is put in social and economic development and yet even that might really be questioned as being inordinately focused on purely economics.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. If you are putting it entirely on a humanitarian basis, I think, yes, it could be questioned. If you are putting it on a very practical basis—here is a part of mankind that is living below the subsistence level and we can't have a world like that. We can help other people help themselves and at the same time that helps the world economy.

I just don't think a few wealthy nations can carry an increasing number of nations when the gap becomes wider and wider.

Mr. FASCELL. I cannot disagree with that, Mr. Eichelberger, believe me. I have said that myself many times. I think we have reached that point in the life of the U.N. when every assumption must be reviewed and challenged, even by us.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. Right.

Mr. FASCELL. This is the purpose of my question to you as the dean of the nongovernmental groups and one who has dedicated a life to this service to mankind. I am anxious to have your view because this has concerned me.

I just attended a conference in Switzerland and one of the questions was, among many that we discussed, the impact of the youth of today in the United States on U.S. foreign policy. It does not take much to expand that question into one affecting all international problems and policies. Today, the impact of youth is a very legitimate question which one must try to resolve or understand.

In order to understand answers to that question, it is necessary to know what young people really want out of life. That immediately puts into question the whole concept of economic development; and a satisfactory political process. Philosophy of life is fundamental to the whole issue.

Is it possible that barefoot kids wearing ragged clothes, who do not get enough to eat, still are happy and satisfied and yet are only indirectly a part of the political process?

I have oversimplified a philosophical problem, but I have said enough to make the comparison. I keep questioning myself over and over again. Do I have a better answer than economic or social development, or responsive parliamentary process or a foundation of law as a basis for human conduct.

I don't have a better answer. But I do think that we have to keep questioning, as our young people question today, the values which we assign, the reasons we do things.

Is it a fundamental statement, for example, that a man is more satisfied with the maintenance of or struggle for an ideal or a purpose than he is with filling his stomach? If it is, maybe we ought to turn our attention to helping achieve those purposes.

It seems to me this kind of questioning is fundamental to the thrust the United Nations is going to take in the next 25 years. If the U.N. is to help solve the problem of man living with man, then I think this questioning process is fundamental.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. I think there are some Burmese who are much happier using elephants to carry their teak wood and pile it up than using modern trucks. Everybody is trying to get rid of the elephant and give them trucks. There are those problems.

The point is that the world is in a dynamic social revolution and if we could just say to the world it shall stop and people live in that kind of happy condition, they would. But people aren't going to let them.

Mr. FASCELL. You mean the other people won't let them.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. The restlessness you find in Africa and elsewhere.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I might say, Mr. Eichelberger, that the committee is honored in having three distinguished members of the Parliament of Sierra Leone here today. [Applause.]

Perhaps you would like to join the discussion.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. I think it was a chairman of this committee at one time, Mr. Carnahan, who was Ambassador to Sierra Leone. So I used to hear a great deal about Sierra Leone from him. I am sure they would agree—well, I think their position is clear without our discussing it.

Now getting back to the problem you were raising, the problem of war and peace. It is not just a matter of the economic condition of life, although that is part of it. At the last General Assembly you saw a certain restlessness on the part of the small States because they felt that the Soviet Union and the United States could get together to run the world without the rest of the nations.

On the other hand, they kept saying that the great powers should get together and solve the arms problem, particularly so the world could make progress. Certainly all of us favor the disarmament negotiations going on, but I think we must make it clear that these are part of a United Nations process and that the two powers are not going to try to reach agreement to the exclusion of the rest.

You said that in the last assembly, Mr. Fascell.

The agenda for the next assembly will have several weeks devoted to a discussion of the problems that are now confronting the world, the very things we are talking about. I would hope that the President of the United States will appear with the other statesmen and speak, but I hope his speech will have some very practical things that this Government will be willing to do. There is this impression that the

United States, like the other great powers, has bypassed the United Nations at its convenience.

I attended a ceremony recently of the signing of the nonproliferation treaty. None of our Government officials including the President and Secretary of State mentioned the United Nations although the United Nations had a great deal to do with starting the whole effort for a nonproliferation treaty.

There is not enough attention or thought given to the United Nations by our Government. I hope the President, when he speaks sometime in October, will challenge the United Nations to certain forward steps and indicate the part that we will play in them.

Mr. FASCELL. I will tell you one thing. If it were not for the nongovernmental organizations, there might not be any attention.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Frelinghuysen?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should like to express my regret to Mr. Eichelberger that I was unable to listen to his testimony as I have known him for many years. I have no questions to ask.

Mr. Eichelberger for a long time has been a leader in the search for peace, both on an individual basis and working with others. I would like to pay personal tribute to him.

The accomplishments of this one man are remarkable and in this case I think Mr. Eichelberger has done a remarkable job. It is my loss that I did not hear his testimony before my own subcommittee today. I was unavoidably squeezed because of the vote on the arms control authorization bill and then I had another obligation before this.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Eichelberger. We appreciate very much your being with us today and adding to this record with your outstanding thoughts on this subject.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. Mr. Chairman, if I may not prolong this, may I call attention to the fact that my organization has just produced a booklet "The United Nations: The Next 25 Years." I think we raised all the questions that have been raised today and tried to give a few answers.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Fine. We would like to have some copies of that.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, did we put Mr. Eichelberger's statement in the record?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Eichelberger's statement is in the record, yes.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. I hope I may have a chance to expand on it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Without objection that may be done. I hope you can come back again. If we did not have the other witnesses today, I am sure the members of the committee would like to exchange more views with you.

Thank you very much.

Mr. EICHELBERGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The full text of Mr. Eichelberger's statement follows:)

STATEMENT OF CLARK M. EICHELBERGER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the invitation to appear before this Committee. I have appeared before it a number of times, particularly when either Congressman A. S. J. Carnahan or Chester Merrow was Chairman. It has been a constructive Committee concentrating on the development of international organization. A number of its members have, throughout the years, been delegates to

the United Nations General Assembly. Congressmen Fascell and Whalley have produced a penetrating report on the last General Assembly to which they were U.S. delegates.

I have seen the United Nations develop from the beginning. The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, of which I am Executive Director, was organized in 1939 to study what would take the place of the League of Nations. It was my privilege to be one of a committee of five that during the war met under the Chairmanship of Sumner Welles to produce a rough working draft of a Charter. I was a Consultant to the United States delegation at San Francisco.

A great human and scientific revolution followed the Second World War. The world entered the Atomic Age and for the first time was faced with the possibility of total destruction. Later it became possible to explore celestial bodies. Forty per cent of the world's population threw off the yoke of colonialism and formed independent states. As a result the Membership of the United Nations which was expected to climb to 70 Members is now 126, with more Members expected. The population of the world has increased greatly since the Second World War ended and may double between now and the end of the century.

Under such circumstances, the world has needed a point of concentration to which all peoples could turn. This was the United Nations. It is hard to see how the world could have survived without the universal principles of the Charter, the common meeting place of the Organization, and the economic and social machinery of the United Nations family.

The United Nations has made the difference between the sporadic fighting which has gone on most of the time since the Second World War ended and a third world war. The Second World War was followed by a revolt of the colonial peoples. The seeds of this revolt are to be found in the Charter but no one anticipated that within two decades, forty per cent of the world's population would emerge from colonialism and form independent states. Many observers believe that this has been the most important contribution of the United Nations. It helped some of these people to independence; it welcomed most of them into the family of nations; it gave them an opportunity to participate in international community life. Without the United Nations it is hard to imagine what the world might have been like had this revolution occurred in anarchy.

I am sure that Congressmen who have served on United States delegations to the General Assembly would agree that the United Nations is the beginning of a world parliamentary system and a means of developing world law. There are those who would criticize the great number of speeches made in United Nations bodies, many of these speeches tedious and repetitious. However, it is amazing to see delegates of countries that have just won their independence, adjust themselves to parliamentary practice and to speak and sometimes speak ably, on the needs of their countries in relationship to mankind. And as the years have gone on there has developed, through the United Nations family, a vast mechanism to promote human rights, economic development and communications. The specialized and other agencies cover many fields of human existence from health to atomic energy.

There are those who believe that the United Nations will be most successful, for some time at least, in those areas where man's sovereign claims or ancient quarrels are not too dominant. President Kennedy in 1961 suggested that the Cold War be kept out of the colder regions of outer space and that international law and the law of the Charter be applied to outer space. He proposed that no state be permitted to annex a celestial body. A few years later, the nations further agreed that atomic weapons could not be planted on celestial bodies or carried in space ships. Much must yet be done to make outer space completely free from military activity, but when American Apollo 11 astronauts stepped foot on the moon, few people were afraid that this would usher in an era of celestial war.

The Members of the United Nations are now approaching the area of the sea-bed beyond the continental shelf in the hope that it too will be free from sovereign claims and be developed as the common heritage of mankind.

International law has been concerned with relationship of governments to each other. There is developing a higher law, world law, which controls the relationship of nations and individuals to world society. This is developing through the United Nations.

As the United Nations approaches its twenty-fifth anniversary, a mood of discouragement and frustration seizes some of the delegates. Secretary-General U Thant has said:

> ". . . I can only conclude from the information that is available to me as Secretary-General that the Members of the United Nations have perhaps ten years left in which to subordinate their ancient quarrels and launch a

global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population explosion, and to supply the required momentum to world development efforts. If such a global partnership is not forged within the next decade, then I very much fear that the problems I have mentioned will have reached such staggering proportions that they will be beyond our capacity to control."

It is the hope of many governments that the United Nations twenty-fifth anniversary ceremonies in the General Assembly this fall will mean a consideration of the problems confronting the United Nations and a rededication of peoples, and their governments to the principles of the Charter and a forging of the global partnership.

We have said that the problems of the world were so overwhelming at the close of the Second World War that man could scarcely have survived without the moral and political concentration which the United Nations provided. This is equally true of the future.

Can anyone doubt but that the problems confronting the world in the next twenty-five years will be even more perplexing than those of the last twenty-five years? Ninety percent of all the scientists that the world has ever known are alive today. We can expect a growing scientific fraternity to unlock mysteries that we cannot now contemplate. Unless controlled, the population of the world will double in the next twenty-five years. Interplanetary travel may be beyond the experimental stage. The threat to the human environment must be arrested and the arms race checked before it has reached the point of no return. To meet these problems the machinery of the world community which the United Nations represents must be greatly modified, changed and strengthened. In view of these problems—most of them universal, national sovereignty as we know it today will be untenable. The dignity of the individual must remain the final goal of international society.

The development of this world society during the next twenty-five years is a task that must be taken step by step. Many people, some of them forgotten, made self-sacrifices and heroic contributions to the development of the United Nations. Such efforts will be needed in the future. The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace has produced a document "The United Nations: The Next Twenty-five Years". This Report outlines the goals that must be achieved step by step. Obviously I do not have time to cover these points today. I hope you will have time to read the Report.

I want the United States to play a leading role in forging the global partnership for which the Secretary-General calls. I should like to refer to a point made by Ambassador Charles Yost in his testimony Thursday, April 23rd. He spoke of the necessity of expanding the United Nations plant on the East River. In 1946 most of the delegates agreed to establish the Headquarters of the United Nations in the United States. The choice was finally narrowed to New York City. Only this country, physically untouched by the war, had the energy and the facilities to build the Headquarters of the United Nations quickly. It is a source of pride to most Americans to feel that New York City provides the Headquarters for the capital of the world. The old League of Nations Headquarters taken over by the United Nations at Geneva have been expanded. The United Nations has offices throughout the world. Nevertheless, the center of its political life is centered in New York City.

I think it is important that this Headquarters remain intact and grow. An international climate has developed in the buildings on the East River of New York City. It must be maintained. But the buildings are outgrown. Consequently, it is important to the growth of the United Nations and to the pardonable pride of the United States that the Headquarters be expanded.

What is asked for is very little indeed—20 million dollars from the Federal government to be added to what the City of New York is contributing and what the United Nations itself is providing.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Our second witness today is Mr. Harvey Greisman, President of the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs. This organization is the collegiate affiliate of the U.N. Association in New York. Mr. Greisman is a student at Colgate University and we welcome him here this afternoon.

We have your statement, Mr. Greisman, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HARVEY W. GREISMAN, PRESIDENT, COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND UNITED NATIONS AFFAIRS

Mr. GREISMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a statement which I would like to read because it is short and I think it does present a point of view that has not been substantially examined by this committee in the past.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Please proceed.

Mr. GRIESMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a very great privilege for me to come before this subcommittee to present my views, both as an individual and as president of a national student organization. I am especially honored, Mr. Chairman, to be placed among such a distinguished list of witnesses, including those who have previously testified and those who will be coming before you shortly.

The various ambassadors, academicians and others whom you have already heard have given detailed testimony on many of the pressing issues now before the United Nations. While I may lack the substantive background and practical experience of your previous witnesses, I do hope to bring a different perspective to these problems, and perhaps some new approaches as well.

I want to first confess how pleased I am that such hearings as these are taking place within our Congress: that this subcommittee has seen the necessity to publicly explore the significance of the U.N. system—past, present, and future—does great credit—credit to our Government. By critically, yet constructively, examining the effect of this world body upon the international system our Government is adding to the United Nations 25th anniversary celebration in a most meaningful and productive way.

I am pleased as well for the forward-looking orientation that these hearings are assuming. For undoubtedly, it is much easier to find fault with an institution, to feel regret over past actions and to self-righteously express condemnation of others. However, we no longer possess that luxury, as time is not on our side, and our problems are at a critical stage.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has recently advised that if we do not soon forge a true "global partnership" capable of dealing with such fundamental and universal issues as the environment, development and the arms race, then man will have forever lost his preeminence over nature and machine. If this is a somewhat troublesome notion to members of the Congress, diplomats and heads of state everywhere, then it is certainly a very ugly prospect for my generation.

We want a chance. We want the same opportunity that past generations have had in helping to fashion the type of world they wanted. That is why I am here today.

I am before you today representing the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs. We are a national student organization, devoted to the study of international affairs, in general, and the United Nations in particular. The Council represents the merger of the two predecessor organizations in our field: the Collegiate Council for the United Nations and the Association of International Relations Clubs. With the recent consummation of that merger, our

membership includes some 500 chapters on campuses throughout the United States, as well as individual memberships.

We are essentially a coordinating organization, which services its affiliates with mailings on substantive international issues, and by supplying leadership techniques to campus leaders through our own manuals and Leadership Training Institutes. Our overall purpose is to provide U.S. students with the means, both substantive and mechanical, to express their views on international issues.

We are, of course, a nonpartisan, nongovernmental organization, with official nongovernmental status at the U.N. and at the U.S. mission to the U.N. As the U.S. affiliate of an international student organization (the International Student Movement for the U.N.), we are also entitled to consultative status with ESOSOC. The benefits that accrue from such affiliations, such as the availability of documentation and other resources, are in turn passed on to our members.

We also enjoy a very rewarding relationship with the United Nations Association of the United States of America, of which we are its collegiate affiliate. UNA–USA is doing exemplary work in its field, both by educating this Nation's citizenry on the fundamental issues of international affairs, and by formulating alternative policies which it feels will contribute to international stability, based on peace and justice.

UNA's recent work in its policy studies program has already been enthusiastically acknowledged by several of your previous witnesses. I could pay UNA no higher compliment than that. Moreover, UNA has seen the necessity to involve the youth community in its programs at all levels, in the field and on its national policy panels.

UNA has realized that in a world in which half the population is under 25 (and indeed in the developing countries the majority is under 21), it is highly feasible to involve my generation in the decisions which will affect our world, which may even eliminate it, but will certainly alter it. But not only should my generation be consulted on decisions because of their eventual effect on us, for that alone is not a substantially valid reason in my mind.

Rather, it is because now, more than ever before, we have the time, the resources, the knowledge, and most importantly, the desire to enter into the social arena and seek to improve what is presently there.

We are grateful to UNA for sharing our concerns. We wish that these sentiments were more widely held.

That private organizations and individuals can make a contribution to the work of the international community has already been established by this subcommittee. The nongovernmental organization can view the international situation, and this country's relationship to it, within a wholly different context than can the Government.

I believe these independent views should always be sought by Government officials, and that is why I regret one aspect of the subcommittee's proceedings. For as far as I know, I am the only student or "youth representative" scheduled to appear before you, and this is on my own expense and initiative.

Certainly if the private community is to be called in to express its views on the future of the United Nations, then the one segment of that community which has the highest stake in that future ought to be consulted as well. For even though we may lack the expertise on some

of the more complex issues before the U.N., we are well acquainted with the attitudes of the majority of the present population, and with the attitudes of the next generation of leaders—for we are that majority and we are the next leaders.

In the past, the student community has made its views known on a number of international issues, with varying degrees of competency and substance. The results of such endeavors, including my own organization's recent conferences, are most often in the form of resolutions, and are always made available to our Government's officials. However, rather than prepare a somewhat sterile list of policy recommendations, I would prefer to offer this subcommittee some general attitudes, and certain specific endorsements of recommendations already submitted by others.

As you know, much of what is voiced by members of my generation concerns the economic and social well-being of the individual—and this has certainly been the thrust of my organization. This is an area in which there is no room for hypocrisy. Here, the United States should practice in the United Nations what it preaches at home.

It is incumbent upon us to follow through with our commitment to the universal declaration of human rights, and join the 75 other countries in the U.N. which have already ratified the Convention on Genocide. I endorse as well the testimony of Ambassador Abram, which is in support of U.S. ratification of the Convention on Racial Discrimination.

I offer these two recommendations and endorsements as part of a much larger picture. For the United States, by casting its first veto not long ago, has told the world that it will not longer mask true intentions with deceptive rhetoric. We will act realistically, and vote as we truly feel. Think of the consequences, then, of further delaying the ratification of these human rights conventions. There are, of course, many more substantial ways of manifesting our concern for the individual through the U.N. system, but these require additional financial expeditures, a greater reliance upon the multilateral aid dispensing structures (which are soon hopefully to be made more efficient due to the Jackson report) and a firmer commitment to the charter's peace-keeping machinery.

I do not want to engage in specifics here, as I am limited both by my capacity as a nonpartisan, organizational representative and as one who follows several distinguished witnesses who have already given ample testimony on these matters. Nevertheless, it is hoped that with a more sound and equitable economic and social structure, based on the sanctity of the individual, our more serious political/military problems will be diminished.

I could not very well close without making reference to some general areas in which youth might involve itself in the work of the U.N. In this, the year designated by the United Nations as International Education Year, as well as the beginning of the second development decade, it seems that there is already a coincidence of interests between youth and the U.N. As youth is already somewhat involved in our National Commission for UNESCO, so should they be in the actual work of UNESCO.

We have already witnessed what occurs when the educational system is outdated and irrelevant to the needs of today's youth.

What better way for my generation to help determine new international standards of education than by actually participating in UNESCO's deliberations?

Certainly this Nation's Peace Corps, as well as the VISTA program, have demonstrated the need for, and usefulness of, having our young people participate in the fundamental aspects of nationbuilding. A U.N.-sponsored International Voluntary Service Corps, as proposed, could do much to implement those very basic and necessary concepts which the second development decade seeks to bring to fruition.

Of course, the U.N. and even President Nixon, in a speech to the General Assembly, have endorsed this general concept of a volunteer service. The U.N.'s Center for Economic and Social Information is already working with youth groups in sponsoring a youth development team to Latin America this summer. I expect that many more concrete ideas on how youth can relate to the problems of global development will be coming out of the U.N.-sponsored World Youth Assembly, to be convened this July. This is an example in itself of U.N.-student cooperation, as many student organizations, both national and international, have been intricately involved in many aspects of the preconference plans.

I urge the United States to fully endorse this assembly in every possible way. The U.S. mission has already endorsed this assembly in principle, as well as voiced its support of one other means of directly involving youth in the working of the U.N., which is to include a youth on the delegation to the 25th session of the General Assembly.

Surely there is no substitute for direct and practical experience in these matters, and I am confident that such an arrangement would benefit both the delegation and this country's concerned young people.

In summation, I will just say that my generation's concern for the welfare and improvement of the U.N. system stems from some very basic fears.

The nuclear sword of Damocles constantly hanging above our heads has taught us that there can be no true national security without international security. And even aside from the nuclear threat, there are those other imminent dangers to our well-being which know no national boundaries, such as the pollution of our waters and the contamination of our air. In short, either a common effort is made to solve our problems, and soon, or else we shall all suffer in common.

The United Nations is unique in offering the machinery necessary for such a global effort. As youth, we seek not to infiltrate, but to cooperate with it. We feel certain that the United Nations can help us, all of us. For surely it can never fail us; only we can fail it and ultimately ourselves.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Greisman, for an excellent presentation. On behalf of the committee I would like to compliment you and your organization for your interest, concern, and commitment to this very important area of our national community.

I have renewed hope that all will come out well when I see people who are as committed as you people are to doing this kind of job and preparing yourself for the day when these problems become yours. I might add that although this is an election year, we don't want to be replaced too quickly.

On page 5 of your statement you express regret that you are the only youth representative scheduled to appear before this subcom-

mittee. The subcommittee would be delighted to hear from other representatives. We made that quite clear at the outset when we announced our hearings.

If you could pass on the message to those who might like to express views, we will be very happy to hear from them. The hearings are at this point open ended and we could perhaps schedule others who may be interested.

The other point I might mention is that, as you said in your statement, you came here at your own expense. I might say that all of the witnesses have done that. It was not an oversight on our part. We invite everyone to particpate, but that is one of the sacrifices that citizens must make, as we do not have any funding to pay expenses to Washington.

On page 8 you refer to the World Youth Assembly which is to be convened in July. Do you know who will represent the American youth at that conference or how that selection will be made?

Mr. GREISMAN. I do not know, first of all, the delegates at this point, but I know how the selection is to be made. There is a private group of national organizations which is at this very moment selecting the actual youth participants.

This private group is made up of a number of national youth organizations including the Young Republicans, Young Democrats, even the Black Panthers, and various other national student groups. They are operating on their own.

Applications have been sent out and they are at this time making the selection process. They hope to have five delegates and, in turn, these names will be passed on to our Government and then it is up to our Government to accept these five delegates.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Do you feel that is a wise way to select the candidates?

Mr. GREISMAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Of course, if it works out, we can all learn something from you.

Mr. GREISMAN. I think it is important that the delegation come not with the endorsement of the U.S. Government, but rather with the endorsement of American youth. I think that will make a critical difference at the Assembly.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I agree with you. You don't believe they are inconsistent?

Mr. GREISMAN. No. At least it should not be inconsistent.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They could be consistent?

Mr. GREISMAN. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think it is an excellent idea. I am happy that you do approve of the selection process. This is something which has interested us here in the Congress, those of us who have tried not to intervene in any way. We want to make it a more meaningful experience and a more meaningful representation.

Mr. Frelinghuysen?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, should like to compliment Mr. Greisman on his testimony. I would like to ask what the Youth Assembly is going to accomplish. I assume from what you say, that you consider this a significant way in which youth not only in this country, but in the other countries

can be made aware of and perhaps contribute toward the United Nations as a useful organization.

Have you any idea what is going to be accomplished? Does it have an agenda? If it does, who decides on what the agenda contains? How does one keep it from being a period of chaos and confusion, instead of a period of contribution by youth to the basic organization?

Mr. GREISMAN. We hope it will not result in chaos. We do have an agenda. Of course, this is a U.N.-sponsored conference. There is, however, an international planning committee advising the United Nations on such matters as selection and on the matter of what items will appear on the agenda. This international planning committee is composed of 13 international student organizations. They, through their own means, have advised the United Nations—its preparatory committee—on what items we would like to see, as youth, on the agenda.

The agenda does contain items on world peace, development, education, and man and environment. There are many sub-topics, of course, for each of the major topics. In general these are the issues that are discussed in the normal course of debate at the United Nation General Assembly sessions and in the various commissions.

What they hope to accomplish is to examine these issues and see where youth can fit into some of the programs designed to implement solutions for these very critical problems. No one is really sure what will come out. They are going to find that at the assembly.

I think it is worthwhile to give these people a chance to do that. They are hoping to discuss the issues, see how it relates to their generation and then suggest mechanisms through which they can help their governments implement the solutions.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is the expectation that individual delegates will speak their own minds, or once they have been chosen will they speak their government's mind?

Mr. GREISMAN. They are to represent themselves, as individuals.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In other words, do you anticipate that the Soviet representative will be speaking as one voice or will they be speaking with the same freedom that you might anticipate of American delegates?

Mr. GREISMAN. These delegates will be coming as youth representatives, representing youth opinion in their countries, not their governments' opinion. They will be there as individuals. They will not be representing their countries. They are representing themselves as individuals, as members of the youth community of their respective countries.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You sound like an optimist. I wonder as a realist whether it is possible to distinguish between the two in a totalitarian society. They are not likely to have any views independent of what their government would like them to express at such a meeting.

Mr. GREISMAN. As youth, we are optimists on the outside, but I think we have some realism hidden beneath. Perhaps it takes the committee's questions to drag this out of me. Yes, we realize that in all cases freedom of speech, elementary freedom of speech, will not be guaranteed to some individuals. In some cases I do personally expect that the delegations will have the approving stamp of their governments.

I think this is unfortunate, but I think what we can get out of this is that even if these students are coming with the endorsement of their government, and even if these people are government-selected, once they come to this forum and see the interplay of debate and talk with other students who were not chosen by their governments, I think this will be a learning experience for them.

I think this is perhaps one of the most important aspects of such a conference. They will intermingle with members of their own generation who have not been subjected perhaps to some of the pressures they have been subjected to in their own countries.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How soon do you think the decisions will be made regarding the individuals to be recommended as delegates?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

I would like at this point to compliment you on that explanation. That is the hope in it all. I think you have given an excellent explanation of your participation and your hopes.

Mr. GREISMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to your question, Mr. Congressman, I believe the selections for the students on the American delegation are being made this week. The target date, I believe, was May 31 as the date at which time the American steering committee would submit the names to our Government.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Will there be alternative selections or is it a slate with no backup?

Mr. GREISMAN. There will be alternatives available. There have been many applications remitted to this committee. There are more than enough applications to choose from and more than five delegates will be chosen. There will be alternate delegates.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you. I have no further questions Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Fascell?

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Greisman, what effort, if any, is being made by the national and international young peoples groups to interest young people in careers in an international organization?

Mr. GREISMAN. I know as president of my organization we constantly try to interest our members and the student community at large to join in the efforts of the United Nations, but there are not enough places available. I think there is not enough willingness on behalf of these international organizations to accept people of my age.

So, sometimes the enthusiasm is generated by national organizations and the students do become interested and apply for positions, but they are turned down; sometimes for not very valid reasons. Unfortunately this is inhibiting many others from seeking careers in the international field.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you have any kind of statistics which might be available with respect to this problem? I am thinking now specifically of U.N. employment worldwide.

Mr. GREISMAN. Those are probably available and I will try to make them available to the committee. We may have them in our organization's files. I think on this point, with respect to this country's situation it is very difficult for an American to work for the United Nations.

No matter how much we seek to encourage youth in this country, we always temper that encouragement with a degree of realism. The U.N. just would prefer to accept people from other countries. After all, the U.N. is located here and that figures in heavily. It is very difficult for youth to become involved in the United Nations here.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, 80 percent of the personnel of the United Nations are located outside of the United States.

Mr. GREISMAN. That's right.

Mr. FASCELL. So aside from the young people of the United States, how about the young people of other countries?

Mr. GREISMAN. They have perhaps a greater interest than American students in joining with international organizations. I know that other organizations in other countries do encourage this of their membership. I do know that.

I think perhaps one other inhibiting factor is that students are sometimes dissuaded from joining an international organization because of perhaps the bureaucratic structure under which it operates, which is something that often manifests itself in the United States. The students are wary of organizations, especially ones that do not act on the critical issues of the day. This is a critical and inhibiting factor.

Mr. FASCELL. I noticed that myself. I wonder what is the answer.

Mr. GREISMAN. The answer is to improve the organization.

Mr. FASCELL. Yes, but it still will be bureaucratic and still an organization. I have never found a satisfactory answer to that kind of philosophy. What are you going to have, a disorganized mob?

Mr. GREISMAN. No, not at all.

Mr. FASCELL. All right. We are both not for that. I am not being critical of you. I have heard this statement many times. I am trying to find what the alternative is that is the improvement.

One of the alternatives I have heard expressed is get rid of all the present generation who are running things and put on some other people.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Fascell, the problem is that when we hold hearings on the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, half of the population of the world will be under 5.

Mr. FASCELL. That raises the question of perspective again, of which I am sure we are all aware. Just for the sake of perspective, what is the dividing line between your generation and the rest of the people? Is it an age 5?

Mr. GREISMAN. I think very definitely not.

Mr. FASCELL. I don't think it is either.

Mr. GREISMAN. I think youth is an attitude, it is a state of mind. You don't judge it by one's chronological age.

Mr. FASCELL. Maybe it is a mistake to refer to it as youth—seriously. I am just asking. I assume you are under 30 and that age has been used as a dividing line in this country for discussions on this subject.

If you say youth, do you assume the maturity necessary or does that infer something? Or if you say youth, does that necessarily infer all the necessary attributes?

Mr. GREISMAN. I think there are many members of your generation who agree with much of what my generation is saying and they are all for having themselves placed in the youthful category.

Mr. FASCELL. I certainly would concur with that.

Mr. GREISMAN. So perhaps we are not able to abandon the terminology, you like it so much yourself. I suppose everyone likes to be considered and called young.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, I don't know about the terminology. I just think it is essential, though, that we talk in perspective, and with understanding without the use of a label. Such as the statement: "I am for young people," participating in the U.N.

When you examine it might be more useful to say "Who applied for a job?" "Who was rejected?" "Who did the rejecting?" "Why was the applicant rejected?" That is more relevant than which generation you came from, it seems to me.

The truth of the matter is, if you talk about political pressure on the secretariat of all the international organizations to get something done, I doubt that the United States has that kind of influence. We are outvoted everywhere.

So who has the votes? When you examine that, it certainly is not the developed countries. I have just been through that experience firsthand in the United Nations, not only in committee work but also in General Assembly.

It is very difficult to put together a consensus if you happen to be one of the developed countries. It can't be done without reaching some agreement or some understanding with the developing countries. That is part of the process.

The point I am making is obvious. They really run it.

Mr. GREISMAN. I think it perhaps would be best if the United Nations could formulate some programs with the concomitant institutions necessary to carry them out—with places open for all.

Mr. FASCELL. The United Nations, you said yourself, really can't do anything. It is up to the individual countries, right?

Mr. GREISMAN. Exactly.

Mr. FASCELL. Well, the United States, for example, as a matter of policy might very well say, "We agree with Mr. Greisman. We would like to have Americans in the U.N. We would like to have young Americans in the U.N." And that is about as far as we get from a practical standpoint.

Mr. GREISMAN. There have been other countries who have been perhaps more active on behalf of involving youth in the 25th anniversary than the United States.

Mr. FASCELL. More active?

Mr. GREISMAN. Perhaps so.

Mr. FASCELL. Do you detect that something is wrong with our efforts, meaning the United States, to involve youth in the 25th anniversary?

Mr. GREISMAN. At the beginning I think there were some reservations, although many were valid.

Mr. FASCELL. Sure there were a lot of reservations as we discussed the various problems. Mr. Frelinghuysen touched on one. I think everybody is generally concerned over whether we get a demonstration in Central Park or we get together and have a constructive meeting on the problems of the world.

I think that is a legitimate question.

Another question is raised, how will the people be selected? It was decided that the United States would not support governmental delegations; that individual delegations should be selected by the

young people in their own countries, and not necessarily reflect or represent their government.

Fortunately that point of view won out. But I wanted to be sure that there was not some reservation in your mind with respect to the present efforts by our Government with respect to the Youth Assembly. As I understand it the United States fully supports it and is taking all the steps to be sure that our young people are involved and have the maximum of freedom. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. GREISMAN. Yes, I believe it is and we appreciate that. I think perhaps there is a financial aspect involved. I am not sure what obligation the United States has assumed in relation to this particular problem.

Mr. FASCELL. That is an interesting point. How free is youth? That depends on your philosophy. If I pay your expenses, are you going to be free?

Mr. GREISMAN. I think that is up to the delegation. I think it very well could be.

Mr. FASCELL. It seems to me that is an interesting point on how bad the groups want to participate. I am not sure, in other words, that I am for the U.S. Government paying the expenses of anybody in what is essentially a movement to involve young people.

Mr. GREISMAN. I think that it would be a worthwhile contribution to participate financially in a movement that would involve young people with the suggested outcome that has been made.

Mr. FASCELL. I have reservations, myself. That is strictly a personal opinion. I am sure that this is one of the problems that we are reviewing. I know it has been discussed with a lot of people.

Delegations coming from other countries, for example, have the important problem of transportation expenses, housing, food, et cetera. How is that going to be handled?

The Government could come up with the money I suppose. That raises some other questions about the nature of the youth assembly. If it is simply to be a direct reflection of the present governmental structures, I am not so sure I would be for the youth assembly at all. At least I would cast it in a different light.

That is the reason I brought up the question. What is the problem with respect to other people or delegations coming to the United States? I did not quite understand.

Mr. GREISMAN. The financial aspect of it?

Mr. FASCELL. Right.

Mr. GREISMAN. Essentially it is the ongoing costs of the conference that entail expenses that will have to be borne here in the United States, housing and that type of thing. I imagine the real serious problem is funding the delegations to travel here. That is where the major expense is.

Mr. FASCELL. As far as the conference itself under the auspices of the U.N., I would assume that the availability of office space, paper, communications, and other services is a U.N. problem, not the host government problem. Is that correct?

Mr. GREISMAN. The United Nations is assuming a certain percentage of this. The U.S. delegation is the one that insisted that it assume no more than—I forget what the exact figure was.

Mr. FASCELL. Just our share?

Mr. GREISMAN. Not more than a certain percentage will come out of the United Nations budget for this conference. The rest was to be dependent on contributions from private organizations and governments.

Mr. FASCELL. Didn't we have some documentation in the last Assembly about fixing the amount of money?

Mr. Chairman, if there is something on that, I think we ought to put it in the record at this point. I don't recall, myself. I seem to have a vague recollection of some kind of a resolution passed with some kind of monetary limitation on U.N. expenses. It had to be approved by the advisory committee and ultimately by the General Assembly.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You must be aging if you have forgotten that.

Mr. FASCELL. I was not directly involved.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Greisman.

Mr. GREISMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Our third witness today is Mr. Everett Lee Millard, executive secretary of People First, which has its headquarters in Chicago. We have Mr. Millard's statement before us.

The Chair welcomes you here this afternoon, sir.

STATEMENT OF EVERETT LEE MILLARD, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, PEOPLE FIRST, CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. MILLARD. If I might do so, I should like to go through my statement because it takes off on a line which I haven't seen explored in these hearings and perhaps you could simply use the copy for the statement.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We will include your full statement in the record at this point, if there is no objection.

Mr. MILLARD. I mean that I would like to read the statement, if I may, because unless you happen to have studied it, there are some points on which I should like to invite questioning and discussion.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Please proceed, sir.

Mr. MILLARD. The crisis which faces humanity today is so complex, so urgent and perilous that we must solve it together or else fail. It is a crisis of peace, of poverty, of resources and pollution, of morals and education, almost a universal emergency. I am here to urge this subcommittee to see its task in terms of the comprehensive whole, as a small part of the undertaking which must engage the labors of all of us, in this Nation and in others, if mankind is to survive.

I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before you today. I believe that these hearings are most valuable. The testimony has been impressive. Former ambassadors and representatives of the United States to the United Nations have urged upon you the need of the United States for the United Nations, and of the United Nations for the United States. Distinguished persons from institutes, universities, and endowments have come here to affirm that there are, indeed, "New Tasks for the United Nations," in the felicitous words of a topic of these hearings. And now private organizations are adding their plea for a comprehensive and constructive approach to the job.

My own role here is as a spokesman for much that has been unspoken. I do not appear as an ambassador, as a representative for an institution,

or as an officer of a highly organized political lobby. What I say speaks for many ordinary people whose hopes, whose lives and welfare ride with the prospects of ordering man's affairs "for a world fit to live in," which the purpose of People First calls "a common cause of mankind."

My name is Everett L. Millard, and I am executive secretary of People First and of the Conference Upon Research and Education in world government, or CURE, which it sponsors.

It seems obvious to us, as private citizens, that the problems of modern society have become inextricably complex and interrelated. Many of them can have no solution except by the common effort of all men. It is in this context that we must appraise the United Nations, as an agency for the benefit of us all, which must inevitably grow to govern many things which no single nation can govern within its borders, if anyone is to be able to control them at all. I cite the high seas, which are five-sevenths of the earth's surface, and the air which we breathe and the very keeping of peace itself.

There is an air of pessimism in the statement of many critics of the United Nations and even in the attitudes of some Members of the U.S. Congress toward its capacity for growth. The President of the United States repeatedly makes speeches on foreign affairs in which he does not even mention the United Nations.

But it is un-American, I think, to accept defeat in an area so vital to our interests and to our survival. The United Nations cannot grow by itself. It is something which we must help to build. If it didn't exist, we would have to invent it. Such jobs Americans can understand and do.

I cannot concur with the President in his neglect of the United Nations, or with Ambassador Lodge in his comparison of the United Nations to an airport at which it is "not the fault of the airport and staff if planes don't choose to land." In fact, if President Nixon doesn't bring his foreign policy in to land at the United Nations airfield, we may land in a worse international disaster than anyone cares to contemplate.

We have to identify ourselves as among the principal offenders. The fellow with the big American automobile is the polluter, not necessarily General Motors. And the Nation which devastates Vietnam under the illusion that it is saving the natives from communism looks like an international outlaw to many other people in the world.

It is not surprising that great nations like the United States or the U.S.S.R. do not take the lead in strengthening the United Nations. We have greater power than the smaller nations, and we are more nearly able to defend ourselves than they are. What is more, no great power can propose reforms of the United Nations structure without inviting a hostile reaction from its important rivals, who would be suspicious of its motives.

It is not even particularly unexpected that our country should be reluctant to change the established patterns of power. We are the establishment today, as Britain was at the time of our Revolution, and you don't change when you are ahead unless, of course, there is a pressing necessity to do so in order to stay ahead. Resistance to change is ingrained in human nature except among those who are starving or oppressed or insecure, and to whom any change is better than their

present suffering or peril. We are richer and freer and safer than anyone else and we may well be among the slowest to accept change.

What is astonishing is that we should so grossly misread the temper of those less fortunate than ourselves. I remember hearing a member of the U.S. Congress assert that few member nations of the United Nations would support proposals for its improvement, ironically at the very moment when a big majority of the member nations were defying the major powers to adopt a resolution calling for a discussion of reforms. Let me review this history for a moment and then point out its implications for the deliberations of this subcommittee.

Away back in 1955, when the General Assembly of the United Nations last debated the subject of a review of the U.N. Charter, it was notable that several of the less powerful nations spoke in urgent terms of the need for increasing its power as a world parliament and a world authority. You will find samples of the debate in the United Nations on that occasion on pages 150–157 of the fifth edition of "Freedom in a Federal World," the report of the Conference Upon Research and Education in World Government, of which we have furnished a copy to your chairman and of which we will furnish additional copies to the members of this subcommittee on request.

At that time, all but 10 of the smaller nations voted in favor of a conference to review the Charter of the United Nations, as its founders provided at San Francisco in 1945.

It is now 1970, the 25th anniversary of the United Nations, a good time to take stock whether to scrap it or to strengthen it. And it would be a good time for the Congress of the United States to take a much more searching look at the attitudes of those who are the clients of the United Nations, who look to it as their shield and protector and their hope for existence.

Last December a coalition of less powerful nations insisted upon placing on the agenda for the 25th anniversary session of the General Assembly a debate of the need for a review of the charter. This was, in fact, a sort of a mini-revolt against the major powers, the U.N. "Establishment" which has consistently opposed calling the review conference though the General Assembly formally approved it in 1955.

Again, in this instance there were impassioned pleas from the "Third Force" nations that humanity rescue itself from mounting perils before it is too late. Again the great powers dragged their feet.

The decisive vote in the General Assembly was 69 nations in favor of placing a discussion of charter review on the 25th anniversary agenda to 11 against and 22 abstentions. The 69 nations were mostly the smaller and less powerful ones. The 11 opposed were mostly the Soviet Union and the Communist power bloc. The 22 abstentions included the remaining veto powers, among them, to our shame, the United States, and most of the European and British Commonwealth nations. There is a profound significance here, and a great opportunity if we take the trouble to analyze and understand it.

Most important is the fact that the initiative came from the "Third Force" nations, as it should. An initiative from Russia or from ourselves would lead mostly to a propaganda battle and to recriminations. An initiative for United Nations reform from less powerful nations merits not our scorn, not our opposition, but our study and our sympathy and, in whatever way we can best give it, our support.

Therefore, we support the hearings of this subcommittee and the resolution, House Joint Resolution 1078, which Chairman Cornelius Gallagher has introduced for the appointment of a presidential commission to study and make recommendations on the United Nations and its functions, and on the participation of the United States in the United Nations during the 1970's.

I should like to take this opportunity to particularly commend the report of Congressmen Dante Fascell and J. Irving Whalley, "To Save Succeeding Generations," both for its severe criticisms of the shortcomings of the present United Nations, and for its knowledgeable recommendations for improvements which may be attainable without a drastic overhaul. I believe that this report shows the kind of analysis of what needs to be done that comes out of the personal experience of these two Congressmen as members of our delegation to the United Nations.

And I should like to say a word in praise of the recent report of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace "The United Nations: The Next 25 Years," by its chairman, Louis B. Sohn, professor of international law at Harvard University. a longtime contributor to CURE's discussions and now a consultant to the State Department. His study embodies the kind of imaginative and constructive thinking America needs.

This is not the time to go into a detailed discussion of specific improvements and reforms. I should like to incorporate by reference into this statement our report, "Freedom in a Federal World," which for several years has been, I believe, the most thorough examination of this subject in print. Among the material which this book includes is a draft for revision of the United Nations Charter to give it the powers of a government of international affairs, and a list with brief biographies of some 350 current contributors to the studies of our conference.

On the feasibility of revisions I should like to make only a few general remarks. Some small changes in the charter of the United Nations have already taken place. More are needed, desirable and practicable. Some observers like to say that the United Nations cannot be more than the sum of its parts. But you can say the same thing about the United States, which is to the pride of all of us a great deal more than the sum of its parts.

At no point can anyone truthfully say that the job is impossible. It is only tremendously difficult in many ways, and I refer you again to our book for arguments that if we have the will, there is a possible solution for every obstacle.

The United States should study with great care the kind of United Nations it wants. A strong U.S. policy toward the United Nations will make a strong United States. What is good for humanity is good for our country and for its citizens. With this basic principle, the world wants and will welcome our wisdom and our leadership.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, has anyone brought up the matter of this agenda item in the United Nations, the placing of the charter revision item on the agenda of the United Nations next fall?

Mr. Gallagher. It has been mentioned. I don't believe there has been an in-depth discussion.

Mr. MILLARD. I hear it so often said that we would not get support of the smaller and less powerful nations of the "Third World" if we attempted to exercise an initiative for strengthening the United Nations for reform. As a matter of fact, the evidence is that we might have a lot more support than we had anticipated.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Millard.

On page 2 you state that we must help to build the United Nations and that this is vital to our interest and to our survival. What specific suggestions would you offer on this point and in what direction should we proceed in the building of the United Nations?

Mr. MILLARD. I can also endorse the suggestions which I believe will come from Mr. Donald Keys or Mr. William Claire from the World Association of World Federalists and the World Federalists, United States, of which I am a member and officer, and these are, I think, close-range suggestions which have a great deal of practicality and would not require for the most part any real changes in its charter or a conference to review the charter.

There are many things which we can do in an immediate perspective. The report by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, I believe, looks farther into the future. One of its recommendations, I think, is particularly good, and I think really the central one, that if we strengthen the system of representation in the General Assembly, we will have given it the capacity to grow in the direction of world law.

Someone mentioned just now that the United States is swamped as one of the 126 nations. This is absolutely true. Obviously we need a better system of representation before we can give more power to the United Nations. I think this is perhaps the pivotal change which we should try to encourage.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Sir, in connection with the question of charter revision, do you believe that the United Nations can be updated and strengthened and made more relevant to the task confronting it without charter revision, but through some other means as some other witnesses have suggested, or do you think that the charter revision is itself the way?

Mr. MILLARD. I feel we ought to approach this kind of question in much the same way an American corporation or, for that matter, a corporation anywhere in the world approaches the question of its future.

You are likely to have a plan for the next year and a plan for the next 2 and 5 and 10 years, perhaps a timetable, maybe not in terms of exact years, but a timetable for evolution and for growth and for development and perhaps for change of emphasis or whatever it might be.

I think that if we look ahead, we can see recommendations such as those of Mr. Don Keys, who is our observer for the World Federalists at the United Nations. I think you can see such revelations as this is as things that can be done in a fairly immediate future.

I think you look ahead to the sort of recommendations that Professor Sohn and Mr. Eichelberger make in their report and you see directions in which we clearly should go and you may find steps that you can take in such a direction. If you examine our book, "Freedom in a Federal World," I think you will perhaps have a clearer picture of where we would like to go.

To get from here to there is a bit difficult. It is like a man said in some Southern context, "You can't get from here to there." As a matter of act, you can. It just sometimes seems as though it is terribly difficult. It is terribly difficult. It is a supreme effort of the human community if we can do it. I am very much in favor of the immediate steps.

I think repeal of the Connally amendment would be a difficult thing to do. You would get tremendous opposition. If you do repeal it, you would not have accomplished a great deal. That is why I mention a more representative system in the General Assembly of the United Nations, perhaps a more representative assembly, such as in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If you want to amend that to a 4-year term, you would pick up a lot of support.

In connection with that, since the Soviet Union is, in fact, opposed to charter revision and since it can also veto any charter changes, would it not be counterproductive to move in that direction, knowing that we can't get there?

Mr. MILLARD. I think it would not be counterproductive.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Would it not divide the organization even further?

Mr. MILLARD. I think not necessarily so. Some people say, and I think the State Department has sometimes said, that charter review is a kind of can of worms or Pandora's box; if we open it, we may wind up with a worse United Nations than we have now or none. I can't see this, because the power of the Soviet Union to veto changes in the charter does not include the power to impose a worse charter. I think there are a lot more people who would oppose amendments intended to destroy or damage the United Nations than the very small numerical quantity of nations which would oppose strengthening the charter.

So, I don't see the deteriorating. I do see a very serious question, perhaps the most serious, but certainly not an insoluble one, of maneuvering through the coming years and through proposals for strengthening the United Nations in such a way that we secure the assent of the Soviet Union and of the other interested nations—you could mention China or the British Commonwealth or the United States of Europe, other powerful interest groups—to this sort of progress.

We have seen the painful procedure that has gone on for a decade or more and may go on for another decade or more in constructing a United States of Europe, but we are all in favor that this should happen, I think, and it will strengthen international organization in one of its most important single areas and I think that we have to contemplate that an effort to strengthen the United Nations is going to be as massive and must be as persistent an effort as it has been to build the United States of Europe.

I don't think that the resistance of the Soviet Union or of communism is anywhere near so monolithic as some people would like to assume. We have a chapter in this book, but I think as you examine the interests of this Soviet Union, a great many of their interests coincide with ours and progress is not impossible. I am not an optimist, but I certainly am not a hundred-percent pessimist.

I think maybe we have one chance in five of accomplishing anything like this before we have a catastrophe, but I am on the side of

the one chance in five. Mathematically that is a great deal better than no chance. It is infinitely better than no chance.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What essential change in the United Nations structure do you feel cannot be accomplished without charter revision?

Mr. MILLARD. I think the most important one is this question of representation. I don't see how the United States is going to give greater power, or Russia or some other nations or some other larger powers—I don't see how the larger powers are going to be willing to give greater lawmaking authority, let us say, to the United Nations, unless the system of representation is sufficiently equitable that we have a proper place.

We can see it very clearly in our own instance. I think if we examine the interest of other people, such as the Soviet Union, it is equally clear if we look at it from their point of view.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What other point do you suggest?

Mr. MILLARD. I believe that those are two of the principal ones. The United States and Russia are the principal opponents of United Nations reform. I don't think we need to be. I think we need to guide such tendencies toward reform wisely. I think it is very significant that, for instance, the Scandinavian nations are very strongly for a reform and a strengthening of the United Nations.

I believe that you are probably aware that the parliamentary group for world government in the Danish Parliament includes all but a couple of Communists or mavericks of some sort in the Danish Parliament. The same sort of situation obtains in Norway.

There are similar groups in Canada, Britain, and Japan, some 17 nations in all. This is a significant thing. I think that one or two of you gentlemen are members of Congress for Peace Through Law and this is, I think, one of the real hopes for America and for the world.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Frelinghuysen?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As a member of Congress for Peace Through Law I am thoroughly confused by your testimony, because I am not sure what your message is. You seem to be saying that charter revision is essential if the United Nations is to grow. Yet you waffled when you answered Mr. Gallagher's question about whether the Soviet Union would not oppose charter revision and whether it might not be counterproductive.

You said, as I recall, that we should work in such a way as to secure the assent of the Soviet Union. Are you contending that the only way for really significantly strengthening the United Nations is through charter revision? You do not think that an attempt to secure charter revision, which results in disagreement among the major powers, will weaken the U.N. and not strengthen it?

Surely, as a practical matter there is no automatic salvation in charter revision. I have not found one thing you have advocated that could not be accomplished without charter revision, except perhaps a drastic reshuffling of the individual votes of member nations in the Assembly.

I think the member nations would be most unlikely to go along with this proposal if this is what you propose. Surely the pressure from the smaller nations is not to enable the larger nations to exercise more power than they presently do in the United Nations.

I assume the pressure by the smaller nations is because they feel there has been a certain sluggishness on the part of the major nations. I doubt very much whether your criticism of the U.S. position is fair. You say that the United States is not trying to strengthen the United Nations and you denigrate the President's references to it. I wonder in what way you think the United States could dump the problem of Vietnam on the United Nations.

Surely President Johnson tried hard enough, but the United Nations has the basic sense to know that it cannot at this stage cope usefully with a problem like that. So it is a refusal on the part of the international community to accept responsibility, not an unwillingness on the part of the United States to share the responsibility for the problem of Vietnam, that is at issue here.

What exactly, to get down to cases, do you think will develop through charter revision that can't be done without charter revision? And don't you as a practical matter foresee troubles by using the charter revision approach?

Mr. MILLARD. I foresee troubles in any instance. I think we have to be bold enough to attempt to solve the problems that confront us by correspondingly strong measures.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I am not sure whether charter revision is a strong measure or a disastrous measure. I would suppose that the United Nations can cope, without charter revision, with the problems of pollution.

It can also cope with the problems of the seas. It presently is examining those questions and it does not require charter revision to do that. The will is there in those areas.

You don't need charter revision. So, I am not sure you are not sloganizing by suggesting that charter revision is a panacea for anything.

I would like one instance, other than a drastic shift in the way member nations vote so as to give big nations more votes in the General Assembly. I guess this is what you are saying, what you would envisage.

I don't know whether our friends in Sierra Leone would be enthusiastic about giving us votes on the basis of our wealth and population. They may think they do not have enough now of a role in the governing of the international organizations.

Mr. MILLARD. I think there is a good answer to that, Mr. Congressman. I hope I don't leave out any parts of it. I am going to go to the center of this, if I may, and try to offer some considerations which might occur to us as we attempt to explore this path.

In the first place, it does seem to me that the United States can't go very far in giving greater power to the United Nations, particularly in the area of peacekeeping——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Did you say it can or cannot?

Mr. MILLARD. Cannot go very far, particularly in the area of peacekeeping, unless we feel that there is a sufficiently valid representational system so that its votes will be responsible. I think this is a case for responsible government at least in those areas which we do try to give to the United Nations.

We would not attempt to govern the United States with a system like the United Nations, for example. Peacekeeping is so important that it is crucial, it is essential. Unless we get peacekeeping as we go

along, not necessarily within 12 months from now, but certainly within the reasonable future, the sort of testimony that this young man from the United Nations Association has been giving about the faith of the future generation is going to have the most ominous sort of answer.

It does seem to me if we examine this, that we should be very carefully considering—I am not trying to be an arbitrary authority on this matter, but I think we should examine very carefully with our friends from Sierra Leone——

Mr. GALLAGHER. In a minute I am going to yield to the gentleman from Sierra Leone.

Mr. MILLARD. Yes. I think we ought to examine very carefully whether in order to secure stronger powers for the United Nations to give its writ of authority a broader run in the affairs of the earth, they might not seriously consider a reapportionment of the representational system, which would in turn encourage the United States to be willing to give stronger powers to the United Nations.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If I understand you, and I may well not, you are suggesting that we should not take the leadership in strengthening the peacekeeping responsibilities of the U.N. unless there is a drastic shift in the methods of voting at the U.N. If you were playing God, what kind of votes would you give to the United States that would enable us to take a major role in developing more effective peacekeeping machinery? You are definitely telling us we should not take the initiative in strengthening or attempting to strengthen the peacekeeping function unless there is a dramatic shift in the present voting arrangement.

Mr. MILLARD. I hate to come on as an isolationist, but as a matter of fact, I have to confess I am a Republican. I am a retired officer in the U.S. Naval Reserve, and I feel just as strongly as a good many of my very conservative friends about awarding the powers of life and death to a nonrepresentational World Assembly or World Court.

I think it is an important thing that this should become a competent international parliament if we are going to attempt to give it some really decisive powers in this area.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. So, you are saying we should not attempt to strengthen peacekeeping under the present method of earmarking funds, voting in the Assembly, the role of the Security Council? You say there must be a drastic shift in the structure and development of what I guess you are calling a parliamentary system?

Mr. MILLARD. Yes. I think there is a very definite limit upon how far we can go in giving additional powers to the United Nations in its present unrepresentative condition; yes, sir.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I don't know why you are rapping the knuckles of the present administration for not doing more if you say you would not do as much as we are attempting, because the structure is wrong.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am not going to get involved in this Republican dialog.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I might say this is not a Republican position that our witness is taking.

Mr. MILLARD. I feel that as we direct attention to the need for United Nations reform, we put ourselves in a much better position with respect to immediate problems, such as Vietnam. If we had

called to the attention of the United Nations the fact that reforms were necessary if it could not take on the problems of Southeast Asia, we would be in a much better position to hold the fort, pending securing some sort of international agreement.

The fact of the matter is that our greatest culpability in Vietnam in my estimation is the fact that we have not tried anywhere near hard enough to strengthen the United Nations so that it is capable of taking over such a job.

That is a broad statement, but I do believe in this area what I am saying is applicable.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Your reasoning escapes me still, Mr. Millard. I have enjoyed listening to you, but I think I disagree with most of what you are saying.

Mr. FASCELL. But you don't know why.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As I understand it, I do know why. I think the witness is being thoroughly unrealistic in suggesting that the member nations would agree to a drastic shift in the voting strength of those nations. I would suppose an increase in the power of the Security Council, and a greater degree of control by the major powers over the smaller powers, would not be agreeable to a great majority of the member nations.

For that reason I think we are talking in circles.

Mr. MILLARD. Congressman Frelinghuysen, I should like, if I may, to make an observation on that, because it seems to me that what I am supporting here with instances is the validity of the study by the presidential commission which Congressman Gallagher has proposed in his resolution.

I think we need to explore many of these questions much more thoroughly than we have and I think that some of the assumptions upon which we have been basing our reasoning in the past may not prove to be as valid as we have thought. It is only a suggestion, sir.

It is a suggestion that we should study these matters much more deeply than we have.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I could understand your endorsement of Mr. Gallagher's resolution and it is very commendable of you to take that position.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I do, too.

Mr. MILLARD. You can get a better argument between Republicans sometimes than you can get between Democrats and Republicans. I think world law is a very genuine conservative goal, because it is the conservatives of our world community who, I believe, have the very greatest stake in world order, just as it was at the time of our American Revolution and the writing of the United States Constitution.

There is a great similarity there. I think Republicans are right at the heart of it, as are all our citizens.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Fascell?

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I think the discussion between you and Mr. Frelinghuysen has sufficiently clarified your position if it was not clear before. The whole purpose of the committee's study is to do exactly what you are suggesting. Obviously there will be no major changes, either administratively or charter revisions, in the United Nations unless the United

States is prepared to review its own positions and come up with possibilities of action.

It seemed to all of us that the 25th anniversary was a good time to do that. It takes a joint effort on the part of the Congress and the present administration to make that kind of review. To at least consider the axiom that charter revision is a can of worms, which it may very well be, but at least we ought to take another look at it and see if there are some that we can make.

So far as the representation question is concerned, the problem is that given the demographic distribution in the world today and the national boundaries that exist, that you may very well wind up with another representational imbalance.

Certainly if you had a representation in the United Nations General Assembly based on the number of citizens per district, for example, as we do in the United States—the United States could very well find itself in a very inequitable position.

Mr. MILLARD. If I might answer that part, because I might forget the first part of your question.

There has been a considerable study of representation systems and no one that I know of supports a pure population basis and I don't think that a basis of electrical energy or education——

Mr. FASCELL. Or number of miles of railroads.

Mr. MILLARD. Yes, that sort of thing, won't go very well in Sierra Leone, for example. And I don't support it. However, in our book we have examined the possibility of a system of representation based on the square root of population. In other words, a sliding scale, a square root, an exponential or logarithmic scale.

Mr. FASCELL. It is just a criterion for representation?

Mr. MILLARD. Yes.

Mr. FASCELL. As a criterion for representation you can use anything?

Mr. MILLARD. That happens to come out with still a very strong representation for small nations and a representation which is more realistic for the United States.

In the most recent calculations we made, I think, we came out at 15 United States representatives in the House of Peoples out of 533, something of that nature. In other words, it would be considerably more than now, but nowhere near as great as it would be on the basis of population.

The same thing would happen in China.

Mr. FASCELL. The point you are making is there are actual criteria which would lead to a different base, which might give you some reasons to lead to substantial changes in the function of the organization politically?

Mr. MILLARD. A possible compromise. I think some less powerful nations might be very willing to consider such compromises.

Mr. FASCELL. The point is still valid, of course, that now is the time for us to take a look. That is what you are basically suggesting?

Mr. MILLARD. I think it is worth noting, too, that for the past several years there have not been any fulltime employees of the U.S. Government in the Department of State or in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency responsible for continuing studies in the area of international organization and strengthening the United Nations.

You are proposing that we fill in this gap and undertake such a program. I can't praise you too much for doing so.

Mr. FASCELL. We are in agreement on the basic objective and what you have been trying to do diligently is to stay away from specifics.

Mr. MILLARD. I am not trying to tell you how to do it.

Mr. FASCELL. Your point is that there are specifics which are available for consideration.

Mr. MILLARD. Precisely.

Mr. FASCELL. They have been proposed by a great many experts that have devoted a lifetime of study to the problem.

Mr. MILLARD. I think the U.S. Government has to get into this sort of study. You are doing the best thing that has been done for quite some time.

Mr. FASCELL. I appreciate your being here and testifying and answering our questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Millard.

Mr. MILLARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Reverend Klotzle, we welcome you here.

The bells have rung and we must be leaving shortly to go to the floor. If it is agreeable, we will place your statement in the record at this point and you may summarize it for us.

STATEMENT OF DANA E. KLOTZLE, UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION

Mr. KLOTZLE. I congratulate the chairman on his display of bravery. Whenever you ask a clergyman to summarize a statement, you are apt to get a longer speech than the statement itself.

Mr. FASCELL. Something like a Congressman might also do.

Mr. KLOTZLE. Be that as it may, I would like to zero in on one or two points that seem to me to be very significant as we evaluate the 25th anniversary year. I happen to be an optimist myself most of the time. If you reread history and if you go back and refresh yourself in terms of the anthropological history of man, I am impressed by the fact that it took three and a half million years for man to reach the point where he wrote the Babylonian Code. Then there was a short jump and a skip until he got to the Magna Carta, and then there were a few more steps before he got to the French Declaration of the Rights of Man.

Now I have gone by the Mosaic Code and The Sermon on the Mount and a lot of other things. Then there was quite a spell before we got to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

I would like to zero in on where I think the problem lies insofar as the strengthening of the United Nations is concerned and that is that we have not yet had time as a human organism that is still in process to develop the experience, the understanding, the psychological know-how which will eventually be needed to make an international community work at the level and pace at which we all want it to work. That is one thing.

The second point I want to make is that it seems to me that the United States of America has an especial responsibility, I have said in this statement, to greatly strengthen the United Nations.

Incidentally I do not believe that tinkering with the charter is the answer. It does not make any difference how much you change the charter. We know in this country the problems we face in spite of the fact that we have probably one of the best constitutions, the best Bill of Rights, perhaps the best in all history. Yet we still have problems.

The problem still has to do with helping man to find the will, what Rollo May calls the "intentionality to fulfill our highest human aspirations."

I think one of the greatest things the Congress can do in this 25th anniversary year is to remind the country that the United Nations is really pretty much the creation of idealism, which began in this country. It has these antecedents that I mentioned before, that really the United Nations, if not as American as cherry pie—being a Bostonian, I make the suggestion it is as American as apple pie—nevertheless is close to the idealism which has developed in the American people.

I do not believe that the American people are necessarily going to follow the ways of violence and war forever. I think there is another part of our history.

What I am saying, as one who is not a cloistered theologian, since my responsibilities throughout the year has been in the international field on three or four continents, is that we need to stress the affirmative. We need to give some real solid backing to the idea that the United Nations is not a foreign import at all. It was Franklin Roosevelt, and I so state in my statement, who convinced Churchill and Stalin to form the United Nations, to put the idea in process before the end of the Second World War.

I have made some other suggestions here which I hope you may have time to read, but basically it seems to me that we must convince ourselves of this basic fact that man, though he is a creature in the process of becoming, nevertheless does have and has demonstrated in enough individuals a capacity for ethical living, for spiritual living, if you want to put it in those terms, of being willing to share with his fellow human beings around the world to give us hope and optimism.

I think this is the emphasis that will carry us through to the second 25 years of the United Nations.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Klotzle.

Mr. KLOTZLE. Would you be willing to include my consensus and my statement, too, which I think is the only document of its kind that I know about.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We will be very happy to include it. Without objection, it will be included.

(Statement and consensus follow:)

STATEMENT PRESENTED BY REV. DANA E. KLOTZLE, UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVE FOR THE UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Committee, the Unitarian Universalist Association of Churches which I represent at this hearing unanimously resolved at its annual Continental meeting held at Boston last July "to rededicate our loyalties and energies in full support of the United Nations" as it enters its second quarter of a century of service to mankind on October 24 of this year.

In a detailed statement of Consensus approved by 1800 delegates representing all of our states we affirmed our basic ethical conviction "that man possesses the ethical and spiritual qualities to create the universal human community called for by the prophets of the world's great religions."

Mr. Chairman, our optimistic faith in man's growing ability to forge a United Nations strong enough "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" is akin to that spirit of innovation which brought forth a Constitution and Bill of Rights based on the premise that free men have the capacity to govern themselves and to develop their highest potentialities.

Sir, we pay meaningful honor and homage to our founding fathers when we recall that the basic plea for a United Nations was sounded even before the end of the Second World War by an American President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, seconded by Winston Churchill, the greatest pragmatist of them all. These two realists painfully aware of the devastation, destruction and death which had already cost the lives of fifty million individuals declared in the Atlantic Charter (August 14, 1941) "that all Nations for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of force and the establishment of a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling together in safety within their own boundaries and afford assurance that all men in all lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want—securing for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security."

In fact, it was President Roosevelt who persuaded Churchill and Stalin to lay the foundations of the United Nations while the war was still in process. The formal signing of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco on June 25, 1945, and the location of its headquarters in New York City are directly traceable to the American belief in man's capacity to eliminate violence, war, poverty, ignorance, and disease from the face of the earth. I respectfully submit, Sir, that the United Nations is not only as American as cherry pie (apple pie in my native Boston), but that our country bears a special moral and political responsibility to support and strengthen the world body at all levels.

During the 24th General Assembly, Mr. Chairman, two sensitive and concerned members of Congress, the Honorable Dante Fascell and the Honorable Irving Whalley, served on the U.S. delegation and presented a most provocative report to the Congress, as you know, called "To Save Succeeding Generations." The report stated in part that—"The United Nations, whatever the flaws, remains the embodiment of man's unending quest for peace with justice and opportunity for a better life for all men." The report then asks "What can and should the U.S. Government do?"

Sir, permit me as a full time Non-Governmental Representative to the U.N., acutely aware of the need for United States initiatives at the U.N., to respectfully suggest several items for your consideration.

First, that our country officially recognize the Peoples' Republic of China and take the necessary initiatives in the General Assembly which would permit that nation to take its rightful place on the Security Council. I have just returned from a speaking trip to Canada and confirm that it is only a matter of time before our neighbors to the north extend relations with Mainland China and, therefore, be in a position to enjoy the economic and human benefits forthcoming. The news photo portraying Henry Ford in Moscow is indicative of the changes that must of necessity be made in our relationships with the U.S.S.R. and China. Second, the United States must become more actively involved in assisting black Africans in South Africa, South West Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Angola, and Mozambique to throw off the yoke of white supremacy. Statements by U.S. representatives calling for an end to apartheid do not mean much when measured against our refusal to serve on the U.N. Council for Namibia (South West Africa); the financial support given South Africa by the private sector; the military support given to Portugal, which enables this NATO ally to repress black millions in Angola and Mozambique through the use of 160,000 troops.

Third, if the U.N. is to become a really effective instrument for peace the United States must repeal the Connally amendment and demonstrate its faith in the international body by submitting disputes to the International Court and accepting decisions rendered.

Fourth, the United States must ratify the Conventions and Treaties pertaining to basic human rights if the U.N. is to develop an effective rule of world law.

Fifth, most important is the need for this country, as the strongest power economically and militarily on earth to yield a measure of national sovereignty to the United Nations as an example to other nations.

Do not misunderstand me, Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the support given by my country to the U.N. in the areas of economic and social development. Our support of the U.N. and its several specialized agencies, though greater than many nations, is woefully inadequate, if placed alongside the moral and material resources we could place at its disposal.

We can, Sir, and we must give support to the U.N. if we are "to save succeeding generations from the scourage of war" and halt what Secretary General U Thant has termed "the mad momentum of the arms race." You may be assured, Mr. Chairman, that increased support for the United Nations will receive strong backing from the members of our Churches.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF CONSENSUS ON THE UNITED NATIONS



PREAMBLE

We religious liberals of several backgrounds and cultures seek to strengthen the United Nations in its efforts to eliminate war, discrimination, poverty, and disease by reaffirming our belief in the essential unity of the human family. We believe that the common bond of concern which grows out of the universality of man's social needs and ethical aspirations will make it progressively possible for all men and nations to move beyond nationalism toward world community.

We recognize that man possesses the ethical and spiritual capacities to create the universal human community called for by the prophets of the world's great religions. Through this consensus, designed to strengthen and implement the principles of the United Nations Charter, we call upon our members to reaffirm their commitment to the objectives and activities of the U.N.

A. We reaffirm the major objective of the U.N. "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

1. Disarmament.

We support U Thant's assertion that "the greatest danger facing the world today is the nuclear arms race (which) has to be halted and reversed if humanity is to survive." We underline the conclusions of the U.N. Committee of Experts that were nuclear weapons "ever to be used in numbers, hundreds of millions of people might be killed, and civilization, as we know it, as well as organized community life, would inevitably come to an end in the countries involved in the conflict."

We hail the initial steps on the long road to general and complete disarmament: the establishment of a hot-line, nuclear-free zones in Antarctica, Latin America, and outer space, the partial test-ban treaty, and the non-proliferation treaty. We acknowledge the painstaking negotiations through the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament and other bodies. We admit that the stockpiles of both conventional and nuclear arms have risen markedly, even while the nations have negotiated; and that five states have become military nuclear powers, and at least a dozen more, civilian nuclear powers. We call for these urgent next steps: a comprehensive test-ban treaty; the limitation, reduction, and elimination of offensive and defensive nuclear missiles; additional nuclear-free zones, including the sea-bed; and collateral measures registering and reducing conventional arms until there is general and complete disarmament under international control. These goals should be reached quickly, and in no way thwart the legitimate right of all nations to the peaceful uses of the atom. Savings resulting from disarmament measures can be applied to more constructive programs, both domestic and international. While there are risks to nation states that disarm, these are more than out-weighed by the protection from nuclear destruction.

B. We reaffirm the objective of the U.N. "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations" and "to develop friendly relations among nations."

2. Universal Membership.

We recognize the necessity to include all states in the U.N. The work of the organization has been distorted through the continued absence of the People's Republic of China. We favor the immediate inclusion of the People's Republic of China in the U.N. We further urge that North and South Korea, North and South Vietnam, and East and West Germany be admitted to U.N. membership in the belief that such membership will lead to a reduction of tensions in these divided areas.

3. Refugees.

We support the continuing efforts of the U.N. to meet the needs of refugees through the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees and the U.N. Relief Works Agency assisting Palestinian refugees. We call upon Member States to broaden the High Commissioner's mandate which is presently limited to meeting the needs of refugees forced to seek haven outside of their original nation or territory. U.N. agencies should be given the power to assist refugees in all situations. We urge increased efforts by the U.N. to develop a permanent resettlement program for Palestinian refugees commensurate with their right of self-determination.

4. Decolonization.

We commend the U.N. for its vital role in aiding many former colonial areas to achieve independence and nationhood. We endorse the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted in 1960, which asserts that "the subjection of peoples to alien subjection, domination, and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights, is contrary to the Charter, and is an impediment to world peace and co-operation."

Millions of Africans are still living under colonialism in Angola, Mozambique, and Southwest Africa. We call upon Portugal to grant immediate independence to her colonies. We urge application of increasing sanctions against Portugal and Southern Rhodesia.

We support U.N. resolutions that condemn South Africa's apartheid system as a "crime against humanity." We also condemn the tacit support given apartheid by the major trading partners of South Africa, i.e., United Kingdom, U.S.A., Japan, West Germany, and France. We urge our governments to contribute generously to the U.N. Trust Fund for South Africa, the U.N. Educational and Training Program for South Africa, and the U.N. Trust Fund for refugees from Namibia (Southwest Africa) and the Portugese territories.

We approve U.N. action calling upon South Africa to withdraw from Namibia and to permit the legal administration of the Territory, the U.N. Council for Namibia, to guide it to full independence.

C. We reaffirm the objective of the U.N. "to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character."

5. Economic and Social Development.

a. Second Development Decade.

We support the Second Development Decade planned by the U.N. for the 1970's. We regret that the goal of the First Development Decade of the 1960's (which called upon the developed nations to contribute one percent of their gross national product to assist the developing countries) fell far short of achievement. We especially approve the U.N. Development Program which assists the low-income states to make more fully productive the vastly under-utilized potential wealth of their human and natural resources.

b. Population and Food.

We are much encouraged by the progress of the developing countries to increase food production by nearly six percent in 1968. We note with alarm, however, that this splendid effort was more than half offset by an annual population increase of three percent. Therefore, we urge expansion of current U.N. programs to moderate population growth and call upon our countries to contribute generously to the Secretary-General's Population Fund which supports these programs.

We endorse the priorities set by the Food and Agricultural Organization, namely, the introduction of high-yielding varieties of basic foods, closing the protein gap, reducing waste and improving the quality of rural life. We urge the creation of a new U.N. agency on protein production and distribution, and a U.N. Food Reserve to meet famine.

c. Human Environment.

We are aware that the world will soon be unfit for human existence unless prompt steps are taken to cope with problems of air and water pollution, erosion, and the effects of biocides. We commend the recent efforts of the U.N. to coordinate techniques to preserve, protect, and improve the natural environment, and to identify those aspects which can best be solved through international agreement. We endorse the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment planned for 1972.

d. Draft Declaration on Social Progress and Development.

We agree with the basic principle of this draft Declaration which states that "all peoples and all human beings without distinction as to race, color, sex, language, religion, nationality, ethnic origin, family or social status, or political or other conviction shall have the right to live in dignity and freedom and to enjoy the fruits of social progress and should contribute toward it."

D. We reaffirm the objective of the U.N. "to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms."

6. Human Rights.

We reaffirm "our 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."

We commend the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in 1943, as "a common standard of achievement of all peoples and nations." We believe the drafting of this instrument was in itself a memorable and dramatic act of faith in man's capacity to develop a universal ethical code governing the behavior of nations and peoples, despite the broad diversity of cultural, religious, legal, social, and economic systems. We rejoice that the Declaration has acquired high political and moral authority. We endorse the proposal of the Economic and Social Council for the election of a U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights. We urge ratification by all States of the two Human Rights Covenants — Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Civil and Political Rights — and Human Rights Conventions not yet ratified, especially on genocide, the political rights of women, anti-slavery, and forced labor.

We pledge our full support for the Declaration on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination adopted in 1963. We urge all states that have not done so, to sign this Declaration and implement it promptly in their national statutes and practices. We urge that the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Intolerance and of Discrimination based on Religion and Belief be promptly adopted and ratified. This would ensure "the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief, and freedom to worship, teach, and practice religion."

We support U.N. efforts to "ensure the most careful legal procedures, and the greatest possible safeguards for the accused in capital cases, where the death penalty obtains." We favor the abolition of the death penalty by all Member States.

E. We reaffirm the objective of the U.N. "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."

7. Pacific Settlement of Disputes.

The Security Council, the General Assembly, the Secretary-General, and other organs of the U.N. have had an impressive record of maintaining international peace in the face of civil war, international war, and other disputes. Immediate crisis situations call for improvement and extension of existing U.N. peacekeeping machinery. A cadre of U.N. observers should be formed and given the necessary logistical and political support. We commend those nations which have trained and made available stand-by forces, and urge that new forces be made available. We urge the creation of a professional U.N. peacekeeping force recruited from all nations and fully committed to the principles of the Charter. A new U.N. peacekeeping fund could be developed to which individuals, foundations, and nations could contribute. In all these measures, there must be an initial imaginative fulfillment of existing obligations by member states, using existing machinery, and the early devising of new machinery.

8. Role of International Law.

Peace depends upon the progressive codification of time-tested international norms which even now provide the nations with the basic foundation for a world legal system. We commend the U.N. for its successful efforts to adopt rules of procedure in the Security Council, General Assembly, and the Specialized Agencies which, by providing a common "frame of reference," and "practice," enhance the development of international law.

We call upon our respective governments to demonstrate practical support for international law by regularly submitting disputes to the International Court of Justice for adjudication, and to agree to abide by Court decisions by adopting the Compulsory Jurisdiction clause of the Statute of the International Court of Justice. We urge faithful support and implementation of U.N. resolutions as a practical method of strengthening the enforcement powers of the U.N.

9. The Role of the Secretary-General and Secretariat.

The U.N. has been most effective whenever the Secretary-General has taken the initiative under Article 99 of the Charter to resolve disputes through mediation, conciliation, and informal diplomacy. We concur with the recommendation of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace that "members provide the Secretary-General with political advice and counsel in matters in which his personal diplomacy and initiative are crucial." We also urge Member States to provide the Secretary-General with the personnel, transport, and other logistical support so that he may effectively implement peacekeeping operations voted by the Security Council and the Assembly.

We support the Secretary-General's efforts to recruit international civil servants of the highest possible calibre, willing to give their full loyalty to the U.N.

10. The Future.

Although the Charter of the U.N., like the constitutions of many states, is an imperfect instrument, we concur with U Thant's observation that the present Charter is "adequate," if Member States resolve to live up to its principles. We urge our respective governments to follow the recommendation of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace calling upon all nations to "recognize that the Charter is a constitution and observance of its principles and use of its procedures is not a matter of choice or diplomatic convenience." We favor a liberal and dynamic interpretation of the Charter to permit the U.N. to meet new needs through the adaptation, improvement, and extension of existing bodies and procedures.

We are convinced that the future success of the U.N. depends upon the increased willingness of our own nations to yield a measure of national sovereignty to the world body in the interest of peace and security for all. We recognize our mutual responsibility for encouraging our respective governments fully to utilize the organs and procedures of the U.N. and the International Court of Justice to settle disputes.

We further call upon our governments to increase financial contributions to the world body, and particularly to the U.N. Capital Development Fund and the U.N. Industrial Development Organization. We note with alarm that only a tiny fraction of the funds spent by member states on armaments is used in support of the U.N. and its agencies. The U.N. may gain in effectiveness as it develops financial resources of its own.

The U.N. Charter can be amended and possible amendments should continue to be studied so that, as national sovereignty inevitably lessens in a shrinking world, the strength of the U.N., and especially of its peacemaking functions, can increase concommitantly.

Therefore we religious liberals resolve to rededicate our loyalties and energies in full support of the U.N. as it enters its second quarter of a century in 1970.

11. This Consensus.

This consensus is adopted by the 1969 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association of North America, consisting of a broadly representative group of laymen and ministers. This consensus reflects a substantial preponderance of opinion, although not necessarily unanimity

on all points, of the majority of delegates present at the General Assembly. This may, or may not, represent a majority of members of our local churches and fellowships. Since this denomination cherishes and recognizes both congregational polity and the freedom of individual members, this consensus presumes to speak neither for all delegates to the 1969 General Assembly nor for all members of our Unitarian Universalist churches and fellowships. We recognize that strong differences of opinion may exist on specific questions among sincere and thoughtful Unitarian Universalists, notwithstanding our underlying unity and our common religious affiliation.

Submitted by the Board of Trustees on behalf of the Advisory Committee to the Division of Social Responsibility.

Mr. FASCELL. I think you have touched on two very important points, Reverend Klotzle. I think that methodology in structure is important. I think a statement of principles is absolutely vital.

Underlying the whole thing is what man himself wants to do. Without that kind of motivation you don't really have anything. When you talk about the assembling of all mankind, as Mr. Millard suggests in his statement, in order to solve the intricate problems which are about to engulf us, nobody can disagree with that.

The problem, of course, is how do you get the people toegther? For a long time, in my philosophical discourses, I used to think that about the only way we could do it would be fear from outer space would drive all mankind together for a common purpose. But that is a negative approach and I don't like to be negative.

I would rather be positive and affirmative. Therefore, what it really involves is a constant search for and action with people to seek for themselves in an affirmative sense those solutions which are for their benefit, and sometimes that is extremely difficult to do.

So, it might very well be, as some people have suggested, that the key to this whole problem really is human motivation. How do you get it in the normal process of give and take of the "reality of life"?

We know what the ideal is; we know what the realities are. The problem always is to get from the reality to the ideal.

Mr. KLOTZLE. What I am really trying to put forward is the notion we ought not to allow ourselves to become discouraged. We want as much as we can get in this stage of human mystery, but we must not to allow ourselves to become discouraged if we don't hit the jackpot all in the same day.

I used to think you could bring in the kingdom of God on the weekend. Now I think it is going to take Monday through Friday in addition.

Mr. FASCELL. That is what I call realistic idealism. That is my philosophy of life.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I see you are not discouraged and are one to be realistic. Yet I wish we had time to get into the sort of contrariness of your statement here as to the inconsistent things that we do, such as our support the United Nations, the goal of the United Nations. You state here it enables our NATO ally to repress black millions, which is absolutely true.

How do we overcome these inconsistencies in the policy developing stage that apparently we are in? Do we throw them out? Do we break up NATO? What do we do about inconsistent positions such as you mention?

Mr. KLOTZLE. I think we have to try to educate the people in our country to the fact that we are signatories of the charter and that we have undertaken certain obligations, solemn obligations under the charter, just as some of us feel we have solemn obligations under the Constitution and Bill or Rights, which even though we do not always agree with those who espouse ideas different from ours, nevertheless it must be protected. If we do that, we will build the kind of public opinion which will make it possible for us not to become involved in South Africa——

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am not talking about that. Assuming now that we all feel what is going on in South Africa is something that we can

totally oppose, how do we bring to bear the fact that we need NATO as part of the imperatives of life, which include Portugal and Spain and Greece, vis-a-vis the need to proceed along the moral lines of the U.N. principle?

This is the sort of inconsistencies we must live with.

Mr. KLOTZLE. Your premise——

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is your premise.

Mr. KLOTZLE. Without arguing the question of war and peace at this point, I would put forward the suggestion that we could still provide Portugal, if this be our desire, with all of the necessary accouterments under the NATO system, but we could also make it very plain that none of these materials could be used by Portugal to equip armies.

In South Africa that holds down the people there.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We can do that. That is part and parcel of the legislation we pass each year.

Mr. KLOTZLE. I do think the Congress has to, at one point, determine whether or not it is necessary in this nuclear age to have the Azores, for example. I think there are a lot of questions that come up in that connection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We are now on the second bell. We must leave. I want to thank you very much, Reverend. I hope someday you can come back and exchange further ideas.

The subcommittee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:15 p.m., in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee will come to order.

We meet to continue our hearings relating to the 25th anniversary of the United Nations Organization.

This afternoon the subcommittee will receive testimony from four private witnesses. They are, in the order of their appearance:

Rabbi Gershon B. Chertoff of Temple B'nai Israel, Elizabeth, N.J.

Mr. Robert H. Cory of the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the American Friends Service Committee.

Mrs. David G. Bradley, vice president of the League of Women Voters of the U.S.A., accompanied by Mrs. John Ahern, the incoming foreign policy chairman of the League of Women Voters.

Mr. Jack McGann, legislative aide with the Liberty Lobby.

I am particularly delighted to welcome Rabbi Chertoff before this subcommittee. Rabbi Chertoff is one of the distinguished civic and religious leaders of the State of New Jersey. He is a very knowledgeable gentleman in international affairs and has evidenced deep insight and concern with the problems of peace and war.

I am certain that his testimony will contribute significantly to our undertaking as we attempt to reevaluate U.S. policy toward the United Nations.

Rabbi Chertoff, we have your excellent statement before us. It runs 12 pages and, since we have four witnesses today, and have to divide the time amongst them, we would be happy to put it into the record at this point and have you summarize it orally in about 5 to 10 minutes.

You may proceed in any way you wish and, if there is time, we will have opportunity to question you. I am particularly delighted to welcome you, not only as a fellow resident of New Jersey, but as a personal friend.

Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF RABBI GERSHON B. CHERTOFF, TEMPLE B'NAI ISRAEL, ELIZABETH, N.J.

Rabbi CHERTOFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The need for reevaluation of the relationship between the United States and the United Nations is so overwhelming, one is led to ask why House Joint Resolution 1078 was not proposed long before now. What is required is nothing less than a complete reorientation of our basic approach and policies toward the U.N.

The study of history confirms the premise that ethics and power may not be separated in relations among nations. A country that asserts that its international policy is motivated by purely ethical considerations is irresponsible. On the other hand, a policy based on power alone will not lead to fruitful relationships, but can only cause in other nations a spiral of fear that will inevitably lead to hostilities. A well-balanced foreign policy must therefore take into account both the claims of conscience and the demands of power.

Unfortunately, our original concept of the United Nations as it deals with international problems was based on a misreading of history and was guided by misplaced idealism. History should have taught us that any international organization, be it the U.N. or its predecessor, the League of Nations, is a political body.

The U.N. is not a juridical entity nor a world community. It is a concert of nation-states engaged in the pursuit of their national interests through the exercise of power politics. Its role is one of accommodating the power relations of the various members toward one another. Even if there were a precise legal definition of aggression, national interests would pervert its meaning.

The U.N. Organization itself reflects the realities of power. The distinction in the Security Council between permanent and non-permanent members and the privilege of the veto both acknowledge the hierarchy of power.

This is as it should be, for it prevents the frivolous use of the vote by small states to pass resolutions which pose no threat to them, but which may be harmful to the great powers.

Last March the United States joined Great Britian in vetoing a resolution calling upon the British to take even military measures to end what was termed the "illegal" regime in Southern Rhodesia. Yet Ambassador Yost indicated that this did not signify a change in American policy toward the veto. If that is so, we have not yet learned that such sentimentalities have no effect in the world.

By forgoing the use of the veto, we become hostages to the other permanent members and particularly to the Soviet Union, which is not at all embarrassed by the exercise of the veto.

No instrument of the United Nations is simon pure, nor are their personnel who execute U.N. policy political eunuchs. U.N. observers and peacekeeping forces are no solution. In Lebanon in 1958 the U.N. observers, against the weight of the evidence, denied Egyptian and Syrian aggression. When Mr. Nasser demanded that the U.N. forces withdraw from the Sinai, the Indian and Yugoslavian commanders made it clear that they would abandon their positions regardless of the will of the U.N.

We have the right to say to our delegates: Ask not what the United States can do for the United Nations, but what the United Nations

can do for the United States. This does not mean we can disregard the moral consequences of the political positions we take in the United Nations. The conscience of the country would not stand for it.

There is a collective conscience in America that will not be denied. A large part of our citizenry lacks faith in the United Nations because its members too frequently mask their pursuit of power, domination, and egoism by a patina of idealism.

Congressmen Fascell and Whalley in their report, "To Save Succeeding Generations," revealed the extent to which the General Assembly has debased the very concept of human rights for "below the belt" political purposes.

The Assembly—

They wrote—

approved a one-sided resolution which castigated the alleged mistreatment of civilians in Arab territories occupied by Israel but completely ignored the plight of Jews in Syria and Iraq. The United States publicly deplored this action and abstained from voting on the resolution.

The growth of the General Assembly from the original 51 to the present 126 states and the change in its political complexion requires a reexamination of our attitudes and policies. The United States no longer can muster a two-thirds majority when required for "important" questions. The Afro-Asian group of states has a built-in one-third to checkmate us. Together with the Soviet bloc they are approaching the two-thirds majority they will need to control the General Assembly.

Irresponsibility is becoming apparent in the attitudes of underdeveloped countries toward U.N. investment funds. These recipient states are trying to bypass controls over funds by the contributing nations. Poverty grants no license for irresponsibility, and it must be recognized that smaller powers are as likely as larger ones, to cater to their own vested interests.

The Afro-Asian bloc has power not only in the councils of the U.N., but in the Secretariat. Our present Secretary-General, himself a native of one of the smaller nations, recognizes this power. This recognition is the cause of speeches such as the one on July 30, when U Thant claimed to see analogies between the Vietcong struggle and the American War of Independence, though there has been no Hue massacre in our War of Independence.

It seems to me that the time has come to recognize that the Secretary-General is not a secular pope, but that he too can fall prey to particularistic influences. This holds true for the Secretariat as a whole.

There is hope for the future of the United Nations if a presidential commission faces its task of evaluation boldly and without illusions. We must free ourselves of the sentimentalities that regard United Nations resolutions as expression of the "conscience of the world." We must not be deceived by sham professions of faith in truth and justice.

The United Nations is a field of force in which power operates. Power exists and as a super power it is necessary for the world's safety that we use it. It is incumbent on us to use it in a civilized way, recognizing that a viable foreign policy is a reflection of our domestic policy. We must therefore demonstrate in our exercise of power the sense of moral concern that is part of the American national character.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
(The full text of the statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY RABBI GERSHON B. CHERTOFF,
TEMPLE B'NAI ISRAEL, ELIZABETH, N.J.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the invitation you extended to me to testify before your committee. I am convinced that H. J. Res. #1078 calling for a Presidential Commission to re-evaluate United States policy toward the United Nations is not only opportune but of prime necessity.

I would like to address myself to the problems of war and peace.

In taking stock of the approach and basic attitudes of the United States toward the United Nations over these past twenty-five years, my angle of vision differs from that of the witnesses who have appeared before you. Ever since college days I have been fascinated by the relationship of ethics to power in international relations. My study of history confirms me in my premise that ethics and power in the relations of nation-states can not be divorced one from the other. A country that asserts that its international relations are motivated by purely ethical considerations is irresponsible. Its policy can lead only to utopianism that may be theologically pure but is completely divorced from the realities of international life. Mr. Kissinger quotes former Secretary of State Rusk as having said, "We have no quarrel with the communists, all our quarrels are on behalf of other people." (American Foreign Policy—Three Essays, W. W. Norton & Company 1969 p. 92). Were this indeed our philosophy other nation-states would consider us naive or hypocritical or both. They would not be able to gear their policy to ours in a confident way—a 'disinterested' policy is likely to be considered 'unreliable'. (Kissinger p. 92).

On the other hand a policy based on power alone tempts its indiscriminate use. The arrogance of power must be restrained: naked power will not lead to lasting security but will initiate in other nation-states a spiral of fear that will inevitably lead to war.

There is a dynamic tension between ethics and power that is the essence of international relations. A nation's policy must take into account both the claims of conscience and the claims of power.

Mr. Chairman: Unfortunately our original conception of the United Nations insofar as it deals with the problems of war and peace, was guided by misplaced idealism. We thought the United Nations would become, to use Tennyson's phrase "The Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World." U Thant made the same mistake when he spoke hopefully of taking "the next step toward world authority and then on to a world government" * * * (UN Monthly Chronicle volume 1 #1 May 1942).

History should have taught us that an international organization like the United Nations or the League of Nations which is its father, and the Concert of Europe that emerged from the Congress of Vienna, which is its grandfather, is not a utopia or a world community or a juridical entity, but a political body. The United Nations organization is a concert of nation-states engaged in the pursuit of their national interests through the exercise of power politics. Neither goodwill nor mutual understanding will ever heal the rift between the Soviet Union and the United States. Nor will exhortations that the member states take a world view instead of a local view as suggested by Ambassador Lodge, have any meaningful effect. And it is a mistake to believe that by submitting conflicts between east and west to the United Nations organization a higher wisdom and unselfish idealism will emerge leading automatically to a settlement. The U.N. Organization has no policy of its own divorced from the policies of the nation-states that compose it (any more than a marriage can solve the problems that the partners have as individuals).

The role of the U.N. is not the grandiose one of creating one world or a world under law, but of accommodating the power relationships of the various states toward one another with the least amount of conflict. The laws of the U.N. are not juridical but in the nature of treaties. They merely register the agreements among the members of the U.N. The laws do not bring those agreements about. One of your previous witnesses wrote in his statement "In the U.N. Charter * * * the community of nations already has a set of fundamental rules which does not need to be rewritten as much as they need to be observed." But this is precisely the point. The rules will be observed not because of a moral impulse but only when they codify the accommodations reached. Similarly this witness

said "without law, international mail can not be delivered" * * * but it isn't the law which is responsible for the delivery of international mail. It is the prior agreement that such a purpose is desirable that brings about the registration of that agreement into law. When a law runs counter to the interests of a nation-state it is disregarded. The International Court of Justice issued an advisory opinion at the request of the General Assembly that the expenditures for the United Nations operations in the Congo and the operation of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East were legitimate "expenses of the Organization". Nevertheless the Soviet Union refused to pay its share.

The entire thrust of the U.N. Charter is directed toward the prevention and control of aggression. The Soviet Union once proposed a definition of aggression that would have branded her the aggressor in Czechoslovakia. The Soviet later dropped its resolution. Nevertheless even if the U.N. Organization were to agree to a precise legal definition, the national interests of the states guilty of such aggression would pervert its meaning. Mr. Khrushchev distinguished between wars of national liberation and aggressive wars. Those that he favored were the former, only those in which opposing powers were involved were reprehensible. The Brezhnev Doctrine goes further. It establishes the right of the Soviet Union to intervene militarily in any other Socialist country in order to maintain a regime of which it approves; and the word *socialist* can be made as broad as the Russians want to make it. A legal determination of aggression is at best a formulation of preceding unwritten agreements between powers who in any case wish to prevent hostilities. Let us not forget that the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact which renounced war as an instrument of national policy and condemned recourse to it for the settlement of international disputes, was signed by 62 nations. What followed was the intervention of Germany and Italy in the Spanish Civil War that was the prelude to World War II.

Clearly the U.N. organization reflects the realities of power. The distinction in the Security Council between permanent and nonpermanent members is a recognition of the inequality of power among the several states. The veto given to the permanent members is an acknowledgement of the hierarchy of power. The veto is indispensable because it prevents the passing of frivolous and irresponsible resolutions by the small states that might compel the great powers to take action whose harmful consequences they would have to shoulder while the smaller powers would risk nothing.

On March 17th last the U.S. joined Great Britain in vetoing a Security Council resolution on Southern Rhodesia that had been adopted on the 21st of November in the General Assembly (2508–XXIV). The General Assembly resolution called upon the United Kingdom to take effective measures including the use of force to put an end to what it called the illegal regime to Southern Rhodesia. The Security Council resolution condemned Great Britain for its refusal to end by force the "rebellion" in Rhodesia. The resolution in effect suggests, "Lets you and him fight".

Ambassador Yost has indicated that this first use of the veto by the U.S. does not imply a change in policy. If this is so it means that we have learned nothing from the imbroglio surrounding the Southern Rhodesian resolution. It means that we have returned to the sentimentalities of our policy beginning with the early days of the U.N. when as an earnest of our good faith we gave up the use of the veto. We thought this would prove our idealism and testify to our rising above national egoism. We hoped that this would prove to the world that our motives were pure. We expected that our example would inspire the other permanent members of the Security Council to surrender their use of the veto. This did not happen. The Soviet *nyet* was used even when its vital national interests were not at stake. The Soviet Union with great confidence even uses the veto to embarrass the U.S. because it does not fear retaliation on our part. With a change in the complexion of the General Assembly we will have to depend more on the Security Council. I would urge that the Presidential Commission give serious thought to a sophisticated use of the veto.

A great deal of praise has been lavished on the employment of U.N. peacekeeping forces, and the sending of U.N. observers to trouble spots. While all this is to the good, we must recognize that no instrument of the U.N. is simon-pure. Nor are the personnel who execute U.N. policy political eunuchs. They are all involved in the national interests of the states whose nationals they are and should not be given the moral stature they do not possess. For example, the U.N. forces in Egypt were made up of national contingents that responded to the political interests of their governments. When Mr. Nassar demanded that the U.N. forces withdraw, the Indian and Yugoslavian Commanders of their respective forces

made it clear that they would abandon their positions regardless of the will of the U.N. And certainly a re-establishment of such forces in the same area today would be an invitation for a replay of those moves that led to The Six-Day War.

As far as the observer groups are concerned they too may be misused for political purposes. Because of the connivance of the observer group and the then Secretary General, President Eisenhower had to send troops to Lebanon.

On May 22, 1958 Lebanon charged in the Security Council that the United Arab Republic was guilty of illegal infiltration of personnel and arms across Lebanese borders. On June 11th the Council sent to the area ten observers headed by the distinguished former President of Ecuador, Galo Plaza. On July 3rd Mr. Plaza issued his first report which stated that the observers found no evidence of infiltration across Lebanese borders. Mr. Hammarskjold confirmed this report in a New York press conference. Nevertheless the chairman of the UNOG admitted that the observers were prevented from making on the spot observations. It was common knowledge that the UAR together with Syria was attempting to subvert Lebanon. The Prime Minister of Lebanon said dispairingly that he was fated to become the Middle East version of Imre Nagy. The situation began to defuse, only when President Eisenhower dispatched U.S. troops to Lebanon.

Had the U.S. depended on U.N. policy Lebanon would have been destroyed as a viable state. What saved Lebanon and quite possibly the U.N. was the fact that the U.S. had developed a policy and took the initiative to carry it out.

We have the right to say to our delegates at the United Nations: "Ask not what the United States can do for the United Nations, but rather what the United Nations can do for the United States". This does not mean that in the pursuit of our national interest we can disregard the moral consequences of the political positions we take in the United Nations. The conscience of the country would not stand for it. The United States national interest can never be reduced to the realities of naked power. It must take into account the character of our people and the nature of its historical experience. Otherwise it will never obtain domestic support. The American people will be antagonistic if its moral conscience is outraged. A moral concern has always been an integral component of past domestic and foreign policy. There is a collective conscience in America that will not be denied. We were born "dedicated to a proposition". This is unique in the history of the world. Other nations grew up in the lands in which they were born and their existence was natural and self-explanatory. We are a nation of immigrants who came here for a purpose. We felt that only here could a man achieve his human dignity. Compassion and integrity and insistence on justice are inseparable from our national purpose. That is why the United Nations has lost the support of a large part of our citizenry, because the nations that constitute the United Nations too frequently mask their pursuit of power and domination and egoism by a patina of idealism.

In dealing with the issue of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the Middle East, Congressmen Fascell and Whalley in their report called *"To Save Succeeding Generations"* have revealed the extent to which the General Assembly has debased the very concept of human rights for "below-the-belt" political purposes. "The Assembly", they wrote without seeking evidence to support or disprove such charges, "approved a one-sided resolution which castigated the alleged mistreatment of civilians in Arab territories occupied by Israel but completely ignored the plight of Jews in Syria and Iraq. The United States publicly deplored this action and abstained from voting on the resolution" (page 5).

The American people expects its representatives in the United Nations to take unambiguous moral positions when moral issues are clear cut. For example:

According to the Charter (Article 23 paragraph 1.) the nonpermanent members of the Security Council shall be elected with "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 . . ." Nevertheless, in direct violation of this article in the Charter Syria was elected to membership in the Security Council though it considers itself legally at war with Israel and refused to accept the *decision* of the Security Council which is binding to accept the cease fire. Syria's attitude is not surprising, when we recall that on May 25, 1967 the president of Syria, Nureddin al-Atassi said, "Every Jew in Israel should be put to death . . ." And Syria has been an accessory to the highjacking of a T.W.A. plane.

In view of the fact that non-permanent members of the Security Council are elected by secret ballot in the General Assembly it is impossible to determine how the United States voted. Syria is not only in clear legal violation of the Charter,

it is in complete and utter disregard of the moral issue which is bringing the United Nations into disrepute in the public opinion of the people of the United States. If the U.S. veto were employed in the Security Council on this kind of issue it would facilitate the rallying of public opinion in the U.S. around support for the U.N.

Mr. Chairman: The growth of the General Assembly from the original 51 states to the present 126 member states, and the change in the political complexion of that body requires a re-examination of our attitudes and policies. The U.S. can no longer muster a two-third majority when required for "*important*" questions in which our country has a vital interest. The Afro-Asian group of states has a built-in blocking "one-third" to checkmate us. The Afro-Asian group together with the Soviet bloc are not too far from the two-thirds of the votes required to control the General Assembly on "*important*" questions (they are now about 57%) and they can be as irresponsible as they wish.

I have pointed this out with regard to the Southern Rhodesia resolution which originated in the General Assembly. It is true too of their politicizing of the Human Rights resolutions to suit their own purposes, as pointed out by Congressmen Fascell and Whalley. And it is becoming apparent in the attitudes of the under-developed countries toward U.N. investment funds.

They have long been dissatisfied with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (BANK) set up in 1944 and its affiliates, the International Finance Corporation (IFC) established in 1956 and the International Development Association (IDA) created in 1960. The voting strength in these organizations is proportional to capital contributions. The receiving countries, therefore, are trying to bypass these obstacles to their control over funds by the adoption of the 1960 General Assembly resolution that established "in principle" the U.N. Capital Development Fund. This resolution in effect, places the decisive influence with the under-developed countries. With the Nineteen-Seventies being designated as the U.N. Development Decade we can expect that the economically advanced countries (code for the U.S.) will be faced with increasing demands for greater capital contributions. The recipient countries are not willing to insure that the monies they receive will be effectively used. There is no reason for us to accept irresponsible actions even on the part of the poorer members of the United Nations. Poverty does not give license for irresponsibility. The claims of the recipient countries on the conscience of the international community would be seriously taken if they were willing to make sacrifices on their own. The regional use of the resources of several states in the area, the harmonization of their economic resources require a certain surrender of their national sovereignty. Surely their willingness to yield something is an earnest of their claims on the resources of the international community. It seems to me that the proposed Presidential Commission taking into account the Pearson and Jackson reports will have to take a long hard look at the seriousness with which we are willing to regard the recommendations of the General Assembly. The smaller powers in the General Assembly are not *ipso facto* of greater moral stature than the big powers. They have their own vested interests which they mask by an appeal to the conscience of the world.

Mr. Chairman: Article 99 of the Charter grants the Secretary General the authority of independent diplomatic action. He has already revealed himself as being pro-Asian-African bloc. In his address of July 30th in the United Nations he claimed to see analogies between the Vietcong struggle and the American War of Independence, though there has been no Hue massacre in our War of Independence. He has been outspoken not only in his condemnation of the bombing, but in other aspects of United States policy as well. I cannot recall, though I would not deny any serious condemnation on his part of the Vietcong. His attitude is not only the result of personal bias because he comes from the third world. He is aware of the numerical strength of the Asian-African bloc which can expect support from the Soviet when an anti-American resolution is on the table. And what happened to his predecessors is not unknown to U Thant. After Mr. Trygvie Lie backed United Nations action in Korea he was treated by the Soviet as though he were the man who wasn't there. He resigned as Secretary General because the Soviet refused to treat with him. Mr. Hammarskjold was in trouble with the Russians over the Congo, and it was during his regime that the Soviet proposed a *troika* to replace a single Secretary General. U Thant has the vested interest of the civil servant who wants to be effective. He knows that he must make concessions to the Soviet and the third world. Heretofore he has not had to grapple with an adamant United States. It seems to me that the time has come for us to recognize that the Secretary General is not the conscience of the world nor a

secular pope. He is not above playing squalid little political games that may develop fallout in the wider international community. When he cut short his visit to his native Burma on February 23rd it was announced in Rangoon that his presence in New York was desirable in the light of reports he had received from headquarters, and his office let it be known that the Middle East was heating up. The fact of the matter is that U Thant was trying to save his *amour propre*. The Burmese Prime Minister, no friend of his, cut him by leaving Rangoon when the Secretary General was scheduled to be there. The Secretary General, the "symbol" of the U.N. should not play games with the security of nations.

I think too that the Presidential Commission should look closely into the make-up of the Secretariat and the extent to which its members are motivated by the interests of the nation-states to which they belong, rather than by their status as civil servants. It is not simply a witticism that the term *Indian mafia* is applied to the appointments to strategic positions in the Secretariat made by the Indian, Mr. Narasimhan, who is chef de cabinet, and at times acting Secretary General.

Mr. Chairman: I have not attempted an exhaustive analysis of the relationship of the United States and the United Nations. I have picked almost at random examples of dislocation in the three major bodies of the United Nations; the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretariat as illustrations of the Pandora's box the Presidential Commission has no choice but to open. By opening the box Pandora let loose the evils attending man while Hope remained inside. There is hope for the future of the United Nations if the Presidential Commission faces its task of evaluation boldly and without illusions. We must free ourselves of the sentimentalities that regard the United Nations resolutions as the expression of the "conscience of the world". We must not be deceived by United Nation member-states in their sham professions of faith in truth and justice while they condemn us for hypocrisy. The United Nations is a field of force in which power operates. Power exists and as a super-power it is necessary for the world's safety that we use it. It is incumbent on us to use it in a civilized way, recognizing that a viable foreign policy is a reflection of our domestic policy. We must therefore demonstrate in our exercise of power the sense of moral concern that is part of the American national character.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Rabbi Chertoff, for your excellent presentation.

I want to express the appreciation of the Chair for your endorsement of House Joint Resolution 1078, calling for presidential commission review of U.S. policy toward the United Nations.

You state that a nation's policy must take into account both claims of conscience and claims of power. You then go on to say, "The United Nations organization is a concert of nation-states engaged in pursuit of their national interests for the exercise of power politics," which I think is accurate.

I would ask, however, has the United States in your opinion acted in that normal realistic way in the United Nations, or where has the United States failed to act in this way?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I think that our concern for the Afro-Asian states is an indication of our lack of sophistication. We seem to follow a policy that operates on the premise that since they are part of the underdeveloped world and they are not first-rate powers, whatever they say and propose should be supported.

While we don't feel that way when it comes to the use of funds, it does appear when it comes to electing members to the Security Council. As I pointed out in my statement, we used the veto for the first time against the proposed resolution of the smaller powers who demanded that military sanctions be used against Rhodesia.

This is one example of the kind of situation that in the past caused us either to abstain or to vote with the Afro-Asian nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In your opinion has the United Nations made and carried out any decision which was injurious to the United States as a great power?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. It can't very well, because we are a super-power just as it cannot against the Soviet Union. It can make things more difficult for us. For example, I mentioned in passing the 1970 General Assembly resolution concerning the attempt to take away the control of the funds from the bank and the other financial agencies, and to have it reside in the recipient nations themselves. This is just one possibility.

Mr. GALLAGHER. In the past we have had some difference of opinion from some of the former ambassadors to the United Nations, who appeared prior to your appearance: Ambassador Lodge, among others, and there seems to be at that level of those who participated in the great decisions, question as to what benefit the United States has gained by its participation in the United Nations.

In your study of the operation of the United Nations would you care to make a comment on the benefits that have accrued to the United States by participation in the United Nations?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I think the very existence of the United Nations makes it possible for nation-states, and particularly the super-powers, to surrender within a context that will look as though it is being done for idealistic reasons and not because the display of power has compelled it to surrender.

It becomes possible, therefore, for our country, as it does for Russia, not to find itself against its own public opinion. If it had been possible, for example, for the conflict over Cuba between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy to have been worked out within the United Nations, the solutions would not have been different but the threat of annihilation would have been reduced immeasurably.

So I think that the existence of the United Nations makes it possible for a give and take that two nations facing each other do not have. It reduces the possibility of confrontation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I quite agree with you. That is perhaps the major benefit that we have and the benefit most overlooked by those who find great fault with the United Nations and who make our participation seem to be a very dreary business.

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I am speaking only about war and peace. There are other agencies that are part of the United Nations that are very important. Those that deal with agriculture, those that deal with human rights and so on.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Derwinski?

Mr. DERWINSKI. Rabbi Chertoff, I was impressed with your overall statement which you condensed for us. The thing that impressed me was your absolute logical and practical approach. You are not looking at the situation of the U.N. with rose-colored glasses. You are calling the shots as you see them.

I note some pearls of wisdom, for example, when you make the point that "the Soviet Union once proposed a definition of aggression that would have branded her the aggressor in Czechoslovakia." This strikes me as being a very key observation.

Would you care to expand on that thought?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I think that that really is the key issue. If we try to be, I would say, sentimental rather than idealistic and the Russians are not concerned at all by such considerations then they are free to do whatever they want, because they know that we will

not retaliate. And we have already thrown our hand in, because we have no advantages.

They do not have to be concerned by the threat of reprisal. The basic relationship among nation-states is power.

Mr. DERWINSKI. And the use of it is something that other nations respect as a rule.

RABBI CHERTOFF. They respect it and they can build their own policy on the basis of such a consideration, because there is a structure to it and a regularity that they can depend on. If it is a matter of an idealism that does not reflect vital interests of the states, they cannot tell what our idealism is going to say a day from tomorrow or a week later. So they cannot react to it with any sense of realism.

Mr. DERWINSKI. This lack of realism in the U.N. would also obviously have played an adverse role in the Middle East problem when quite prematurely the U.N. forces were withdrawn just before the 6-day war. I note you made a historic reference to the situation in Lebanon in 1958 when the U.N. committee failed to properly handle the situation and U.S. troops had to be dispatched, which no longer is possible.

I also note the morning news reports of the newest developments in Lebanon that leave that country in a fragile state.

To what extent, then, is this attitude of the states in the U.N.—you made a specific case of the Syrian situation, with Israel as being in contrast to the rules of the Security Council. What happens then if the rules are evaded and ignored?

This hardly leads to a consistent situation. Is there any suggestion you could offer for a cure of this abuse?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. The name of the game to me is the tension between ethics and power. I do not think that there is any magic lamp you can rub and say, "You do this and inevitably something else will follow."

I would say that where the issues are clearcut, then you must take an ethical stand. The Syrian situation is clearcut. The people in our country know it and they can see it without knowing anything about the history of the relationships in the Middle East.

If they see we disregard ethics completely, they are going to shrug off the U.N. completely. Certainly today we are much more sophisticated about what goes on.

Mr. DERWINSKI. One last point, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

Rabbi Chertoff, you mentioned the complications of the civil servants in the U.N. who obviously tend to be more interested in their own country's welfare than to maintain an impartial or technical attitude. This would present quite a major problem since we find with every administration change in this country that the incoming administration has a difficult time before it acquires the minimum loyalty of the bureaucrats that it inherits.

Now to what extent has this civil servant status been so perpetuated that these individuals are beyond control of an effective U.N. administrator?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. Mr. Derwinski, I would like to answer that question, as I would really answer all the questions that were presented to me. I directed my remarks toward the support of this particular resolution. It was not my intention to offer solutions. I don't have them. And this would be the role of the Presidential commission.

I had hoped simply to raise some of these questions, which you are now reflecting, and to emphasize that this is the kind of thing on which the Presidential commission should spend about a year. I think that is what the resolution says.

So what you suggest in a more elaborate way than what I mentioned offhand is correct. That would be part of what they would have to do.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I think you certainly helped the committee since you made a very good case for this Presidential commission. You pointed out the obvious problems that should require this high-level attention.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Burke?

Mr. BURKE. I did get here late, Rabbi, and I apologize. I was on the House floor. I would like to ask one question, because, when Ambassador Lodge and Ambassador Yost were here, they indicated they did not feel that the funding of the United Nations particularly or particularly many of the nations that we had been funding, had been to our advantage.

Do you have that feeling, as far as the United Nations is concerned?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. In a general way, yes.

Mr. BURKE. I also had the feeling when they testified 5 or 6 weeks ago, and I would have to fully review their testimony, that they had some questions and doubts about the ultimate success of the United Nations in comparison to what the people originally believed would result from the United Nations as such.

What is your view of the future of the United Nations as a world peacemaker?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. The chairman had asked me that question before and I would answer that the existence of the United Nations makes it possible for the surrender in a particular issue of particular nation-states within a context that makes it appear as though they are moved by idealistic considerations, taking into account what the world would like to see.

It prevents the possibility of confrontations between two nation-states and the very existence of it, if it did nothing more than to make that possible, makes the U.N. worth while.

Mr. BURKE. Could I interrupt to ask you, you say "makes it possible." Where has it made it possible to prevent confrontation between nations in the past, except in Korea perhaps where it went in under the United Nations Charter, but where has it prevented it around the world?

Certainly not in Biafra and Nigeria, certainly not in the Far East or Africa. Where has the United Nations stepped in as an effective peacemaker?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. If the Khrushchev-Kennedy confrontation had been actually developed in the United Nations, there would not have been a threat of annihilation.

Mr. BURKE. But it was not.

Rabbi CHERTOFF. Right. Now if the U.N. is used in the spirit in which I suggest, there would not be confrontation and if we do not expect too much from it, then it is likely that this element of the relationship among nations will come to the fore.

Mr. BURKE. Rabbi, haven't you answered the question in your own statement when you say the United Nations is based upon

politics and the art of power is within politics; and isn't that the reason why the United Nations did not step in during some of these confrontations, because of the Soviet Union and other Communist views for power rather than those for world peace?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. If the United Nations ever does step in, it will be due to the fact that there is a prior agreement on the part of the superpowers.

Mr. BURKE. We have been 25 years now and before that we had other attempts at world peace and the superpowers somehow or other are still somewhat greedy for power and suspicious of each other. How are we going to overcome the big "if," outside of a dream and a hope for peace tomorrow?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I don't dream and I don't hope, because I don't look at the U.N. as a utopia. I see the U.N. as I indicated in my statement as a descendent of the League of Nations, which was a descendent of the Concert of Europe. Nations, if they are to have relationships with one another, must have some kind of structure within which they can operate, and there must be certain rules of the game so that they know how to react one to the other.

And if the United Nations does that, it is enough and I think it would do that if we do not demand too much of it.

Mr. BURKE. But aren't you saying, in effect, now that it is an ineffective peace organization?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. It is ineffective if we think it is going to bring us world peace.

Mr. BURKE. Isn't that the purpose of the United Nations?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. No.

Mr. BURKE. What was the intent of the United Nations?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I believe that was a mistaken intent.

Mr. BURKE. What I am driving at though, aren't we drifting further and further away from the original intent of the United Nations, whether rightfully or wrongfully, of how it was put to the world-at-large? But effective, as far as being effective as a peace organization, it has failed in the last 25 years?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I think that——

Mr. BURKE. Let me ask you this—do you agree or disagree—rather than you thinking that perhaps I am being dogmatic in my approach?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. Insofar as it deals with war and peace, its stated goal which was to bring about a world community has not been accomplished. And it will not be accomplished. I think that a presidential commission, however, can indicate what its legitimate role would be and I think that the United Nations has a very important legitimate role if power relationships among the different nation-states are to be accommodated one to the other.

Mr. BURKE. Are you talking about a role as far as our own national security is concerned, or about a role that we participate in as far as world politics, and that is really what we are talking about in the United Nations?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I am concerned about our security, but our security cannot be achieved in isolation. It has to be within the terms of a world of nation-states.

Mr. BURKE. I agree with that, but I am trying to figure out how we find the answer, whether it is elsewhere or through the United

Nations, which appears to have an interest in us at least financially from the point of view of contributions but not by those that are participating nations but make no financial contributions. We have financed a good deal of the United Nations expenses out of the pockets of American taxpayers, but we have also found that as far as the American citizen is concerned, he objects because of the failure with regard to the U.N. creating world peace or let us say stopping those nations that have caused dissension within the world.

Rabbi CHERTOFF. Insofar as American citizens are disillusioned with the United Nations, they are reacting to what they see: That the stated purpose of the existence of the United Nations of bringing about world peace is unrealistic. They recognize, I am sure, the importance of power, but you cannot have an organization like the United Nations that exists only on naked power.

They want ethical considerations to be part of the search for security on the part of the United States.

Mr. BURKE. How do we get that through the existing United Nations Charter and the existing power structure of the United Nations itself.

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I think we can do that roughly the way we do it in the United States on the basis of a Constitution that was written in the 18th century, in a different economic and social time, through interpretation, through development and explication of elements that were there that have never been developed.

Mr. BURKE. But don't we need number one, the unity of desire by the member nations and second, how can we acquire that unity of desire when there are direct opposite political views with regard to the capitalist system and the Communist system?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I do not consider the United Nations as being the place for an attempt to bring ideological solutions to problems. It is a place where nation-states can get together and accommodate their power relationships.

Mr. BURKE. I agree with you in principle, but what I am driving at is that the United Nations has been used at various times as a propaganda sounding board for certain political ideologies. How do we get away from that which has been existing for some 25 years and how do we convince the American people that we can change something that originally was idealistic and it certainly was originally, and it held great hopes for the people in the world.

How can we change now by merely saying that this would happen if something else happened? How do we erase the big "if" that you put before us?

Rabbi CHERTOFF. If you are concerned about propaganda, then I would say that I have a little more faith in the American people, to recognize what is propaganda and what is not propaganda.

Mr. BURKE. But propaganda is an effective weapon used by not only Hitler—it is used by Communists. It is used as sales promotions and it is an effective weapon. Now its existence is not so much what the American people think, it is the world use of political propaganda, which is spread around the world by various nations through the United Nations.

Now you still have not erased, Rabbi, the big "if" and that bothers me. You are saying "if" we do this, but how can we erase the big "if"?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think you allude to it in your statement, Rabbi. Perhaps we should get back to it. I think the United Nations has had some success. The example of its action on Kashmir certainly prevented a war between India and Pakistan.

The example of its action on Cyprus prevented a war between Turkey and Greece; the Congo as well. I am talking about United Nations peacekeeping. It has prevented a direct confrontation between Soviet Union and United States. The United Nations has to its credit Israel in 1949, 1955, and 1967 a success.

I think these are some of the things that the American public should know and I think your statement alludes to that.

Mr. BURKE. As I indicated earlier, I have not had time to study the entire statement you made, but I do know that this question exists and I do know certainly that there were some questions by Ambassador Lodge and Ambassador Yost, who were our Ambassadors to the United Nations, as to its effectiveness or its future effectiveness and as far as our general contribution to it. As to whether it is ever going to be successful as an organization or whether we should review it and go some other route, let us say, to get a common understanding between nations for world peace is still an important decision and needs full development.

Rabbi CHERTOFF. I would strongly urge that the United Nations remain a part of our basic policy with the understanding that it helps us in our own security. I think it would be almost a fatal mistake for us to withdraw from the United Nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you.

I would like to add that I have heard a lot of statements here, Rabbi, especially from people who have made comments in connection with the veto and realities of the U.N. They have discussed the combination of realities in this world and the ethical requirements for the world to continue down its path. I would like to say that your statement, particularly your remarks on the veto, I think, was one of the most clear and concise statements of understanding on the necessity of the veto that I have seen.

Thank you very much.

The Chair would now like to welcome Mr. Robert H. Cory, who is representing the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the American Friends Service Committee. We apologize to Mr. Cory, who was present at our last public hearing on April 28, but we were not able to hear his testimony because of a call of the House.

We have your statement before us, Mr. Cory, and you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT H. CORY, FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. CORY. I assume my statement is filed. Since this committee last met, events have occurred which reinforce my own deep conviction that we have a great responsibility in ending the war in Vietnam and in achieving some success in SALT talks. These changes in policy have to be made before our Nation can really explore all the potentialities of the United Nations.

In my 5 years of work at the United Nations for the Quakers I think I came away less cynical than the last speaker, but a bit more discouraged. In talking with people in the Secretariat and in delegations there, I was impressed by the fact that the United Nations is a tool kit—a very complex and very promising tool kit—which obviously has not been used in the way some of us had hoped back 25 years ago.

My own personal feeling about the human dilemma is that now is the time for reassessment. The world is so dangerous that we have to do a great deal more creative thinking about where we are going. I cite the dangers of accidental war, the shortness of decision timing in a nuclear confrontation, the incredible expense of the nuclear arms race, the dangers of world pollution and the potentiality of escalation of small conflicts, all as specific reasons for the urgency of a reassessment at this time.

From the point of view of Quakers working in overseas operations, realism lies not with the people who are merely looking at the present power structure—and none of us want to overlook the power aspects here—but in the need for human survival. For meeting this need we have, I think, great potentialities in the United Nations system.

I have found that the process of the United Nations is a great deal more complicated than the charter or some of our myths and expectations indicate; there are many positive things going on in the U.N. system, some of them unrecognized.

I would not be as pessimistic or as skeptical either about the quality of the U.N. Secretariat, of which I have some knowledge, nor about the role of small nations.

I do not believe that the change that we are going to have to take in the next few years in our foreign policy and in our whole approach to the United Nations is one that can be achieved through charter revision.

I concur with the comment made that just as our Constitution has proven adjustable and still has many unused potentialities; so the United Nations Charter can grow if there is the will to use it.

In addition to these comments and the specific suggestions of my written testimony, I would be delighted if I could contribute in some small way to the very impressive testimony that your committee is collecting. I hope you will pass that testimony along to other officials responsible for foreign policy in our Government and will also be able to communicate it to the public. There is a very big educational job to be done in this country.

(The full text of the statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY ROBERT H. CORY ON BEHALF OF FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION AND AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I am Robert H. Cory, director of William Penn House, a Quaker study center on Capitol Hill. I am speaking today on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation and the American Friends Service Committee. Neither the AFSC nor the FCNL claims to speak for the entire Religious Society of Friends; they do speak as corporate organizations administered by representatives of Friends' Yearly Meetings and Quaker organizations throughout the nation. But it is safe to say that there is nearly universal support among Quakers for strengthening the United Nations.

I have a deep personal interest in the United Nations because from 1961 to 1966 I served on the Quaker United Nations Program, the accredited nongovernmental representative agency for the international Quaker movement. In my previous university teaching career I offered courses on International Organization. I am particularly concerned with the opportunities offered to

strengthen the United Nations in an anniversary year. In 1965 I served as chairman of the committee on International Cooperation Year for the Conference Group of the U.S. Non-Governmental Organizations and attended here in Washington the White House Conference on International Cooperation. At that Conference 30 teams of governmental officials and citizens of special competence presented to the President more than 400 specific recommendations for strengthening international cooperation. This was an example of the action for a U.N. Anniversary from which we can learn both positive and cautionary lessons.

As a member of a religious society with a 300 year record of testimony on peace, I am among those who believe that the major way to strengthen the U.N. in 1970 is to halt the arms race, hopefully starting with the SALT negotiations, and to bring an end to the tragic conflicts in Vietnam and in the Middle East. I hope the Congress will use its every influence to achieve these overriding goals. Only if there is an end to war and an abatement of nuclear confrontation can our attention be turned to problems of building an effective United Nations.

But there are many smaller steps we can take in 1970 to utilize and expand the United Nations system, steps which, I believe, can be taken without Charter Revision.

The particular steps I shall emphasize are those for which I feel that Quakers have some claim to special insights, either because of careful research or because of involvement in crisis situations. There have been numerous Quaker "working parties" on specific methods of solving international conflicts (most recently those dealing with Vietnam and the Middle East). There have been many Quaker missions ministering to human need in areas of conflict (most recently in Vietnam, Nigeria, Kashmir, and the West bank of the Jordan River).

First, I should like to emphasize the need for an increase in 1970 in the training of mediators and in sharing of knowledge about the process of mediation. The most important war-prevention provision of the U.N. Charter is Article 33, which requires parties to disputes to "first of all seek a solution by negotiations, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice." To implement this Article, the nations of the world need more persons with special mediation skills. Congress can provide for special instruction at foreign service training institutions; it can encourage exchange scholars from other nations to study the processes of peaceful settlement; it can provide encouragement to such non-governmental efforts as the International Peace Academy; it can call upon the experience of our national labor mediators through special public hearings. Congress can also ask the President to press in both regional organizations and in the forums of the United Nations for increased staffing of agencies for mediation. Such investments will not obviously produce instant peace, but may in the long run open up more opportunities to handle conflicts without resort to war.

Secondly, I feel that the United States should continue to make every effort to bring to fruition in 1970 the U.N. Corps of Volunteers. For many years the Quakers have experimented in their international workcamps and in their international volunteer programs to bring together young people of many nations for work and study together. Now in a resolution to be brought before the 25th General Assembly is a plan to extend the present use of volunteers by the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies. A truly international volunteer effort, quite separate from national overseas volunteer plans, can be an important agent of communication between peoples. A corps of concerned 'alumni' with first hand experience could be an important source in the future for personnel for U.N. projects and for representation of nations in the U.N. system. Not only should Congress provide funds for the U.S. share of the financing of U.N. Volunteers; Congress should encourage the Administration to work with other nations to expand the program and provide longer term commitments of funds.

Third, I feel that Congress should in 1970 appropriate additional funds for the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees. Few Americans are aware of the homeless and forgotten people, some 2,450,000 of them, now under the care of the High Commissioner. The Quakers have been involved in only a few of the areas in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, but this involvement has impressed them not only with the immediate suffering but also with the long-term impairment of opportunity for these uprooted people. The United States can well afford to undertake a majority responsibility.

Fourth, I would suggest that the United States could in 1970 take a dramatic step toward furthering the recommendations on international development of the Pearson and Peterson reports by authorizing the transfer of at least 25% of its Special Drawing Rights in the International Monetary Fund to the IDA for

concessional loans to the developing countries. This action was recommended last year by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States. Quakers, with their long experience in technical assistance in developing countries, realize how inadequate present 'foreign aid' projects are. Through the new international finance mechanism of Special Drawing Rights, the more wealthy nations will acquire a windfall of $9.5 billion over the initial three year period. The United States could set an example for other nations in sharing this 'unearned' income through the IDA 'window' of the World Bank. This act would be a symbol of U.S. commitment to the Second U.N. Decade of Development.

Among the hundreds of small but significant ways of strengthening the United Nations, other witnesses before this Committee may emphasize other U.S. initiatives. In the limited time available, I have selected only four from the many in which Quakers and Quaker agencies are interested: Peaceful Settlement, Volunteers, Refugee Relief, and International Development.

Concerned Quakers are impressed by the efforts of this Subcommittee to insure that concrete initiatives are taken by our Government in this 25th anniversary year of the U.N. We put our suggestions forward with the conviction that you will make a significant contribution to the strengthening of the U.N. system. We put them forward with the further conviction that the greatest contribution to the U.N. and mankind would be the halting of the arms race and the ending of the wars in Vietnam and the Middle East. In the words of the U.N. Charter, we must 'save succeeding generations from the scourge of war.'

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Cory.

Mr. Cory, it appears likely that the 25th General Assembly of the United Nations may approve the establishment of sending volunteers to areas where greater understanding is needed and where assistance is required. It appears the U.N. may establish a corps of volunteers, a U.N. corps of volunteers.

How do you envision the operation of such a corps?

Mr. CORY. At the present time, as perhaps you know, there is a corps of U.N. volunteers. Some of them work for FAO, some of them work for UNESCO, out in project areas. They have been largely financed by special contributions from the Netherlands, from Germany, and from the United Kingdom.

One of the problems here is that the skilled young people who get placed as junior executives on a volunteer basis have most often been Western young people who could afford to carry the expenses and could afford to interrupt their careers. The result is that in many cases there has not been the opportunity to have an international community of volunteers working under the U.N. and to profit from the experience of working together as representatives of different cultures.

I would envisage that much of the machinery that the U.N. and its specialized agencies at present have will be geared up, but that there will be a financial problem of making possible the participation of people from the poorer countries, not only in projects in poor countries—where they may have some very real insights, because they too are poor—but also to work alongside people in the more wealthy countries. This will be a small experiment, because it is fairly expensive, as you know. Our Peace Corps has come down from $10,000 a year expense per volunteer to about $9,000. American Friends Service Committee's 2-year overseas projects are down to about $5,000 per year. This is not an inexpensive project.

Therefore, it has to start small. My own feeling at the present time, however, is that the experience that can be gained through this has a very important relation to the long-range personnel problem of the U.N. That sense of training, the getting of dedicated people who may then graduate, not just into the U.N. bureaucracy, but also into the

foreign offices of participating nations, could make this very much worthwhile.

I also have the feeling that national Peace Corps are getting into more and more trouble and probably are not going to be expanding. I would rather right now put some American contributions into a U.N. Peace Corps, or volunteer force, than I would to expand the U.S. Peace Corps.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am curious, as one who sponsored the original Peace Corps legislation, why it cost the Government $4,000 more a year.

Mr. CORY. Than the Friends Service Committee?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CORY. We do not pay for the American Friends Service Committee as much in volunteer allowances. The individual makes greater sacrifices. Secondly, I think we do have lower administration costs, because we use some volunteer training. I would have to study further this differential.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I would be interested if you could supply that for the record. If it is not too inconvenient, would you please?

(The information follows:)

The American Friends Service Committee's Volunteers in International Service Assignments program ended in 1968. In its last year of operation, the average annual cost per volunteer (including overhead) was $4,758.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I sense the same motivation in our Peace Corps as with your volunteers.

Mr. CORY. The American Friends Service Committee was much involved in the establishment of training programs for our American Peace Corps.

Mr. GALLAGHER. How, in your opinion, should the volunteer corps be incorporated into the United Nations development program or, in your opinion, would it exist with greater vitality and effectiveness as a separate entity of the United Nations?

Mr. CORY. Again I have not studied this. I think at the present time they are developing a liaison staff in the Social Affairs Section of the U.N. I know the person in charge. The Assembly establishes the general standards, sets up plans, and so forth. Then people are contracted out for actual supervision to the agency that is running the particular project.

I think there are possibilities here of cooperating with some nongovernmental organizations in both policies—because of their experience—and in recruitment. Only limited use of voluntary agencies is now in effect.

As you know, there have been several conferences on international volunteers in which the United Nations has taken part. I think the experience they have had so far is going to stand the Social Affairs Bureau of the U.N. in good stead.

The present system of volunteers, I think, has never been more than about 400. I assume in the first year or two they may get up to 1,000, and in the long run to perhaps as many as 5,000. If there were a major interest and this were made a major program with a major budgetary outlay, the numbers could go higher, but it is going to be very small in relationship to the present U.S. Peace Corps.

Mr. GALLAGHER. On another note you open your remarks by stating that you are less cynical, but more disappointed than other people

who have spoken here. Do they go together or how do we reverse this into a hope for renewal?

Mr. CORY. I suppose my feeling of being less cynical comes out of the fact that I have observed somewhat from the inside, a process of training people and of opening up horizons for people that goes on in the U.N. system. It is simply amazing to have a person from Upper Volta, for instance, come into a debate on the Cyprus issue. His country has to study and learn something about a problem that Upper Volta might never have considered. Several foreign offices call the U.N. the best diplomatic school for a small nation.

It is very interesting to trace the careers of people who start as junior diplomats at U.N. and end up in important negotiating positions and in important policymaking decisions. There is a constant turnover. You are a freshman, sophomore, junior, but a lot of people in the delegations don't reach a senior year and very few are graduate students, if you want to use the academic analogy. So we are, I think, creating people with an international point of view. I find that largely true in the Secretariat, the people I have known there.

I also think it could be documented that the role as a mediator is a crucially important one. I have stressed this in my paper. I think the role of mediator is right at the base of survival of societies in a power-torn world.

The interesting fact is that on many occasions in the U.N., it is one person—I often cite my friend from Nepal who is free to disassociate himself, because the interests in conflict are not his national interests and who becomes a problem solver in the name of the U.N. In Security Council meetings very often that key person is a Scandinavian, who, after both sides have stated the confrontation, works on issues through quiet diplomacy.

The U.N. is somewhat like an iceberg with a visible confrontation tip and many moderating processes underneath. So a compromise resolution may be worked out by the skilled diplomat of the small nation. This is of great value, though admittedly not all the small nations have delegations with people of this skill.

But the very fact that the potential is there has created a number of very interesting situations of mediation. In a mediation situation, essentially both sides have to come out with a "victory," though it may not be the victory they want. Ultimately they must search for some common survival interest.

I was impressed at the U.N. with the number of cases, some of them small, in which mediation processes help even though the U.N. is the dumping grounds for the problems that national governments have failed to solve.

Mr. GALLAGHER. U.N. pollution problems?

Mr. CORY. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have sat here many weeks now, as my colleagues have, and we have heard about the training school for the other nations' personnel. There seems to be a growing group of writers in the United States that keep pointing out that the greater the sophistication and greater the knowledge we have in the technological age, the greater the frustration and the greater the cynicism becomes.

What are your observations about that? Do people from underdeveloped countries, as they get more knowledge; do they acquire cynicism or do they acquire hope?

Mr. CORY. They get the initial cynicism that often is taught to them by the great powers and those nations which are dealing with issues cynically. But I am surprised that once you start from a degree of realism of what is going on, then you are in a position to use U.N. machinery and you do not have to use it cynically. So I would say it is an oversimplification to say it is a school of cynicism.

I think the U.N. is a school of realism where a constant pressure to solve intolerable problems forces the use of cooperative mechanisms.

Mr. BURKE. No questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Cory.

We will now hear from the League of Women Voters of the United States, represented by Mrs. David G. Bradley, the vice president of that organization and the outgoing foreign policy chairman. With her is Mrs. John Ahern, the newly elected foreign policy chairman.

Ladies, we welcome you and your contribution to our undertaking.

As a personal note, I want to say we are all aware of the outstanding work that your organization does in bringing greater understanding of the problems that confront us.

STATEMENT OF MRS. DAVID G. BRADLEY, VICE PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE U.S.A.

Mrs. BRADLEY. Thank you very much. I am going to just give the highlights from my statement, but I would like to ask that the complete statement be entered into the record.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Without objection it is so ordered.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY MRS. DAVID G. BRADLEY, VICE PRESIDENT, AND MRS. JOHN AHERN, FOREIGN POLICY CHAIRMAN, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES

I am Mrs. David G. Bradley of Durham, North Carolina, vice-president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, and for the past three years, foreign policy chairman. With me is Mrs. John Ahern from San Francisco, the new foreign policy chairman. The League is a volunteer citizens' organization of about 160,000 members in 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. We devote our energies to governmental issues on the local, state and national levels.

The League has just concluded its twenty-ninth Convention in Washington, D.C., in this its 50th year. Delegates from all parts of the country reaffirmed the League's continuing support for U.S. policies to strengthen the peacekeeping and peacebuilding capacities of the UN system. The events overseas and within this country which unfolded at the time our Convention gathered lent added urgency to League support of the UN system and to the League's conviction that our country must make more effective use of the UN machinery.

The League's long-standing position in favor of a strong UN system dates back to the founding of the United Nations when the League had an official consultant at San Francisco. The League undertook an intensive campaign for public understanding of the new organization. Our members have always been eager to implement the League's UN position through community education efforts as well as by their support of governmental policies at the national level. They know the need for sustained attention to problems of international conflict and to the building of institutions and processes that can promote peaceful change and justice for the people and nations of the world. They further believe that the UN system will not be strengthened to meet the needs of the world community if our government and other governments fail to make consistent use of those international mechanisms that do exist. At the same time the League believes the UN member nations, when necessary, must create new institutions responsive to the

needs of a world that is technologically and economically integrating more rapidly than the political institutions that serve it. We can be certain that in the future there will be many more problems of a global nature, and we must prepare for their solution by strengthening now, and devising now, the international tools we shall need to deal with then and to shape our destinies.

The League's support of the United Nations has always been firm but not uncritical; it has always examined UN strengths and weaknesses alike. It has recognized also that the United Nations reflects the international tensions and differences of its member nations. At this critical juncture in the striving for world harmony and orderly processes the League believes it is imperative for our government to undertake a commitment to the increased use of the international machinery as well as to correcting imperfections in it. We must have the will to make use of the UN system if we are to encourage it to become more than a mere reflection of the world's political divisiveness. We must use it imaginatively if it is to become an effective instrument for peace and justice.

We should like to offer for our government's consideration some specific suggestions for more effective implementation in areas in which the League has a special interest in terms of its national program. Our many-faceted program focuses on the enhancement of human welfare and the fostering of conditions which will promote greater world harmony. High among League concerns that are also UN concerns is the plight of the developing countries. League members recently concluded a year-long reevaluation of development assistance and reached consensus on certain issues. The League's new Statement of Position on Development Assistance stresses the importance of humanitarian, long-range objectives as well as the desirability of making greater use of multilateral channels. League members believe that attention must be given to social and civic progress as well as to economic growth. They want the developing countries to have a greater voice in planning and executing development programs in partnership with the developed countries, and they want assistance to be responsive to the needs of the developing countries. The UN role in development assistance will be of increasing importance, and the League wants our government to assist in strengthening UN development agencies where necessary, and to make more and better use of them.

Another League concern is the control of chemical and biological weapons. We hope our government will proceed rapidly with ratification of the Geneva Protocol. It is a necessary minimum step for us to take to retain credibility as a negotiator on other arms control issues in the United Nations. Elimination of the threat of chemical and biological warfare will reduce the risk of war and it will remove a grave potential danger to the life and health of people everywhere. The League welcomed the President's announcement in November 1969 that he would resubmit the Geneva Protocol to the Senate for ratification, and we urge that this be done without further delay. We commend the recent measures taken by the Congress to control the production, stockpiling, and transportation of chemical and biological agents as acts that are consistent with U.S. support of UN resolutions which aim to reduce the risks of chemical and biological warfare.

In April 1969 the League concluded a three-year study of U.S.-China relations in the course of which our members decided it was in the national interest for our government not to put obstacles in the way of UN representation for the People's Republic of China. We believe that such a policy is consistent with other recent moves by our government to relax tensions between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

The League has long worked for improved water resources and is about to embark on a wider environmental quality study. Though its study and action center on environmental problems in this country, the League recognizes that a large range of ecological issues ultimately are global and that many national environmental problems cannot be solved without international cooperation. We support U.S. participation in the UN's environmental program and we encourage cooperation in investigation, planning, and implementation.

Finally, in addition to the policy areas I have already suggested for implementation, the League would suggest as an immediate specific act in behalf of a worthwhile UN project a contribution for the Youth Conference that is planned as part of the 25th anniversary celebrations this summer. It would be a fitting way to turn the anniversary occasion from commemorative ceremony, and even from the necessary tasks of review and reform, to a demonstration of faith in the future value and effectiveness of the United Nations, the imperfect instrument upon which we must depend so greatly.

The League has always welcomed our government's statements of support for the United Nations, but it wants to take this opportunity to caution that the rhetoric of support and the proposals for improvements are not enough. They must be accompanied by concrete implementation. They must not be belied by inconsistent action. Above all, our government must match its professed support of UN peacekeeping purposes with a will to make creative use of the United Nations in the resolving of political issues as well as economic and social problems that confront the member nations. We believe that this is the realistic course in our increasingly interdependent world of nations. We know that it will not be an easy task, but it is one that our government must begin.

Mrs. BRADLEY. The League has just concluded its 29th convention in Washington, D.C., in this its 50th year. Delegates from all parts of the country reaffirmed the League's continuing support for U.S. policies to strengthen the peacekeeping and peacebuilding capacities of the U.N. system. The events overseas and within this country which unfolded at the time our convention gathered lent added urgency to League support of the U.N. system and to the League's conviction that our country must make more effective use of the U.N. machinery.

This mood was very prevalent during the convention. After years of hard work, we know the need for sustained attention to problems of international conflict and to the building of institutions and processes that can promote peaceful change and justice.

We know that the United Nations system will not be strengthened to meet the needs of the world community if our Government and other governments fail to make consistent use of those international mechanisms that do exist. At the same time the League believes the U.N. member nations, when necessary, must create new institutions responsive to the needs of a world that is technologically and economically integrating more rapidly than the political institutions that serve it.

The United Nations reflects the international tensions and differences of its member nations. At this critical juncture in the striving for world harmony and orderly processes the League believes it is imperative for our Government to undertake a commitment to the increased use of the international machinery as well as to correcting imperfections in it, and that is the main point I want to make.

We think it is important that the United States should make a commitment to really use the United Nations. We must have the will to go forward with this and we must use the U.N. system imaginatively, if it is to become an effective tool.

We should like to offer for our Government's consideration some specific suggestions for more effective implementation in areas in which the League has a special interest in terms of its national program. Our many-faceted program focuses on the enhancement of human welfare and the fostering of conditions which will promote greater world harmony.

High among League concerns that are also U.N. concerns is the plight of the developing countries. League members recently concluded a year-long reevaluation of development assistance and reached consensus on certain issues.

I would like to be able to tell you about this, but I think at this time I only want to stress for the purpose of speaking to this committee that League members believe that more attention must be given to social and civic progress. We do not underrate the impor-

tance of economic development, but we believe that in the development picture in the United Nations and in other multilateral organizations—in fact, in our own bilateral assistance programs—we must put stress on social and civic progress. The development assistance programs must reach down to the people.

The United Nations role in development assistance will be of increasing importance, and the League wants our Government to assist in strengthening U.N. development agencies where necessary, and to make more and better use of them. The League has a strong position on increased use of multilateral agencies.

Another League concern is the control of chemical and biological weapons. We hope our Government will proceed rapidly with ratification of the Geneva protocol. It is a necessary minimum step for us to take to retain credibility as a negotiator on other arms control issues in the United Nations. This is one of our important reasons we have other things to say about it.

Our members also hold that it is in the national interest for our Government not to put obstacles in the way of U.N. representation for the People's Republic of China. We believe such a policy is consistent with other recent moves by our Government to relax tensions between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

The League has long worked for improved water resources and is about to embark on a wider environmental quality study. Though its study and action center on environmental problems in this country, the League recognizes that a large range of ecological issues ultimately are global and that many national environmental problems cannot be solved without international cooperation.

For instance, we have just reviewed development assistance policies in which we talked about advantages of the agricultural revolution in India, only to find that other of our members said "Yes, but you are spreading pollution through the use of DDT and insecticides and fertilizer in India."

We support U.S. participation in the U.N.'s environmental program, which is really getting started with international conferences. And we encourage cooperation in planning and implementation.

Finally, in addition to those policy areas which I have already suggested, the League would like to suggest as an immediate specific act which the Government could take, would be a contribution to the projected U.N. Youth Conference, which is to be held this summer. That is planned as a part of the 25th anniversary celebrations.

We really feel this would be a very splendid thing for our Government to do.

In conclusion, I want to say our Government must match its professed support of U.N. peacekeeping purposes with a will to make creative use of the United Nations in the resolving of political issues as well as economic and social problems that confront the member nations. We believe that this is the realistic course in our increasingly interdependent world of nations.

Thank you for asking us to appear today.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much.

We are delighted to have you with us today.

We have had some debates as to how the representatives to the youth convention are going to be selected. Do you have anything on that?

Mrs. BRADLEY. I think these basic problems have probably been worked out by the various countries involved. I am not familiar with the details of these arrangements, but I do think it is important that the united nations of the world not only provide an opportunity for youth assembling, but also listen to what youth has to say.

I think that this is building for the future.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The main bone of contention appears to be how the United States delegates will be selected. It will be interesting to see how that progresses. We are all for it.

Mrs. BRADLEY. I know. I just wanted to support you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Does the League's position on Red China's admission to the U.N. include specific stands on different approaches to the question? For example, the two-Chinas option.

Mrs. BRADLEY. It appears most of the people we have listened to agree on one thing. There is only one China.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Do you have any particular solution?

Mrs. BRADLEY. We do not have a solution to that particular problem to propose, I think primarily because our members are about as split on that subject as the nations or, for that matter, the experts who are dealing with it.

We did take a consensus 2 years back and our members in spite of the obvious technical difficulties of this problem of what to do about Taiwan, did say that in spite of this, we must find a way to do it and we must find a way to bring such a great power into the United Nations. Many of them think that should the United States stop opposing the admission of China to the United Nations, the United Nations then might settle down and find the solution to the problem.

That is one thing that could happen.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Of course, one of the problems with a hands-off attitude is you are getting right back into the dilemma itself: The question of the mainland China regime, which is interested in coming to the United Nations. The question is whether or not they are interested in coming in other terms other than those previously elaborated by expulsion of Taiwan; branding the United States an aggressor in Korea, Charter revision, and so on.

Mrs. BRADLEY. I would like to explain why we do not have details. This is very unusual for the League, that we have not dealt with these specific topics. The reason is the study we did had to do with U.S. relations with mainland China, and not a study of Southeast Asia policy as a whole and not a study of the Taiwan issue as such.

And it was really after taking a look at U.S. relations with mainland China that we decided that we think we should trade with China, we should look toward diplomatic recognition. All these bilateral things.

The members wished to add that they thought it was important to the United States in relaxing the tensions between this country and China to stop opposing the admission and, frankly, it is an uncomfortable position to be in.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I agree with you. Somewhere along the line when we get to the point where we reorganize the world and live in peace, then we must meet the China question.

Mrs. BRADLEY. We have not stopped working on it. We have a foundation proposal on for the grant to continue looking into the Taiwan issue by our education fund. We are not ignoring it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think we will have to recess for a few minutes to answer the rollcall, but I want to tell you two that it is a pleasure to

have an opportunity to question the League of Women Voters. They have been questioning me for years.

If you would like to come back, you may or we will begin with an additional witness that we have.

Mrs. BRADLEY. We are absent from a board meeting, so with your permission, we will leave.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you for your contribution.

The Chair will recess for about 10 minutes and then we will begin with Mr. McGann.

(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee will resume the hearing.

The committee will now hear from Mr. Jack McGann, who represents the Liberty Lobby. We have your statement before us, Mr. McGann, and we welcome you here today.

For the record please include that Mr. McGann is accompanied by Mr. Warren Richardson.

STATEMENT OF JACK McGANN, LEGISLATIVE AIDE, LIBERTY LOBBY

Mr. MCGANN. Mr. Richardson is general counsel of Liberty Lobby. If there are any questions, hopefully he will be able to assist me.

I am Jack McGann, legislative aide of Liberty Lobby. I appear today to present the views of Liberty Lobby's 23,000-member board of policy and on behalf of the 240,000 subscribers to our monthly legislative report, Liberty Letter.

Liberty Lobby's board of policy has voted overwhelmingly to oppose world government and U.S. withdrawal from the U.N. At the same time, we commend the decision of the chairman to take a long hard look at the United Nations Organization, to review its past, and render constructive criticism where it is due.

This fall the world will commemorate the 25th anniversary of the U.N. Nearly a quarter of a century ago at the birth of the U.N., war-weary people around the world acclaimed it as a triumph for everlasting peace. After two world wars, Americans as well as all other nationalities derived great solace from the prospect that dialog would replace guns and tanks. International problems would become soluble in the General Assembly; battlefields would be consigned to history books and wars would be declared obsolete.

As we look forward to this silver anniversary, let us ask ourselves whether it has been a worthwhile endeavor for the states of the world, and whether the best interests of the United States in particular have been served by continued membership in the U.N. Too often human goodness ascribes greatness to age, which is not always the case.

Has the U.N. matured and prospered, or merely survived and endured? Is it an adult at 25, or is it destined to perpetual adolescence? Do many of the larger and stronger countries remain in this organization household purely to hold the "family"—of nations—together?

To aid in responding to some of these thorny questions, the past can provide the most accurate basis of analysis for the future. While we glance back, it is also important to pause and consider whether U.S. participation symbolizes an empty moral commitment to peace on earth, or whether membership is genuinely effective.

Compromise of sovereignty: To examine this proposition it seems appropriate to recall the admonition of George Washington in his Farewell Address:

> It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it * * *. But in my opinion, it is necessary, and would be unwise to extend them * * *.

Of course these words were spoken nearly 200 years ago, but their warning is still applicable today. Human nature never changes. A wise man once proclaimed that there is no such thing as permanent friends or permanent enemies, but only permanent interests. Washington was mindful of this in his prophetic word on these baneful alliances.

Speaking at Upsala, Sweden, in May 1962, Secretary General U Thant gave his ideas on sovereignty:

> If the U.N. is to grow into a really effective instrument for maintaining the rule of law, the first step must be the willingness of the member states to give up the concept of absolute sovereign states in the same manner as we individuals give up our absolute right to just what we please as an essential condition of living in an organized society * * *. Similarly, in the community of nations, it is increasingly important to restrict the sovereignty of states, even in a small way to start with.

With George Washington and U Thant in conflicting positions, it appears that membership in the U.N. and faithful adherence to the precepts of Mr. U Thant spurn the message of our first President. While disregarding advice from the Father of our Country does not constitute an unlawful act, the legality of the U.N. Charter was questioned by a contemporary.

On the Senate floor, on July 27, 1945, Senator Langer of North Dakota exclaimed:

> As their [constituents'] representative here in the Senate, I cannot, I will not, God helping me, vote for a measure which I believe to be unlawful under our Constitution, a measure which in my opinion betrays the very people who sent us to the Senate as their representatives.

But if we assume that Washington's advice is anachronistic, and ratification of the Charter was legal, it becomes increasingly important to ask whether there are any pluses on the ledger for continuing U.S. membership. What does America have to gain? What rewarding dividends can the U.N. provide? Whether it be the Boy Scouts or the Elks, it appears pointless to remain in a group if certain needs cannot be met and desires fulfilled. Useful in arriving at conclusions on this account is the following:

Structure and cost proportions: Perhaps it is common knowledge to this committee, but certain facts bear repeating. The smallest U.N. member is the Maldive Islands, with a population of 106,000, smaller than many American cities. Within the U.N.'s General Assembly, a two-thirds majority now can be mustered by "nations with less than 10 percent of the world's population—and these same countries pay less than 5 percent of the U.N. budget" (James J. Kilpatrick, Washington Star, Feb. 10, 1970). More than half the U.N. members are in arrears, and that explains why the Assembly refuses to remove voting rights from delinquent countries (Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Washington Star, Feb. 14, 1970).

The U.S. appropriation for fiscal 1970 is $263.7 million, up 85 percent from 1961. (See statement of Hon. Elmer Staats, Comptroller

General, before this committee on March 5, 1970.) Admittedly, this amount is small when placed beside a $200 billion budget, but it is exceedingly prodigious in terms of alleviating the domestic ills of our own country.

As history records: In reviewing the records of the U.N., with particular emphasis on achieving the mandate of its Charter to insure world peace, several episodes come to mind. The Korean war, although not started by the U.N., was waged under U.N. sanction. Yet the United States provided 95 percent of the forces and sustained the same percentage of casualties.

It will also be recalled that the Security Council of the U.N. sent American troops into Korea. Pursuant thereto was an executive agreement which was never submitted to either House of Congress for approval. So, too, U.N. muscle was conspicuously absent when Russia assaulted Hungary in 1956, when the Berlin wall was erected in 1961, when Czechoslovakia was raped and the *Pueblo* was seized, both in 1968.

Speaking of U.N. involvement in the Congo, Richard M. Nixon had this to say in a letter to Under Secretary of State George Ball, as reported in the New York Times of December 20, 1961:

> The U.N., which is supposed to be in instrument of peace, has been bombing and strafing Katanga Province in the Congo, killing civilians indiscriminately from the air and destroying hospitals and places of worship, while Moise Tshombe, the educated Christian anti-Communist head of Katanga, has been pleading for peace and negotiations. Even the Red Cross has protested. The U.N., instead of serving as an agency to mediate differences among the various factions in the Congo, has been attempting to force Moise Tshombe to join the central government of the Congo, which is infiltrated by Communists and Communists sympathizers.

The foregoing highlights beg the question of whether the interests of the United States are being genuinely served by continuing its membership in the U.N. Have we not already made yeoman efforts to accommodate Communist-backed countries at the conference table, to wit: Panmunjon, which to this day is still attempting to conclude an armistice respecting the Korean war; the Paris peace talks, where even the shape of the table could not be agreed upon without ridiculously protracted discussions, and no substantial progress has been made.

There are many treaties and other agreements involving the United States and Russia, including the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. The latter treaty is emasculated, since there is no provision for onsite inspection. There are many truly peace-loving members in the U.N., but as long as Russia and her satellites are not serious about peace, and are more interested in rhetoric than in reconciliation, the question again arises, should not the United States disengage itself from this burlesque world government and cease allowing its pride and dignity to be trampled?

Looking forward: As to U.N. prospects, Edvard Hambro, chief delegate of Norway, told the Associated Press (Columbus Dispatch, Feb. 1, 1970):

> After all, you cannot expect people to come back year after year to hear the same debates on such subjects as apartheid and Korea. Most of the speeches have, in effect, become ritualistic exercises. The views expressed were once novel and interesting, but it's old stuff now.

In the same report, Jamil Broody, head of the Saudi Arabia Mission, berated the members for their excessive socializing and referred to most offices as sinecures. "Today," he said, "we have too many raucous voices that disseminate their propaganda, their ideology, their way of life, claiming that they are superior to the way of life or ideology of another state."

Conclusion: Liberty Lobby is of the same mind as Senator Dodd of Connecticut, when he told the Senate on March 22, 1962:

> If we wish the U.N. to live, and if we wish to live with it, we must first of all face up frankly to the fact that there has never been any such community of nations; that the U.N. has, instead, been from the beginning a two-headed organism—a composite organization embracing two mortally antagonistic camps the Communist world and the free world; and that the Communist world is out to bury this free world by subversion, by infiltration, by guerrilla operations, by direct aggression where they can get away with it, by indirect aggression where this seems safer.

Senator Dodd's speech is even more timely in 1970.

> We are of the conviction that American people want world peace. If, however, history is any guide, the yielding up of our sovereignty, a fortiori individual freedom, is too dear a price to pay, and still would not ensure lasting peace. That has been the credo of our forebears, and we believe it to be that of a majority of those of us living today.

There is no room in any collective security system for the faithless and treasonable. The U.N. will prosper only if it rids itself of Communist bloc countries and establishes meaningful alliances with free countries. Since this is a remote possibility at best, the United States should withdraw from membership in it.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear today and present our views.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. McGann.

Do you have anything to add Mr. Richardson?

Mr. RICHARDSON. No, sir.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. McGann, do you see any alternative? Does your organization have an alternative to the United Nations?

Mr. MCGANN. As presently constituted, we see little hope in that the avowed intent of the U.N. was to be a problem-solving body. As long as the members of this so-called problem-solving body are not intent on so doing, it seems futile to engage in this. I think we are kidding ourselves in the belief that Russia does want to accommodate us.

I think the record of the past has belied this noble intent. Our board of policy has not voted on this, but it would be my personal belief that that we should have a representative in the U.N. but not be bound by its resolution.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We are not bound by its resolution. We do have a veto.

Mr. MCGANN. We do, but again I have to revert back to situations like the Korean war.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Many people think that we used the United Nations for our advantage during the Korean war.

Mr. MCGANN. I am sure there are two sides to everything.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You say the United Nations will prosper only if it rids itself of Communist bloc countries and establishes meaningful alliances with free countries. How could that be done?

Mr. McGann. Again, it seems quite remote that the U.N. will ever boot out Russia and Communist bloc countries. So the practical alternative would be for the United States to withdraw.

Mr. Gallagher. We do have organizations such as NATO and SEATO that do not include the Soviet Union. They serve another purpose, other than merely an alliance of common interests and common allies.

Do you feel that it is hopeless to continue the quest for peace with the Russians through cooperative means or should we all be on our own?

Mr. McGann. I think we should always pursue peaceful means. It is becoming increasingly hopeless to hope that Russia really means business. We have to point to the past. We have always been a peace-loving country. We fight when we have to, but we first want peace.

Mr. Gallagher. You don't believe the nuclear weapons have altered the requirements for peace. We are staring at total annihilation if we get into war with the Soviet Union. Isn't it in both our interests to find alternatives and is there any other viable alternative to the United Nations?

Mr. McGann. I believe that is one of the reasons why the SALT talks are now taking place, to resolve the differences. We are signatory to the Nonproliferation Treaty and it is toothless without an onsite inspection provision.

Russia has a history of breaching treaties.

Mr. Gallagher. I sat in on some of those talks and a great number of our people feel onsite inspections are not necessary, due to our technology.

Mr. McGann. We would love to believe that, but there seems to be a division of authority on that.

Mr. Gallagher. This is our military people who are part of it, and who, under the legislation, are required to review all policies from the standpoint of national security. Our military feel they do have sufficient technology to negate the need for onsite inspections. Of course, it would show intent if we could have onsite inspection. I think it would demonstrate to many who have reservations that the thing has more validity than it might otherwise have.

STATEMENT OF WARREN RICHARDSON, GENERAL COUNSEL, LIBERTY LOBBY

Mr. Richardson. On your question about alternative to the U.N., I would like to point out that in Europe you have various European organizations that are quite effective, Inner Six and Outer Seven.

Mr. Gallagher. They seem to have a lot of battles among themselves.

Mr. Richardson. Those two groups do, but accentuate the positive. At least the group within the group is getting along well. There are a number of inter-European groups so to speak. For example, in education, a French student who graduates with a degree from a French academy can go to a German university, and there are about 20 countries which join in this concept. There is a great deal of progress in this type of thing in Europe and it seems to me that much more could be done and much more could be done not only in Europe, but outside of Europe. These would be alternatives.

I think, too, that in further answer to your question, alternative to the U.N. would be this. We have emphasized here in our position that it is the sovereignty angle that is important to us.

I think there are many functions. I believe some of the other speakers ahead of us mentioned functions of the U.N. which do not involve sovereignty, which are very helpful. So I would not rule out many things on the horizon today which would be good alternatives to the U.N. as such.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The matters that you point out are related to the ever-increasing circle of participation among allies. Yet, does peace rest merely on the agreement of peace-loving nations?

The alternative I seek is to bring our adversaries into an organization where we and they can find ways to peace. That seems to be the issue the United Nations has.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would answer that in this way: At the time of the end of World War II the United States was paramount in military power in the world and Russia was at that time very eager to achieve peace and the United Nations came into being.

The recent statistics that are available in the press show that they have more continental ballistic missiles, and a greater capacity for delivered multiple warhead-type missiles. The question could be transferred into different words this way: What will be their position when they achieve a numerical superiority in offensive weaponry of the nuclear age? In other words, will they be as eager to achieve peace then as they were in 1945 when they were clearly second-rate in nuclear weapons, arms and power?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The whole issue is not what they want. It is what we want, too, what we both want. The alternative they face is incineration also. So what viable alternative is there to the United Nations to pursue the quest of peace without going into intentions. That is really what we are seeking here.

Mr. RICHARDSON. At this time it is fair to say that the quest for peace as such between Russia and the United States is not through the medium of the United Nations. Your Paris peace talks are extracurricular to the United Nations function. And certainly that is the most important peace talks now extant.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am not talking about individual effort. I am talking about collective movement, or perhaps you do not believe we should have an organization. Would that be your point? We should not have an organization that includes Communist countries as long as they are Communist?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would not want to say we should not have an organization which excludes them. I think the point we tried to make is that as long as they remain in the posture they have, of not being serious about peace, there seems, after almost 25 years of constant talk, that we have wasted a lot of time and advanced nowhere.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They obviously do not want war.

Mr. MCGANN. There is a difference between talking for peace and not wanting war. It is true none of us wants war and we have managed to avoid it, but I would say we have managed to avoid it in spite of and not because of the United Nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I agree we have maintained peace by superiority of our weapons, perhaps that posture most of all. But the point is that an organization must exist somewhere where potential adversaries

can meet. I refer not necessarily to those of the magnitude of the Soviet Union and the United States.

We are not going to solve all our problems, but meeting should be in the context, in an atmosphere, where there will be a forum to reduce frictions leading to war.

Mr. RICHARDSON. In further answer to that, I would say that in the Rabbi's response or characterization—and I am fearful of trying to condense his testimony—but he mentioned the magic words, "the concept of superpowers." I think to enlarge upon that and to interject my own thought, if we recognize the existence of superpowers, then you have really a twofold problem, because there is one thing to maintain peace among the superpowers and their relationship between each other and then there is a relationship between any one superpower and the other lesser powers.

We have had very little difficulty between ourselves. We maintained the peace between ourselves. The question has always been, as in the past—say, Hungary and Czechoslovakia and so forth—when you have one of the superpowers engage with one of the lesser powers, what is the attitude of the second superpower? There is the rub.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They do what they can when they can and don't do what they can't when they can't.

Mr. RICHARDSON. So obviously the United Nations has little to do, if anything, with peace keeping in this situation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They have where the superpowers are not involved. There have been successes.

Really what I am trying to get at—and we could have a philosophical discussion here which would be interesting—but I am wondering whether or not, in your opinion, there should be any organization to which we belong that includes Communist bloc powers. I gather you think we should not. I am trying to clear the record.

I gather from Mr. McGann's statement that the U.N. really will only get on with its business in a meaningful way if it rids itself of Communist bloc countries and establishes meaningful alliances with free countries, to use his term.

I think one thing that has contributed more to peace than the United Nations has been meaningful alliances with other countries. But the issue that I address myself to in your statement is whether or not you feel that the United Nations or any organization such as that should exist with Communist bloc countries.

Mr. MCGANN. I might try and answer that by saying that we choose the concept of peace over the concept of war at any cost. Who does not? What man in his right mind would not?

Now after 25 years we say that this approach of sitting at the U.N. negotiating table has not worked.

Mr. GALLAGHER. New York is still there. Moscow is still there.

Mr. MCGANN. That's right and growing stronger we are reading, so we have tried negotiation. It has not worked. I cite the testimony of Panmunjom, which a lot of people don't know is going on. I cite the Paris peace talks as a collateral matter.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Those discussions are nasty. At Panmunjom we snarl at each other, but it is better than people being shot at over there, though occasionally they do shoot at people.

I see no alternative other than renewal of the war. Perhaps we will have one of those in Vietnam, too, which is preferable to people getting killed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We can talk and snarl with each other without having the sign "U.N." over our heads.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I follow you.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Has the U.N. as an agency promoted Panmunjom talks? If they have, are they responsible for the fact that we have talked ourselves to death?

Mr. GALLAGHER. We have not talked ourselves to death. That is the issue.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We could still sit down and talk to them without having it under the auspices of the United Nations.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You would prefer if the United States substituted for the United Nations at Panmunjom?

Mr. RICHARDSON. We have done that at Paris.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Vietnam was never under the aegis of the United Nations.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is there a difference between the two situations?

Mr. GALLAGHER. The real difference is that we are involved in Vietnam, along with the South Vietnamese Government and several other allies, to a very small extent, as opposed to the conduct of the war in Korea under the United Nations.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to use one of the phrases you used a moment ago. Some people think we used the United Nations to our benefit.

Mr. GALLAGHER. No question. Certainly the Soviet Union does. Rather than go along I just wonder whether or not I could ask that question again. Do you feel we should not belong to any organization that has Communist bloc members in it?

I am looking for a point of view for the record.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The orientation of our testimony is based on principles of sovereignty. If you are talking about relinquishing sovereignty to an organization which includes Communists, our answer would be unqualified—we would not want to be involved in a venture where we give up sovereignty.

If you are talking about a proposition of trade talks, limitation of nuclear arms, the nuclear testings in the atmosphere, and so forth, certainly we would sit down at a table and discuss it with them.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The arms talks themselves indicate enrichment of sovereignty at that level. Are you opposed to that? If we say we won't use our nuclear weapons or proliferate our attacks in the atmosphere, that is a relinquishment of some degree of sovereignty.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would recast it this way—and don't think we are trying to be walking dictionaries, but I would say it is a forebearance of an act we could take as a sovereign nation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Forebearance is an infringement of sovereignty If you forebear under treaty to proliferate or test in the atmosphere, we have given up our sovereign right to do so.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is a distinction here. In a forebearance you can resume at any time. You retain the sovereignty to resume, whereas if you give up your sovereignty, you have given up the right to resume.

So there is a fundamental distinction.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I don't see it, but I guess I misunderstand. But again I would like to just include it. I am trying to get an alternative, if there is an alternative, because that is what the hearings are about.

Is there an alternative to the United Nations? Is there an alternative to an organization by any other name that you would advocate if it does consist of Communist bloc nations or do you say we should not belong to any organization which Communist bloc nations are part of?

That is really our search, in this case.

Mr. McGANN. I think the United States ought to be happy to talk with anyone.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am saying, should we belong to any organization where Communist blocs are participating members?

Mr. McGANN. When experience has proved it is efficacious to belong to such group.

Mr. GALLAGHER. 25 years after its beginning, the United Nations is in business. Is it sufficiently efficacious for us to continue membership or should we get out?

Mr. McGANN. Our testimony seems to indicate it is not.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It does, and that is what I would like you to place in the record.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We would state that unqualifiedly, but your question brings in any——

Mr. GALLAGHER. You say because the Communist bloc nations are in the United Nations, we should get out; is that right?

Mr. McGANN. People have referred to it as a junior debating society.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There are a thousand things we can say. I am now trying to find out, because you bring another point of view, whether or not you are for getting out of the United Nations at this point because Communist bloc nations are participants.

Mr. McGANN. Because Communist bloc participants are unwilling to measure up to stated goals of the U.N.

Mr. GALLAGHER. For that reason. Whatever the reason may be, are you for our getting out of the United Nations?

Mr. McGANN. We are opposed to U.S. membership in the U.N. as of now as presently constituted.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Because of Communist bloc nations?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Because of that and because of the relinquishment possibility of our sovereignty. This is the distinction I am trying to make.

We have no objection in belonging to an international organization which has nothing to do with the relinquishment of sovereignty.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Of course it means the United States has relinquished sovereignty in that area——

Mr. RICHARDSON. That is like an embassy.

Mr. GALLAGHER (continuing). Which is a relinquishment of sovereignty, but does the same reservation apply to any organization that we may belong to with Communist bloc nations, if there is a relinquishment of some degree of sovereignty?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, sir, when you phrase it that way, we have a reluctance; right.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Do you see any viable alternative?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes, sir. The viable alternative is to so structure your international organization as to recognize—as our distinguished predecessor said—you have superpowers and lesser powers. You have your organization so structured that you do not get involved with the

problems of relinquishment of sovereignty. Then you could have many viable relationships and accomplish a great deal.

Mr. GALLAGHER. How do you feel about China?

Mr. RICHARDSON. We are bound, as you may or may not know, by the Board of Policy and the Board of Policy has declared that we are against the admission of Red China.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is the one thing that Chinese agree on too, as I told the ladies before: "There is only one China."

Thank you very much, gentlemen, for bringing us your point of view.

(Whereupon, at 4:45 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2:15 p.m., in room 2200, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee will come to order.

We are continuing this afternoon to hear testimony from the private sector in our series of hearings on the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. The Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has been engaged since February in an in-depth study of the future role of the United Nations and its relationship to United States foreign policy.

We are pleased to welcome this afternoon the following witness: Mrs. Allen Schweizer, representing the Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

We welcome you here this afternoon, and please proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ALLEN SCHWEIZER, MEMBER, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, AND CHAIRMAN OF PEACE AND WORLD RELATIONS, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF TEMPLE SISTERHOODS

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. May I first thank you for permitting us to be here today to speak to you, and I would like to express the deep regrets of both Mrs. Levitt, our president, and Miss Jane Evans, our executive director, who had hoped to be here, but could not be.

The National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the women's arm of Reform Judaism, includes a membership of over 110,000 women in some 635 sisterhoods located throughout the United States. Also, associated with us, too, are similar women's groups of reform or liberal or progressive Jewish synagogues and temples in 14 other countries of the United Nations.

Since 1945 and the San Francisco Conference on International Organizations (UNCIO), at which the U.N. Charter was drafted, our agency has been a staunch supporter of the U.N., and, at times, a critic—we hope constructively—of some of its actions, or lack of them.

In fact, even in the days of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, which preceded the actual creation of the U.N., we urged our farflung mem-

bership to participate in study, discussion, and debate of these proposals and in maintaining a two-way flow of communication with Washington in an intensive effort of democracy in action which, we trust, played a part in preparing ourselves and the rest of our country for participation in the then-proposed new world organization.

We are proud of the fact that one of our leaders, Miss Jane Evans of New York, then, as now, the executive director of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, was one of the consultants to the U.S. delegation during UNCIO.

We feel strongly that the United Nations must be maintained not only as an international forum for discussion and the development of world public opinion on issues of international concern, but also as the keeper of peace.

To this end, it is necessary for the United Nations to be strengthened in order to implement decisions and directives. While the many specialized agencies of the U.N. have an enviable record of achievement, many nations and peoples have been disappointed by the inability of the Security Council and the United Nations to function adequately in critical political and military areas.

In the face of the complexities of world issues since the inception of the United Nations in 1945, the remarkable fact is that the U.N. attained a large measure of success, especially when great powers would allow it to fulfill its functions.

In the firm belief that strengthening the United Nations will prove an essential bulwark of peace for the United States as well as other countries, we urge our U.S. Government to do all in its power to:

1. Strengthen U.N. peacekeeping machinery by:

Pressing on with the negotiations now underway in the U.N. Special Committee on Peacekeeping regarding the principles of future peacekeeping operations.

This is especially important in view of the fact that the United Nations can play only a very limited role in peacekeeping without the acquiescence of other great powers, especially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Agreeing to support with U.S. resources a strong U.S. role through creation of a U.N. Peace Fund, with appropriate U.S. contributions thereto, as well as through the supplying of technicians, transportation, materials, and other assistance.

2. Channel more foreign aid through U.N. programs, rather than on a bilateral basis. As the U.N. development program improves its capacity, the United States should increase its contribution to the U.N. development program.

3. Make greater use of the International Court of Justice for the settlement of international disputes where these are essentially legal disputes.

Therefore, repeal of the Connolly amendment is needed to enable the United States to appeal to the International Court of Justice much more widely than now is possible in disputes to which we are a party.

4. Support the program to expand present U.N. headquarters in the New York area, thus reducing the necessity to establish additional U.N. offices abroad. This might also constitute a vital factor in maintaining our country's influence in the United Nations.

The Senate of the United States should be urged to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of genocide.

The Executive should be urged to submit to the U.S. Senate the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

It is a painful fact that although the United States was a prime mover in the U.N. development of these Conventions, it is one of the very few member nations, large or small, which has not yet ratified them.

In general, we should like to see the United Nations and its agencies turn their attention in ever increasing intensity to such questions as peacekeeping and peaceful settlement in all areas of the world, population control and family planning, problems of the environment, human rights, arms control and the banning of underground nuclear testing, use of the sea beds, colonial and racial issues.

In the 25 years since the signing by the United States of the Charter of the U.N. our organization has seriously continued its educational efforts in U.N. affairs among its membership. As only one indication of this effort, it should be noted that many of the Biennial Conventions of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods have included resolutions on U.N. matters and U.S. participation in the U.N. These resolutions have been adopted either by unanimous vote or extremely large majorities.

As an example of some of these resolutions, it should be noted that in October of last year in Miami Beach, Fla., our delegate body under the title "Priorities for Peace" adopted a resolution attached hereto, the checked paragraphs of which are dealing with international and U.N. affairs, and I would like to quote to you:

> The greatest challenge today to the future of man, even beyond the excitement of space, is to control and reverse the escalation of armaments and the nuclear arms race which threatens to reach the point of no return. We applaud the agreements to extend the original 18 nation Disarmament Committee of the United Nations to a possible membership of 26 nations, even as we express the deep hope that the wisdom of the political and scientific leadership of the world, as well as the aspirations and prayers of all people, will lead to further control and reduction in armaments, including the elimination of chemical and biologic weaponry.
>
> Therefore, the National Federal of Temple Sisterhoods in Convention assembled in Miami Beach, Florida, in October 1969:
>
> 1. Reaffirms the prior decisions which it has taken throughout many decades committing itself to peaceful international cooperation; support of the United Nations; arms limitation and control; containment, deescalation, new initiatives if necessary and prompt termination by all parties of the war in Vietnam; the development of economic and technical resources for the achievement of human welfare.
>
> 3. Urges a cessation in the development and deployment of ever-deadlier weapons and systems, whether these be chemical or biological or such as the ABM or MIRV, which escalate the international arms race and accelerate the dangers to mankind. We urgently ask the United States to invite the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to join in a moratorium on the production of both offensive and defensive weapons systems pending a good faith effort by both nations to negotiate effective and realistic arms control agreements to which, hopefully—through the United Nations—other Powers will adhere. Thus there shall be reduced for all men the crushing burden and cataclysmic dangers of a continuing arms race.

In September 1967, the previous biennial assembly adopted another resolution on the U.N. and human rights in connection with the United Nations' International Human Rights Year and the Human Rights Conventions.

In earlier years, other U.N. matters were included in our resolutions, and the Genocide Convention in particular has been frequently men-

tioned, as well as various stages of disarmament and technical assistance programs of the U.N.

It should be noted that when the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods' delegate body, however large, adopts resolutions, we do so with the clear understanding that even when accepted by majority vote, they neither require nor imply total unanimity of opinion among all the members of our geographically widely distributed federation.

At no time do we presume that the adoption by our delegate body, in convention assembled every 2 years, even when the adoption is unanimous, is a reflection of the individual opinion of every single one of our more than 110,000 members.

However, adoption does give guidelines for information, education, and action by our organization, our affiliated units, and our members through programs, seminars, study literature, discussion groups, and direct communication with appropriate agencies, as well as through suitable communal activity.

The United States and the world are gravely in need of a continuing and strengthened United Nations. We would urge the United States to continue to use the U.N. as a major factor in its foreign policy and its relations with other nations.

While the prospects of charter amendment are limited in the present state of world affairs, this need not be a matter of despair. Fortunately, 25 years of experience has shown that the charter of the United Nations is a living document, and that to the degree that nations are willing to utilize the U.N. and to abide by its charter provisions and decisions, it is indeed a viable instrument that can help mankind achieve peace and security.

Thank you.

(The full text of Mrs. Schweizer's statement follows:)

A Statement on the United Nations at Its Quarter Century Mark by the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, New York, N.Y.

The National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, the women's arm of Reform Judaism, includes a membership of over 110,000 women in some 635 Sisterhoods located throughout the United States. Also associated with us, too, are similar women's groups of Reform or Liberal or Progressive Jewish Synagogues and Temples in 14 other countries of the United Nations. Since 1945 and the San Francisco Conference on International Organization (UNCIO) at which the UN Charter was drafted, our agency has been a staunch supporter of the UN and, at times, a critic—we hope constructively—of some of its actions or lack of them. In fact, even in the days of the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals, which preceded the actual creation of the UN, we urged our far flung membership to participate in study, discussion and debate of these proposals and in maintaining a two way flow of communication with Washington in an intensive effort of democracy in action which, we trust, played a part in preparing ourselves and the rest of our country for participation in the then proposed new world organization. We are proud of the fact that one of our leaders, Miss Jane Evans of New York, then as now the Executive Director of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods, was one of the consultants to the consultants to the U. S. delegation during UNCIO.

We feel strongly that the United Nations must be maintained not only as an international forum for discussion and the development of world public opinion on issues of international concern, but also as keeper of the peace. To this end, it is necessary for the United Nations to be strengthened in order to implement decisions and directives. While the many specialized agencies of the UN have an enviable record of achievement, many nations and peoples have been disappointed by the inability of the Security Council and the United Nations to function adequately in critical political and military areas. In the face of the complexities

of world issues since the inception of the United Nations in 1945, the remarkable fact is that the UN attained a large measure of success, especially when great Powers would allow it to fulfill its functions.

In the firm belief that strengthening the United Nations will prove an essential bulwark of peace for the United States as well as other countries, we urge our U.S. Government to do all in its power to:

1. Strengthen UN peacekeeping machinery by:

Pressing on with the negotiations now underway in the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping regarding the principles of future peacekeeping operations. This is especially important in view of the fact that the United Nations can play only a very limited role in peacekeeping without the acquiescence of other Great Powers, especially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Agreeing to support with United States resources a strong U.S. role through creation of a UN Peace Fund with appropriate U.S. contributions thereto, as well as through the supplying of technicians, transportation, materials and other assistance.

2. Channel more foreign aid through UN programs rather than on a bi-lateral basis. As the UN Development Program improves its capacity, the United States should increase its contribution to the UN Development Program.

3. Make greater use of the International Court of Justice for the settlement of international disputes where these are essentially legal disputes. Therefore, repeal of the Connolly amendment is needed to enable the United States to appeal to the International Court of Justice much more widely than now is possible in disputes to which we are a party.

4. Support the program to expand present UN headquarters in the New York area, thus reducing the necessity to establish additional UN offices abroad. This might also constitute a vital factor in maintaining our country's influence in the United Nations.

The Senate of the United States should be urged to ratify the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide; likewise, the Executive should be urged to submit to the U.S. Senate the Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination. It is a painful fact that although the United States was a prime mover in the UN development of these conventions, it is one of the very few member nations, large or small, which has not yet ratified them.

In general, we should like to see the United Nations and its agencies turn their attention in ever increasing intensity to such questions as peacekeeping and peaceful settlement in all areas of the world; Population Control and Family Planning; Problems of the Environment; Human Rights; Arms Control and the Banning of Underground Nuclear Testing; Use of the Sea Beds; Colonial and Racial Issues.

In the 25 years since the signing by the United States of the Charter of the UN, our organization has seriously continued its educational efforts in UN affairs among its membership. As only one indication of this effort, it should be noted that many of the Biennial Conventions of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods have included resolutions on UN matters and U.S. participation in the UN. These resolutions have been adopted either by unanimous vote or extremely large majorities. As an example of some of these resolutions, it should be noted that in October of last year in Miami Beach, Florida, our delegate body under the title "Priorities for Peace" adopted a resolution attached hereto, the checked paragraphs of which are dealing with international and UN affairs.

In September 1967 the previous Biennial Assembly adopted another resolution on the UN and Human Rights in connection with the United Nations' International Human Rights year and the Human Rights Conventions. In earlier years other UN matters were included in our resolutions and the Genocide Convention in particular has been frequently mentioned as well as various stages of disarmament and technical assistance programs of the UN.

It should be noted that when the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods' delegate body, however large, adopts resolutions, we do so with the clear understanding that even when accepted by majority vote, they neither require nor imply total unanimity of opinion among all the members of our geographically widely distributed Federation. At no time do we presume that the adoption by our delegate body, in convention assembled every two years, even when the adoption is unanimous, is a reflection of the individual opinion of every single one of our more than 110,000 members. However, adoption does give guide lines for information, education and action by our organization, our affiliated units

and our members through programs, seminars, study literature, discussion groups and direct communication with appropriate agencies as well as through suitable communal activity.

The United States and the world are gravely in need of a continuing and strengthened United Nations. We would urge the United States to continue to use the UN as a major factor in its foreign policy and its relations with other nations. While the prospects of charter amendment are limited in the present state of world affairs, this need not be a matter of despair. Fortunately, 25 years of experience has shown that the Charter of the United Nations is a living document and that to the degree that nations are willing to utilize the UN and to abide by its charter provisions and decisions, it is indeed a viable instrument that can help mankind achieve peace and security.

National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods—Resolutions of the XXVII Biennial Assembly, Miami Beach, Fla., October 1969

PRIORITIES FOR PEACE

The ringing words, "We came in peace for all mankind," are inscribed on the plaque left on the moon by Astronauts Neil A. Armstrong, Michael Collins and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr. It is a fortunate reality that contemporary man and his technology—contributed to by the geniuses of many countries—make it possible to achieve the exploration of the universe. But, in order for peace for all mankind to become a literal fact and for all men, whether in the United States or elsewhere, to enjoy the fruits of an advancing society, it is of prime importance for the developed nations and especially the United States to re-order national priorities.

The greatest challenge today to the future of many, even beyond the excitement of space, is to control and reverse the escalation of armaments and the nuclear arms race which threatens to reach the point of no return. We applaud the agreements to extend the original 18 nation Disarmament Committee of the United Nations to a possible membership of 26 nations, even as we express the deep hope that the wisdom of the political and scientific leadership of the world, as well as the aspirations and prayers of all people, will lead to further control and reduction in armaments, including the elimination of chemical and biologic weaponry.

Mindful that the ordering of national priorities may be a reflection of a people's religious conscience and sensitivities, we are especially aware of the debate in the United States on the effectiveness and the vast costs of armaments such as the ABM, the anti-ballistic missile system or MIRV, the multiple independent reentry vehicle. The resolution of urgent domestic issues requires rethinking and restructuring of goals and primary objectives. Therefore, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods in Convention assembled in Miami Beach, Florida, in October 1969:

1. Reaffirms the prior decisions which it has taken throughout many decades committing itself to peaceful international cooperation; support of the United Nations; arms limitation and control; containment, deescalation, new initiatives if necessary and prompt termination by all parties of the war in Vietnam; the development of economic and technical resources for the achievement of human welfare.

2. Appeals to all peoples, and particularly to the Congress of the United States, to reduce military expenditures so that more funds can be made promptly available for the fulfillment of essential human needs, both at home and abroad.

3. Urges a cessation in the development and deployment of ever-deadlier weapons and systems, whether these be chemical or biological or such as the ABM or MIRV, which escalate the international arms race and accelerate the dangers to mankind. We urgently ask the United States to invite the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to join in a moratorium on the production of both offensive and defensive weapons systems pending a good faith effort by both nations to negotiate effective and realistic arms control agreements to which, hopefully—through the United Nations—other Powers will adhere. Thus there shall be reduced for all men the crushing burden and cataclysmic dangers of a continuing arms race.

4. Applauds the successful negotiations of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968 and its ratification by the U.S. Senate. We look forward hopefully to its ratification by those signatory nations which have not yet acted upon it and earnestly hope that it will receive early acceptance by all the nations of the world.

Furthermore, it is the confirmed view of the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods that the resources of affluent nations should be used on many fronts simultaneously, whether these be exploration of space or the amelioration of the grievous ills of our society, rather than disproportionately upon provocative military armaments. Above and beyond the funds needed for limited, intelligently planned defense, monies are urgently required for human necessities. While the following subjects will in large measure be applicable to the United States, they are also of concern in varying degrees in other nations as well:

A. Housing

In the United States, the commitment to volume production of lower-income housing contained in the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act will not be realized unless full funding is appropriated. The congested, decadent conditions of urban slum areas breed disease and crime. Middle-income families, unable to find housing at prices they can afford to pay, move from urban areas. They leave behind them inner cities inhabited almost entirely by the disadvantaged, ringed by a more prosperous, middle-class generally white suburbia, thereby establishing conditions which often lead to added racial frustrations and tensions.

B. Education

Neither higher education nor elementary and secondary education has had adequate funding; appropriations have often fallen short even of the amounts authorized. Unless more Federal and State money is added to local funds for schools, equipment, special studies, remedial programs, teachers' training and salaries, as well as student aid, education in the United States cannot meet the needs of these closing decades of the 20th century, in which the under-educated are irreparably handicapped.

C. Welfare reform

The Welfare System in the United States, as now constituted, is costly, inequitable, cumbersome and often destructive of human dignity. It saps local treasuries; penalizes job seekers when a too high amount is deducted from every welfare check for money earned in the job market; tends to disrupt families because many states still refuse payments if unemployed fathers are in the household, thus encouraging husbands to leave home in order to qualify their wives and children for benefits; permits too-wide disparities between the payments made by rural and industrial states. We call upon our members to study with objectivity the many proposals for Welfare Reform, whether from the President's Commission or other sources, including a possible maintenance of adequate income for essentials so that no man, woman or child shall live in degradation in the midst of an affluent society.

D. Cooperation

Even persons of good will and of relative security suffer greatly today from a sense of frustration as they seek to face the challenges and complexities of contemporary society. It is essential for all men and women, of whatever color, race, creed or economic condition to continue with unyielding resolve their efforts to cooperate one with another in meeting and overcoming the grave issue which confront us. A nation and a mankind that can place men upon the moon can likewise resolve the ills of their civilization. Therefore, Sisterhood women—wherever they reside—shall continue their efforts with their neighbors and in active programs, to build the better world all men seek.

Finally, the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods calls upon its affiliated groups and District Federations, as well as individual members, to study these grave issues of priorities for peace—including the problems of the population explosion—with open mindedness and, as citizens, to make their convictions known to Governmental authorities and to their legislators. Thus shall we, both organizationally and individually, make our contribution—however great the complexities—toward a world of orderly development for all men.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mrs. Schweizer, for an excellent statement.

Would you care to respond to questions?

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. Do you have any questions?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I don't know. I didn't ask my colleagues.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I have no desire to embarrass the witness, Mr. Chairman, but I do have some questions.

About foreign aid, you suggest that the United States should increase its contribution to the United Nations development program as it improves its capacity. Then, in the same paragraph, you suggest that more aid be channeled through U.N. programs rather than on a bilateral basis.

Are you suggesting we should look before we leap, or should we increase the aid to the U.N. regardless of the capacity of its agencies?

I am not sure whether one sentence doesn't contradict the other.

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. Well, we say here, channel more aid through U.N. programs rather than bilaterally.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Then you say it should increase its efficiency——

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. But they go hand in hand.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Should there be no greater contributions until the capacity has improved?

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. Until the capacity has improved; yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The major way we presently make our contribution is through the UNDP.

Why is your federation opposed to bilateral aid? What advantages are there to multilateral aid, as opposed to bilateral?

We lose a considerable amount of control in the sense of watching where the money goes, if it goes to a multilateral international organization. Why do you think there is going to be a better use of the taxpayers' money with a multilateral agency than on a bilateral basis?

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. They feel this is the best way to do it. They have studied it, and feel we should look into it and try to do it through a multilateral agency.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Criticism of a bilateral relationship is quite common. I would think it is almost easier to justify giving aid directly, if we feel it is desirable, and we feel the recipient country is capable of handling its problems and using the assistance.

If we give aid through a multilateral agency, it would be far more difficult to control. Your statement seems to be a criticism of a bilateral program.

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. They don't mean it as criticism, but they feel we should look into doing it more on a multilateral basis.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You spoke of strengthening the United Nations. One of the key trouble areas in the world is the Middle East, and the United Nations attempted to say what they thought should be done there, and a resolution was passed.

Do you think any strengthening of the United Nations would put teeth in such a resolution and do you think this would be advisable?

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You think a settlement should be imposed between Israel and her neighbors?

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. To try to bring all people together and end war.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Israel is sensitive about the resolution itself, let alone any imposition or implementation by the U.N.

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. But I think if the U.N. were strengthened enough, they would be able to bring both parties together.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Regardless of whether the parties thought the action was biased or not?

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. In a strengthened U.N. I don't think there would be bias.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Israel thinks less than highly of the United Nations at the moment. She might be very sensitive about something passed with a very substantial bloc of votes from Arab countries. This might not represent justice at all to Israel. This kind of imposition of a decision by an international body, although it might seem just to the United States, might seem unjust for Israel.

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. I would not want to presume to speak for Israel on this, but we feel, and I think most people feel, that the U.N. does not have the strength, the power, to cope with many of these things.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. And perhaps not the wisdom.

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. Possibly the wisdom, as well, and that this is the thing that they really would like to see, the U.N. attract the people on it who would have the ability to bring man together across a table to discuss these things, and to eventually do away with all war.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to thank you very much for your statement.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I have one short question.

Do you favor the agreements which increased the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee to 26?

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. Yes. May I point out that what we say is "We applaud the agreements to extend the original 18-Nation Disarmament Committee to 26."

Mr. GALLAGHER. We have worked out the nonproliferation treaty, and the seabed arms control treaty. It seems to be working well.

Thank you very much.

Mrs. SCHWEIZER. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We now have Mrs. Williams, please.

STATEMENT OF MRS. NOVELLA WILLIAMS, PRESIDENT, CITIZENS FOR PROGRESS

Mr. GALLAGHER. We welcome you here this afternoon, Mrs. Williams. Mrs. Williams is the president of Citizens for Progress.

We have your statement before us. Please proceed.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for granting our organization the opportunity to share with you some of our feelings concerning our country and the world as a whole.

I am Novella Williams, president of Citizens for Progress, an organization that feels very strongly in the area of human rights and works for the betterment of all people, especially black people and poor people.

The United States Government is in fact the superpower of the world, but its image is tarnished, and its position endangered by its failure to guarantee basic human rights to many, many human beings subject to the power, influence, and dominion of this Nation.

The Secretary General of the United Nations has stressed that the second development decade must be based on the concept of a global strategy, a strategy which recognizes that this small planet of ours, despite its division into rich and poor, into north and south, into developed and developing, is in fact an indivisible entity.

The position of the United States should be one that builds on this concept. The United States should make an all-out effort to advance the

efforts of the United Nations by informing the people of this Nation of the vast peacekeeping machinery in motion in this world body.

The legislative bodies of this Government ought to make the United Nations goal for peace and justice their goal, without thought of national interest, for the interest of all people is in the national interest. Many of the problems of developing people are of national interest. Many of the problems of developing people all over the world are the problems still being faced within our Nation.

The right to speak, the right to work, the right to learn, and the right to avoid poverty and hunger are still a very real quotient missing from the lives of black people in this Nation. Freedom of speech and the right to dissent is being jeopardized.

The atmosphere for peace in this Nation, which is one of the most powerful political and economic forces in the U.N. is daily being shattered by the widening gap between youth and adults, black and white, poor and the rich.

The atmosphere of concern one for another, where a willingness to hear an opposing view and with a mind to accept an opposing view with an understanding mind is being destroyed. Political moves which to a majority of black people and youth are immoral, and expedient only to the economic and materialistic growth of the Government, and not the development of people, is becoming a shattering force in the minds of those in search of true peace.

It is stated in the preamble to UNESCO's Constitution, "Peace is built in the minds of men, and it is in the minds of men that the defense of peace must be constructed." Peace is unity, one controlling force which seeks to bring understanding between men. The United Nations is a center of peacemaking, and the United States ought to use this center to deal with the minds of men in our society.

It is the duty of the legislative body of this country to consider the impact the United States organizational system could have if made available to the people of this Nation at every level. If the vast resources of the United Nations in areas of human relations, cultural, and scientific resources were instruments through which our Government encouraged its people pursue peace, the perilous effect of unresolved conflicts might be redirected into avenues of peace.

The people of this Nation ought to be informed of the alternatives to confrontation, black people and young people, or any persons seeking to be heard, seeking to carry his concerns to the world, ought not be kept out of this world body.

The United States ought to make it their policy that no person would be denied access to the wealth of information and resources available at the U.N. It ought to be the policy of the United States that black people will be represented more fully in the peacemaking functions at the U.N., that youth will be heard, and that the United States, through the U.N. body, would seek to close the dissenting gaps, by reconciling people to people.

The voices of dissent are not destructive voices. These are the voices that could unite this country and hopefully bring it back to its original ideals of freedom for all people was supposed to be, if listened to with a willingness to effect those changes which contribute to the well-being of mankind.

When people like Secretary Finch and Commissioner James E. Allen of HEW can be fired for expressing opposing views to the poli-

cies being made by some of our present legislators, the majority of people in this country begin to realize that the freedom for which they came to this country searching is in jeopardy and an hostile atmosphere develops which threatens the very foundation of our Government.

The United States should commit itself to channeling constructively the U.N. theory and principles to the masses, so that its principal source of strength, its supporting public opinion, can contribute to a healthy U.N.

Miss Angie Brooks has been driving home the idea during her presidency that grassroots support from the masses all over the world would help individual countries change their selfish policies, and thus make the U.N. effective.

Black people, poor people, and youth are the grassroots. It ought to be the U.S. policy of highest priority in this decade to enlist the support of these people. These people feel that they have no place to turn, except to this world organization. If they are turned away from this source of justice, where this country is one of its most powerful components, they can only lose complete faith not only in the world body, but this country and this generation, the feeling that neither should exist.

This country cannot survive long divided into so many divergent factions. Since there are organizations within the United Nations concerned with creating and preserving a society where crises are less likely to occur, a society whose main concern is to foster human welfare and strengthen mutual respect and understanding among peoples of the world, it would be well for the legislative body of this country to make the most of these implements of peace, not only internationally but nationally.

It is, therefore, imperative that the United States insure all of its citizens, regardless of race, religion, or other factors which have no bearing on their pursuit of true justice, full participation, or representation in the United Nations family.

This country's position should show the will and moral integrity to support the wishes of the majority in the United Nations Security Council on peacekeeping issues. The policies of the U.S. Government have to be of such as to set precedence and show a moral faith in the wisdom of the United Nations' peacekeeping machinery. It is imperative that the United States keep the line of communication open.

The U.S. position should be one that seeks to inform the public through the machinery of the United Nations Office of Public Information of their responsibilities as individuals and organizations to the United Nations' peace effort.

The United States should seek to have all its constituents capable of electing officials who can put the interest of peace over the political and economic arrangements of governments, officials more concerned with the promotion of man and of humanity, and the building of peace with justice.

In the next 10 years, Africa will have the largest population of any continent in the world, so the United States should put forth every effort to cooperate and help set policies which do not conflict with but strengthen the human rights goals of the United Nations throughout the world.

The voices of black people in America cannot be cut off from this world body. The injustices perpetuated through ignorance and oppression on black people in this country is not unlike that of black people throughout the world, and especially South Africa.

Unless these voices become a part of the organizations set up to create an atmosphere of peace through understanding, the gap will continue to widen, and the destructive forces of mistrust and hate will destroy the foundation of America.

Through the annals of history, there is no civilization which has survived more than 200 years. We are nearing that hour, and the tensions and chaotic confrontations with the policymakers of this country is building up with unprecedented momentum.

The United States must get about the business of honoring the United Nations Charter of peacekeeping and cut out the nonsense of creating situations which divide the people and lead to violent action and death to far too many people in this country and throughout the world.

The United States is a very powerful force in the United Nations, and in recent months the United States has used her veto power for the first time. When a nation as powerful as ours feels it must use its power to control the actions of a combined majority, it ought to reevaluate its position and its reason with the hope of being more representative of the goal of that combined whole.

The United Nations is the only organization in the world where there might be hope for peace for the people of the world. If this Nation honestly desires peace, if the concepts outlined at the United Nations are the true goals of our Nation, if the human rights charter is parallel to our own laws, then it is imperative that the legislators who are the guardians of our country look closely, and examine their principles and values, and act in response to an honest desire for peace.

The people of the United States need leaders with the courage to speak and act in truth, rather than react to apathy and upheaval. This Government has to get about the position business of supporting the peoples and nations, large and small at the United Nations, taking definite and strong actions to insure the implementation of the United Nations Charter.

Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mrs. Williams.

I am sure Congress is blamed for many things, but this is the first time I have seen the legislators bear the burden of the blame for the firing of Mr. Finch and Dr. Allen. I think they disagree with other people in other places.

Mrs. Williams, we have wrestled with these problems a great deal, and one of the problems, as I see it, is as you say here, your wishing to give greater control—reduce the nationalism of the United States, and give greater control to the United Nations, is one of the fundamental problems we have.

I am sure you would agree that if it were not for the United States, the United Nations could not survive, financially and otherwise. Therefore, one of the problems we have is whether we have greater problems internationally than at home.

You seem to feel we have greater problems internationally, to spend our money in the nations where there are poor, which is an argument made at the United Nations.

Where do you think our responsibility is?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I think the greatest responsibility of the United States at this time in history is with all people and all countries of the world, because, as I stated, we know, as I indicated or alluded to in my statement, with the third world being born, and we are all fully aware of the fact that there is a third world coming aboard, then I can't seem to understand how the United States can take the position that their interests should be mainly in this country, when every single political or economic action of this country is very definitely international.

Sometimes——

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am talking, really, about our poor, as opposed to, say, the poor of India and Pakistan and Africa.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Poor is poor. If the United States takes the lead and eliminates some of the poverty, yes, in this country, it would be humanly impossible for you not to eliminate some of the poverty in the other countries, because there is a very direct tie with the poverty in other countries and the poverty in America.

I can't seem to separate the two, since some of our large corporate structures receive a great deal of their finances from the foreign lands, and those people also are poverty stricken.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am not talking philosophically, now, because I fight the battle each year of trying to get more money for the United Nations, and I also fight the battle of trying to get more money for our poor.

There comes a point when philosophy ceases, and the point is made as to where our greatest responsibility is, when the vote as to where the money will go comes over in the Capitol, and this is something that troubles us a great deal.

I agree that we have great moral obligations throughout the world. I am not sure whether those obligations and the expenditures of money are higher than those obligations we have to our citizens.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Right. Let me go a little further than that, Mr. Gallagher.

Most people look at money, and think of eliminating poverty and poor people through a little money, but I am talking about——

Mr. GALLAGHER. It doesn't hurt. It gives them hope.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. It doesn't hurt, but I am not sure it gives them hope. A man can have all the money in the world, and if he doesn't have human dignity, he is still a tramp.

I am speaking more in the line of human rights and human dignity. You cannot have a nation survive when you have so many people being subjected to inhuman treatment.

What is wrong with America today is that there are certain segments of our population that are being dehumanized, and this segment, no matter how much money you give them——

Mr. GALLAGHER. You must have been reading my speeches.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. No, I haven't.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is what I say.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. But I am trying to relate to you the facts as they are. Some people say if you give black people a little money, give poor

people a little money, if you create programs for them, and somehow give them hope, you have solved the problem in many instances, but I totally disagree, because you can give a man the world and take away his rights, and he is still nobody.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I fully agree. In fact, this is the argument that is made each year when we try to expand the budget for the United Nations, that we have spent a great deal of money, and we haven't really raised the dignity level in a great many other countries so where is the answer to it all? I am not quite sure, myself.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Maybe the answer is if the peoples of the world will come together.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If we could only do that, wouldn't it be nice?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. And maybe we can eliminate some of the wars and stop killing other people.

We might do that, if we do a little more soul searching.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Can you tell us about your organization, Citizens for Progress? How many members do you have? When was it set up? What are its purposes generally?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Very good.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We have a rollcall. Mr. Frelinghuysen will take the chair, and I will be back. Excuse me.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Citizens for Progress is 5 years old, and it was set up because we felt we had to have a voice. We had to have a voice in the education of our young people, and the policymaking of this Nation.

We felt very strongly that there was a great denial of human rights to an awful lot of people in this country, and that we had to get about the business of trying to correct that wrong.

We have throughout the Nation approximately 27,000 members. We have some members in Africa, and I am unable to give you that figure now.

Our main aim is to educate our people as to what the world is all about, and what a people should do and must do if we are to survive as whole human beings.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (presiding). Do you mean educate your members, or black people, or the people of the United States?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. The people of the United States, because we feel they are all our people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Where do Africans fit into the education of citizens of the United States?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I am African.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You are a citizen of Africa?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I am Afro-American, and I think I have to realize the fact that I have ancestors, and that if it had not been for them, I would not be here, and I can never ever forget that fact, and in order to build the people that I love a great deal, and I am going to be blatantly honest and frank with you, black people, because we have been at the bottom of the ladder so long, then I have to begin to look at my brothers and sisters in the foreign lands to find out just a little bit more about who I am, and I think that once we understand this, we can respect people as people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. So to some extent, this is an association of Americans who are interested in their African ancestry?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. No; not really. We are interested in our African ancestors because I think every race on the face of the earth is interested in its ancestry.

We are an organization interested in people, but being black, and realizing we may be the only black organization, or one of a very, very few black organizations at the United Nations, someone has to represent us, and I think I will agree at this point in history or time that black people have to represent black people sometimes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You are anticipating my next question. I didn't really understand the point you were making on page 4 of your statement, "It is imperative that the United States insure all of its citizens, regardless of race, religion, or other factors having no bearing on their pursuit of true justice," and so forth.

The only trouble is that the United Nations doesn't represent people. They represent countries.

Are you suggesting that members of the delegations from the United States should include black people? Because, of course, we have on a more or less regular basis included blacks in our delegations.

I served at the General Assembly in 1965, and Mr. James Nabrit was one of the members of the delegation that year.

Is that what you are suggesting? That there should be more black representatives of the United States in these various agencies?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I would suggest that, but that is really not what I am saying.

I think you know that without people, there is no government, and when we say that the United Nations represent governments, then the United Nations would have to represent the people of the world, because those persons at the United Nations representing their governments are people.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I won't argue the point at all, but it is done through representatives.

In other words, what is your point, that all citizens must participate and be represented in the United Nations?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I was shocked the day after Dr. Martin Luther King's death, when four women and myself journeyed to the United Nations, because we felt there was no place to turn, that all of our black men and our black leaders in this Nation were being killed, to find no black people at the people's level, and I am talking about NGO's, and I am talking about black people sitting and briefing, knowing what is going on throughout the world.

You want me to tell you something? I didn't know that this kind of action was taking place, but when I learned of this, I made every effort to make sure that the organization and the people that I was representing was represented there.

I say this because you know as well as I know that the United Nations was not established for no reason and no purpose. Some peoples, some place in the world, and especially in our country, felt that we needed this organization in order to have peace in the world.

I feel that, being a citizen of this country, if we are going to have a large organization like the United Nations then there should be some more people there at the people's level.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If you are talking about nongovernmental organizations——

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes, I am.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is the responsibility of organizations such as yours.

Are you saying in effect that there was no organization such as yours at that time represented at the U.N.?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. But I will go even further. How can an organization such as mine be represented at the United Nations if we know nothing about it? Who is funneling the information into the communities, into the minds of the people so that they will know that there is machinery at the United Nations for these people? There is recourse?

I question the reason that organizations are not aware of this fact, because I have come back into the communities, traveled around this country, and informed people that there was such machinery at the United Nations, and that we should take advantage of this. These people knew nothing about it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. As a member of the United Nations Association myself, I should send you an application form so you will get on their mailing list, at least.

I have one other question. First of all, the record ought to show that Secretary Finch has not been fired. His job has been changed. I suppose you might call it being kicked upstairs, but he is still very much in the high councils of Government.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Mr. Frelinghuysen, since you are so close to where I live, in New Jersey, we can call it anything we want to call it——

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. He wasn't fired. His job was changed.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. That is true as far as the people are concerned, but when you are as deeply involved as we are, and when you know the workings of government inside out, when you have people like W. Walden Ramsey counseling you, you know when a man was fired. We can place him any place we want to place him. We can sit him beside the President in his office, but in our opinion, and as far as the people out there are concerned, he was fired because he dared to disagree.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is an unusual definition of being fired. Not everyone who is fired ends up in the White House. But I won't argue as it is nice to know he has such an enthusiastic supporter in you.

One other thing, you talked about the vast peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations, about which the people in this country know too little.

The sad part is that the machinery may be vast, but it doesn't keep the peace. This is part of the problem we have had. If we could only develop the machinery, and if the United States could dump some of the problems we take on on the lap of the United Nations, we would be glad to do it.

President Johnson was eager to have the United Nations take on the problems of Vietnam, but they weren't eager to touch it.

The situation in the Middle East is one in which the United Nations is interested, but about which it can do very little.

It is foolish to create too much in the way of expectations that this vast machinery has thus far been as useful as we would like. I share your desire to have it useful, but I don't think at the moment it is as useful as we had hoped it would be when the United Nations was established.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I agree with you, but I still must say that peacekeeping is what this Nation should be all about, and if the people of the world, and especially black people in this country, realized that that world body was there, and that a nation can only survive through world opinion, that a nation is and a nation grows according to what world opinion of that nation is, we would change some of the situations in this country, because when people begin to talk about what is happening throughout the world, and you look at the most power nation in the world and realize that it is a forerunner, then you have to begin to question whether or not we want true peace.

I think there is a group of people in the country who very definitely desire true peace. People don't want to fight. People don't want to riot. They don't want to burn. They don't want to kill, but they have no alternative to confrontation—none.

If you push me against that wall, and I am starving to death, and I see no relief in sight, I am going to come out fighting, and I am going to kill anything that gets in my way that will give me relief.

We are in this country creating monsters, we are developing killers, and they are roaming our streets, and they are killing our people, and unless we get about the business of addressing ourselves to what the United Nations Charter speaks about, peace in the world for all peoples, food, clothing, shelter, the right to work, the right to speak, the right to dissent, America in 1976 will surely fall, and I assure you of that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Who are you pointing the finger at? You seem to be stressing turbulence on the domestic scene, and suggesting that violence will break out.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I am not suggesting. I am saying that it is.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. How will the U.N. help us with such domestic problems? If we could dump the domestic problems of this country on the United Nations, it might be good, but I don't see what we can do but address our own problems. Everyone has an awareness that there is a lot of unfinished business in this country, which is what you are saying. We know we need to develop realistic solutions for some of these problems, or at least progress, as the title of your own organization suggests. We need to see that progress is being made toward greater opportunities for all our citizens.

But what has this to do with the United Nations? In a sense the U.N. Charter is a bunch of high-flown language, nice to refresh our ideals, but the United Nations is in no condition to help us with our problems. As I understand it, you think that in some way the United Nations is going to help us resolve the problems in this country?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. In the world, and this country is part of the world.

If the United Nations were given more power, more authority as a world body, at some point in history we are going to have to become a world of people. I can assure you that some of the conflicts in this world would not take place.

There is no reason for us to have a war that takes the lives of so many people, no reason for us to have a war that destroys the human dignity of so many people, no reason for us to have a war that sends back, brings back to our country thousands, hundreds of thousands of drug addicts. There is no reason.

These people will destroy the very fabric of this Nation, because when a man loses his mind, he loses everything else, and that is what we are involved in now.

The United Nations can help in this. The United Nations can serve as a very vital instrument in this area.

All of the information that I got on drugs, drug abuse in this country here, I received it from the United Nations, not this country.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I must answer my name. Mr. Burke will preside as acting chairman.

Mr. BURKE (presiding). I want to ask you some questions. I don't know what previously has been asked while I went down to answer the quorum call, but I notice that you mention in your statement, on page 4—I am sorry. Mr. Frelinghuysen asked you about that—it is on page 1, where you say legislative bodies of this Government, meaning the House and Senate, ought to make the United Nations goal for peace and justice their goal, without thought of national interest, for the interests of all the people is in the national interest.

Do you know any country that is a member of the United Nations, particularly the black nations, that haven't now become strongly nationalistic in their views, as against the way many of them have been over the last 10 years?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I have no quarrel with countries or people becoming nationalistic.

Mr. BURKE. Countries represent people, and people become nationalistic. What you are telling us is that other people should become nationalistic, but the people in this country shouldn't become nationalistic.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. No, I am not telling you that.

Mr. BURKE. That is what your article says.

You say that without thought of national interest that we should represent or talk about the United Nations, regardless of what the national interests in this country are.

Isn't that what it says?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes, but I would like to explain what I mean when I say national interest.

For the interests of all people is in the national interest. When a government, a superpower, and indeed our Government is the superpower of the United Nations——

Mr. BURKE. But are we the lone superpower in the United Nations? Aren't there other superpowers in the United Nations?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. As far as I am concerned, as far as political and economic areas are concerned, I would say that the U.S. Government is the most powerful, the most powerful organization at the United Nations.

Mr. BURKE. Why do you say that?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I say that because the United States in every way influences all of the decisionmaking efforts of the United Nations.

Mr. BURKE. You don't think the Soviet Union has anything to do with influencing anything?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I think the Soviet Union has a great deal to say, but I don't think they are the superpower the United States is.

Mr. BURKE. I have to disagree with you.

The thing I disagree with you more about is that you take the position that the only wrong country in the United Nations is apparently the United States——

Mrs. WILLIAMS. No.

Mr. BURKE. And you do not criticize the other nations who have to collaborate and coordinate if there is to be peace in the world.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I do not live in Russia, France, or England. I am concerned with the country where I pay taxes, being as human as it can be, and leading the way.

Mr. BURKE. Don't you think our country has been far more human and far more liberal in its donations to the various countries around the world, including its contributions to the United Nations, than any nation in the world today? Do you really think we have failed only, or do you not also think somebody else might have contributed to the failure you are talking about in having world peace?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I am sure that there are some countries who have contributed to the failure of world peace. I am sure of it.

Mr. BURKE. You know it?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Well, I said that I am sure, but I am also aware of the fact that if the United Nations is to survive, then the superpowers will have to set the pattern. The superpowers will have to lead the way.

If we use our veto power, if we say we are going to take our embassies out of a country, then we have failed.

Mr. BURKE. Do you know how many times the Soviet Union has used its veto power? I haven't heard you speak out against any other superpower except the United States which only used its veto power once.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. But I think when our country begins to use our veto power, then we are on our way out. When we use our power to control the whole——

Mr. BURKE. What do you think the purpose of the veto power is in the Charter? What was it established originally for, except to give representation through the veto power when needed, when other nations move into the picture with what I consider an attempt at world power to defeat a nation such as the United States in its efforts in the United Nations?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Let me say this. I know what is written, but can we always justify the writings?

Mr. BURKE. I don't know that we can, but I can tell you one thing: I can't justify in my own mind why American citizens come to this committee and criticize the United States knowing that this country has contributed more to humanity around the world, and sacrificed more of its boys in wars in an effort which was I feel intended to bring world peace; and that has made efforts continually to solve the problems and restrain war in the world, and which has made efforts to meet with other nations, and has contributed more to the United Nations. What surprises me is that none of you ever come up here to Washington and say, "Thank God for at least trying. Maybe others ought to do more."

I can't understand American citizens who say we are always wrong.

I have been to Africa, by the way, and I will say that many citizens who are black in this country should be thankful they live in the United States instead of Africa. I think they have made progress compared to what their black brothers have made in Africa. I can't see why somebody doesn't come up here and say, I'm proud that we have been trying, as an American Nation, and acknowledge the spirit the American people who have made great sacrifices toward world peace.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I am a black woman in America. I have an 18-year-old son who is poorly educated because the American system has decided not to educate him.

Mr. BURKE. Tell me why you say that, now.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I will. I am also a mother of three daughters in a system where I had to place only yesterday, my daughter, in a private school, because America has decided that she is not to be educated properly.

Mr. BURKE. I don't believe or understand this.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Let me finish, now.

I attended—I was a delegate to the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, and I saw hungry people, potbellied kids, bellies like their heads. Twenty-five million hungry people in a nation.

I see poverty around where I live. I travel throughout America, and I see——

Mr. BURKE. Let's get to your daughter, first.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. My daughter is not separate from all these problems. This is what has happened in America. We have separated the masses, but we cannot do that. If you have poverty in America, I am grateful for what has happened to me in this country.

Mr. BURKE. But you said to Mr. Frelinghuysen and in your statement that you think we should—that you think humanity is all over the world, and not in one place. When Mr. Frelinghuysen said, "Don't you think we ought to use our efforts in this country here first, and then get involved in the United Nations"——

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I think I answered that. I think I told him that we have to do something in America, but what he is talking about, Mr. Frelinghuysen is talking about, I think I said to him, or to Mr. Gallagher, he was talking about dollars, talking about materialistic values. I am talking about human dignity.

I want the right to speak.

Mr. BURKE. You are having the right to speak now, to the Congress of the United States, today. You have the right to dissent and to disagree with me.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I want the right to dissent, because that is my birthright. I want the right to be a free agent. I want the right to attend whatever church I so desire, without oppression. I want the right to work without being subjected to inhuman treatment, and I think very strongly, and I feel very strongly about this.

The reason I am involved in the United Nations is because the organization that I represent felt that we had no place to turn, nowhere to go, but to the Human Rights Division of the United Nations, after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, because we felt that every single black man that we respected was being killed by the system.

Mr. BURKE. Do you really believe that?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I believe it from the depths of my heart.

If you go back to every man who has spoken out, who has tried to tell America what is happening to its people, he has been shot dead. Look at it, it speaks for itself. If we continue in this pattern——

Mr. BURKE. Why don't you sit in the House of Representatives some time, and you will hear some of the black Representatives speaking out like you do, and they haven't been shot dead.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. I have.

Mr. BURKE. And you will also hear white Representatives speaking out when they find injustices here and elsewhere.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. You know, Mr. Burke, exactly what I am talking about. I am talking about people who go out and inform people of the injustices of the Nation.

I don't think we should criticize them, because until we have these people criticizing, and we have the legislative body listening and acting, we will always have chaotic situations in the world.

You can't have, in a nation as rich as ours, 25 million starving people. You can't have Senators who will not grow food on their land, and expect peace in the world, because you can no longer look at black people in this country, or poor people in this country, as a separate entity. You have to look at them as the group that has joined together with groups in other lands, because they feel that is their only hope, and when you begin to think about this seriously, you are going to bring back thousands of young men from Vietnam.

Let me finish this, because I think you should hear this from a black woman.

They are angry as hell. They are so angry they won't even talk to their parents. They want to tear this country down, and they walk the streets——

Mr. BURKE. Don't you also want to tear this country down, with what you are saying?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. No, I want to tear down what it is doing to people.

No, I don't want to destroy this beautiful building. I don't want to destroy the land of America, because I love it, but I don't like what I see, and I know that you and I both are in jeopardy, because when you have thousands, like in my town where I live, Philadelphia, thousands of drug addicts walking up and down the streets telling you that they began this terrible habit in Vietnam, and they are going to kill someone for it, you have a problem.

Mr. BURKE. I know we have problems.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. We have to get about the business of world peace in order to eliminate this. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. BURKE. But in order to have world peace, you must have a bipartisan outlook on world peace. It isn't a unilateral approach, and the United States alone isn't responsible for the troubles in the world, and I would——

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Partly.

Mr. BURKE. Partly, perhaps, but not wholly responsible.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. They are a little responsible for the war in Vietnam, aren't they?

Mr. BURKE. A little perhaps, but American citizens come up here who profess to be American, wanting things from other American citizens, and yet criticize them and their Government on the basis that they are the only ones who can cause problems.

Mr. GALLAGHER (presiding). The gentleman's time has expired.

Thank you, Mrs. Williams.

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Our next witness is Mr. Mark Starr, please.

STATEMENT OF MARK STARR, ESPERANTO LEAGUE FOR NORTH AMERICA

Mr. GALLAGHER. The Chair is happy to welcome Mark Starr of the Esperanto League of America.

Mr. STARR. I appear with a couple of hats on, because I am active in the United Nations as an NGO member, attending briefings, and am also president of the Queens Chapter for the United Nations Association.

In the short statement which I submitted to you, there are some incipient suggested criticisms of the United Nations, and the way in which it could be improved, but I would not want you to think that this in any way implied criticism either of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Assembly, and the very competent technicians in international affairs who man the U.S.-U.N. Mission, and open up its doors regularly so that NGO's can get in and find out inside information about things which are actually happening.

I would like to thank the committee for the privilege of coming here, and also to say that I don't think that there is a more important committee, so far as the next 25 years is concerned, particularly in international relations.

The poets have been singing about peace ever since the Bible was written. They are beating the sword into plows and the spears into pruning hooks and things of that sort. Tennyson had his "Parliament of Man," and Vachel Lindsay saw a world at peace, and even our modern poets like Auden and Tom Wolff say, "Brothers, brothers we must be, or die."

I think you have the nitty-gritty job of translating that idea into reality, by devising the means of world law and order.

We can have our speeches, but if there is not effective world organization, then we are going to continue to live on the balance of terror, on the knife edge of fear, with the dangers of nuclear war still hanging over our heads, and certainly constituting a very real nightmare for the future of our whole human civilization, which has attained such great and tremendous heights.

We have the sort of grim choice of either pushing ourselves off the planet by a population explosion and suffocating ourselves by the affluance of garbage, or destroying our world by cosmic suicide. Mankind has never had the power to do that on any previous occasion.

I have already presented to you my document, and I was instructed in the letter to talk for only 10 minutes, so that is why I am talking fast.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We are rather liberal in that, aren't we, Mrs. Williams?

Mrs. WILLIAMS. Yes, you are.

Mr. STARR. But the point I am bringing up is that you have not only got the job of building up organization, because in a democracy, before an organization can flourish, it must have public opinion behind it.

In the long run, there is nothing wrong with the United Nations but its members. Likewise there is nothing wrong with America but its individual citizens.

There is no difficulty or problem from which we suffer that we can't cure, given educated understanding of that problem, given the will to do it.

Don't forget, when you were talking about the United Nations, it has received complete acceptance. Those of us who live in New York know that the most popular daily in that city has as its slogan "U.S. out of U.N., and U.N. out of U.S." That pictoral is the big popular sounding board that comes out every time in criticism of the U.N. so don't think the future of the United Nations is so much assured.

The League of Nations failed, and we had Armageddon. God forbid that we should even contemplate failure in not sustaining the United Nations for its next 25 years.

One is glad to see that you are making some steps in seeing what can be done in Congress to avoid failure.

If we are going to shift zenophobia, if we are going to shift fear out of people's minds, they must meet each other, men and women talking to each other as human beings, and get away from the feeling that, "I am an American," "I am a German," "I am a Russian," and find that there is something between them as members of the human race.

One of the big things about the United States is that it thinks of itself as a nation of nations in 50 States united in a Federal Government.

The United States has indeed given most to the U.N., and as one citizen of the United States, I am happy to take off my hat to the record of our country on that score. I must recognize the role that the United States has played in making so many agencies of the United Nations possible and I am hoping it will continue and enlarge its aid.

In the paper I have presented to you, Mr. Gallagher, you will see that I definitely suggest that the Security Council should set up permanent sessions of a cabinet status.

Among other things, I would suggest that we need in the matter of human rights a sort of international ombudsman, because now no matter how much a man is afflicted in his own country, he can only bring his plea to the United Nations by the consent of that nation. I am thinking there could be an international ombudsman functioning on an international supernational basis, so that some individuals could go outside their own nation to complain about an infringement of their individual human rights.

I don't think you will disagree with the suggestions in my document. And I am sure you wouldn't be holding this hearing if you didn't feel that the United Nations was the last great hope of mankind in order to set up world order; law and order on a world scale.

Without it, and despite all our achievements in civilization, we do stand in danger of cosmic suicide. But if we want people to understand and appreciate each other, if we want to break down national stereotypes, then we have to take notice at some particular time of the barriers of lingual diversity that now prevent people from understanding each other.

The curse of Babel is still with us. Some of us say fallaciously "Well, everybody speaks or will speak English." Some of us are unconscious of our implied cultural colonialism when we say, "Let them learn our language." There are over 2,700 languages used in the world. The use of any one natural national tongue would not be acceptable by the others. Should we agree to use the language of Mao or Kosygin without demur? No national political language can be inflicted on other peoples, except by improbable conquest.

The plan to develop more United Nations space in New York is running into difficulties because the French and the Germans feel that if the United Nations is in New York, then the English language has a position of prestige and predominance here; the French think their language should be the international language, and so do the others. In the United Nations itself, more than 10 percent of its expense goes for interpretation and translation.

We are suggesting, and we have been doing it for quite a long while, that one of the things that could be done, and which is necessary to modern civilization and organization, is that in addition to learning our own tongue, much more effectively and getting more knowledge of the richness of its literature in a thousand and one ways, and instead of wasting time trying to tackle even 13 of the major languages out of the 2,700 languages which are operating in the world at the present time, that we should recommend to the United Nations members that in their schools, its affiliated groups would think in terms of developing the teaching of the secondary international language; namely, Esperanto.

That is already being done in some countries. We are not giving you a sort of a theoretical project but one which has stood up to the test of time for many years.

I don't know whether you got to the last part of the statement I gave you, but you will see a sample of Esperanto written there, and this isn't the only one that has appeared in a Government document. Not so long ago, the U.S. Government Printing Office published a booklet called "Lingvo de Agreso," a military handbook for the "foreign" invading army in maneuvers. This is still available but not the ideal and usual use of the language.

Mr. GALLAGHER. For the record, would you explain what Esperanto is?

Mr. STARR. Oh, yes. It is an international auxiliary secondary tongue to be learned in addition to the native language of any given nationality.

It claims that it can be learned in at least one-tenth of the time of any other language. It has 16 rules of grammar, without any exception. It is regular in its accent—always on the penultimate syllable. It has 26 letters in its alphabet, and is perfectly phonetic.

Its roots come from international sources selected on the basis of their widest use, and then used with over 40 multipliers, affixes words put on before and after.

You must excuse me if I speak of this with some enthusiasm, I have helped to set up trade unions in Japan with MacArthur. I have been in Soviet Russia and in 60 or 70 other countries of the world, and the international language has never let me down. You can recognize much Esperanto by sight and sound. Inteligenta persono facile lernas la lingvon kiu helpas interkomprenon tutmonde.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The stenographer is having trouble, I am sure.

Mr. STARR. Tourism has become the basic industry of many countries in this wide, wide world. Those of us whose grandfathers never left their native village, now look upon a holiday in distant parts of the world as a matter of course.

You have probably noticed among the many important technical agencies of the United Nations, the television and radio section there;

and now, thanks to the satellites, you can get instant communication both by television and by radio to well over 90 percent of the population of the earth.

You send the message up to the satellite, the satellite sends it down. It is enlarged there. And so, in India, in 1972 there will be a collective campaign by television against illiteracy.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Someone says that is our problem.

Mr. STARR. Please, if you have any questions about reforms that I suggest in connection with the United Nations, I hope that you will raise them, because I merely mention them in a catalog, as it were, but I do feel deeply about them.

I do feel, for example, that we haven't settled the problem of representation in the United Nations. There must be some method, some regional allocation of members, so that a nation of 30,000 members does not have the same vote in the Assembly as one with 200 million people.

I do think that you must have an effective peacemaking force that will stay on the job, with a staff of investigators and mediators that will go into a country before the trouble starts to really find out what it is all about.

You will see, I hope, that the force of the NGO's in the United Nations, will be increased, because there are nations who do not have unofficial, nongovernmental bodies that come in and talk to them. They don't see the need of it at all. They have what they call "directed democracy." In other words, the rulers have the ideas, and the common people do what they are told.

I hope that you will see to it that the powers, the activities of the NGO's in the United Nations are increased, rather than diminished.

That, and the omsbudsman, and the permanent Security Council are things well worthy of letting your experts loose on in order to develop papers on those particular things, which I can't do in the 10 minutes.

I hope you will read those documents that I submitted to you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, we will.

In fact, at this point, we will include your statement in the record.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY MARK STARR FOR THE ESPERANTO LEAGUE OF NORTH AMERICA

Credentials.—In addition to being vice-president of the Esperanto League, I serve as chairman of the Esperanto-Inform-Centro, as representative of ELNA to the USA Mission to the U.N. and as NGO representative of the Universala Esperanto-Asocio (with units in over 80 different countries) to the United Nations. Further I am currently president of the Queens (N.Y.) Chapter of the UNA-USA. My experience with the technical agencies of the U.N. was gained as "expert in trade union education" for the International Labor Office (U.N.) in Singapore and East Africa in 1960–63. Details of service for the U.S. Government and for other public agencies and of books written are available in "Who's Who."

The Importance of the United Nations.—Despite frustration due to over-expectations the U.N. has kept us out of a third world war in its first 25 years. The League of Nations was allowed to die and Armageddon followed. Without the United Nations, nuclear war would bring cosmic suicide for mankind. By an extension of its powers, we can escape the unbearable costly balance of terror!

Reforms in the U.N.—Repeal of the Connolly amendment to save the World Court from futility, ratification of the Genocide and other U.N. conventions, permanent sessions of the Security Council, an effective multinational Peace-Making Force, multilateral aid to developing countries via the technical agencies to war on hunger, ignorance and disease, inclusion of nations now outside the

U.N. to make it universal, an international ombudsman to deal directly with complaints—these are some of improvements urgently needed in the next 25 years. Some abrogations of national sovereignty for the common good are indispensable.

Basic understanding and mutual appreciation.—Only in such a mental climate can the U.N. achieve its goals of co-operation in world law and order. One of the greatest barriers is caused by *lingual diversity;* the Esperanto League of North America works to remove this by the adoption of the neutral, auxiliary language Esperanto. Technically giant steps have made in satellite instant communication. It takes less time to fly to Europe than it took the Founding Fathers to go from New York to Philadelphia when they too were welding rival states into the United States. No existing single national tongue is likely to be accepted for political and economic reasons. A planned neutral language such as Esperanto is immeasurably easier to acquire. The United Nations must spend at least 10 percent of its income upon interpretation and translation costs. The attached documents describe the Proposal presented to the U.N. in October 1966 signed by over a million top influentials in many countries and collectively signed by 70 million. Esperanto has survived two world wars and points the way out of the increasing imbroglio of lingual diversity.

Inteligenta persono lernas facile la internacian lingvon, Esperanto. La lingvo helpas krei tutmonde interkomprenon por solvi la problemojn de internacia kunlaboro en internacia organizado. La lingvo meritas seriozan konsideron de via Komitato.

Mr. STARR. Some people think if we all talked alike, we would agree. Of course, we wouldn't necessarily—remember the Civil War in our own country, but you could speed up communication. Then there is a need to avoid the increasing lingual imbroglio, which is costing the United Nations 10 percent of its income in translation, personal contact and understanding among various races and nations are basic. Otherwise all our plans of improved organization would be like a ship without wind, like an automobile without any gas in the tank. We do seriously hope you will consider this.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Starr, for your imaginative presentation, and for allowing us the benefit of your ideas.

Mr. STARR. My enthusiasm is based on experience. I lived in East Africa for 3 years as an "expert" of the ILO, and this helps me to answer your earlier question, Mr. Frelinghuysen, on bilateral-multilateral aid.

You wanted to know why multilateral aid was more appropriate than bilateral aid. The thing out in East Africa was that when I was working as an ILO agent in what is now Tanzania, which was then Tanganyika and in Uganda, when I told them I came from the ILO, an international organziation, they accepted me much more freely, and gave me their confidence and worked with me much more cooperatively than they would have if I had said I was coming solely from the United States.

So often bilateral aid is under suspicion. Very often it is partly military aid and it is always under the suspicion that there is some ulterior motive in the giver's mind.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If you were addressing those remarks to me, Mr. Starr, I am in favor of multilateral aid. It seems to me there is a place for bilateral aid, too.

Your defense of multilateral aid reminds me of Senator Fulbright. He is less enthusiastic now about multilateral aid, in spite of his nice sentiments about it. I am afraid that there may be less interest, on the part of the Congress if they know they are not going to be able to control our contributions to multilateral programs. At least we can keep a watchful eye on bilateral programs.

Maybe we are in trouble on bilateral programs, and maybe not——

Mr. STARR. I am sure your own constituents are the problem there, because they would not allow you to vote money away unless they felt American interests were involved.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I don't feel pressure from my constituents. If I felt such pressure at all, it would be from groups sympathetic to the United Nations.

But I am honestly concerned about the feeling on the Hill. Even those who pay lipservice to the advisability of multilateral assistance, to get away from the handicaps of bilateral aid, don't support multilateral programs that are needed if we are going to reduce our bilateral programs. We may be creating a dilemma for ourselves, and the recipient countries may be the losers in the end.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Starr, I would like to just ask you a question or two, and I want to compliment you on your presentation. I feel that you have experience behind it, and your desire to see a peaceful world and a world in which we can communicate and reduce friction is important.

I find your idea of an international ombudsman rather fascinating. Certainly in the field of human rights it would be an extremely useful thing, and would serve a useful purpose.

I wonder, however, whether or not there would be any way in the development of this that those people who truly have problems in the areas of human rights, whether there would ever be a vehicle to allow their voices to be heard, since the question of suppression in various countries would be the very one that they would be complaining about, and therefore would not the U.N. in New York really become a voice for those who are rather dissatisfied with their present position within the United States itself? How do you overcome this barrier?

Mr. STARR. There is the International Rights of Man League led by Roger Baldwin, whose name I am sure you are acquainted with, which is active in this.

But I think the only weapon you have at the present time—because the United Nations has no real power when the showdown comes—is publicity. The U.N. has no peacemaking force; it is running on a deficit at the present moment.

These are the real facts of life, but publicity for justified complaints would help. Often when you now go abroad, people will come along and give you a document detailing the way in which they have been unfairly treated. They have been robbed of human rights. You bring that back and show it to Secretary General U Thant. He says, "I am sorry, it must come through a member nation."

If there were an international committee or commission looking after the international rights of man, if it were permitted to set up at least a public investigation, the facts could be known. The phonies could be sifted out from the real; genuine cases of people who were suffering from oppression could be exposed to public opinion.

I would suggest that such publicity would be a powerful weapon to make the nation involved feel a little selfconscious of the way its individual citizen had to go outside in order to get a hearing on what could be proven to be unjustified discrimination.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Back on the record.

I would just like to continue on the discussion of the international ombudsman.

There is a proposal for a High Commissioner of Human Rights which would function in this area. What is your feeling on that?

Mr. STARR. I feel that would be the way to do it. Give him official status, official credentials, official power to make representations to governments which were in question.

Don't forget the futility of the World Court at the present time, and the necessity for the repeal of the Connally amendment to save the World Court from frustration because 80 nations followed our example and refused to give the World Court any international right to go into any particular case, or to accept any verdict of the World Court. So it has not a single case on its docket at the present time.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, it is very sad.

Mr. STARR. It is futility in the extreme.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much.

I have my colleagues who perhaps would like to ask questions.

Mr. Fascell.

Mr. FASCELL. No questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Burke.

Mr. BURKE. No questions.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much.

Mr. STARR. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Miss Johns.

STATEMENT OF MISS HAZEL T. JOHNS, U.N. REPRESENTATIVE, UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST (COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION)

Mr. GALLAGHER. Miss Johns, we welcome you here this afternoon.

Miss Johns is presenting a statement for the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.

Please proceed.

Miss JOHNS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members of the committee. I appreciate this privilege to be before you.

I am Hazel T. Johns, director of United Nations Affairs, Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ. Our national office is at 289 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y., and our U.N. office is at 777 U.N. Plaza, New York, N.Y.

The United Church of Christ was formed in 1957 by the merger of the Congregational Christian Churches and the Evangelical and Reformed Church. It has about 7,000 local churches, with slightly over 2 million members, mentioned only for identification. We do not presume to speak for all our members.

The Council for Christian Social Action is an official agency within that denomination, with the responsibility of making "the implications of the Gospel effective in society." It has 27 members, chosen by the denomination's highest deliberative body, the General Synod.

In 1961, the General Synod of the United Church of Christ said:

> The United Nations is the symbol and the central instrument of a community of interest and service that serves all mankind. It is indispensable to world peace and order and to progress toward world community.

In the 25th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations, we want to reaffirm our faith in this "last best hope of mankind."

The formal signing of the United Nations Charter at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, and the location of its headquarters in New York City are directly traceable to the American belief in man's capacity to eliminate violence, war, poverty, ignorance, and disease from the face of the earth.

We believe that our country bears a special moral and political responsibility to support and strengthen the world body at all levels.

May I, as a full-time nongovernmental Representative to the United Nations, place before you a few of our concerns:

First: We believe it is to the national interest of our Government to find ways by which the People's Republic of China might take her rightful seat at the United Nations.

In 1965:

> General Synod urges the United States Government to take a positive position in consulting with other nations on how the People's Republic of China may be brought into the United Nations. . . . General Synod further urges the American people to make known to their Government their willingness to support positive economic and cultural programs with the People's Republic of China.

The United Nations was founded on the pillars of the five major allies of World War II. To have a more effective United Nations, the one pillar, representing a small portion of the largest nation in the world, needs strengthening badly. This move, we believe, will be in keeping with the recent considerations to relax tensions between the United States and the People's Republic of China.

With this in mind, General Synod in 1969:

> . . . recommends that the Council for Christian Social Action form a Committee on a New China Policy for the 1970's. This committee would report to the 1971 General Synod.

Second: Our council in late 1966 launched a new program with a full-time staff entirely devoted to international development.

In 1967, General Synod adopted a "Statement on Justice and International Development—A Manifesto for American Action in the Struggle Against World Poverty."

We commend our Government on her continued support to the United Nations in the areas of social and economic development. We would, however, urge our Government to assist in strengthening the U.N. development program by making better and more use of it, for although our support is greater than many nations, it is woefully inadequate if we consider the moral and material results we could really place at the disposal of this body.

Third: In a recent speech, Ambassador Yost stated that the United States, in reviewing its policy of southern Africa, has decided to strengthen its opposition to South Africa's policy in Namibia, with a strong belief that they should reconsider their policy by officially discouraging investments by U.S. nationals in Namibia, and by not giving Export-Import Bank credit guarantees for trade in that country, and by withdrawing U.S. Government assistance in protection of such investments against claims of a future lawful government of Namibia.

We heartily endorse such steps, and would call upon the United States to become more actively involved in granting human rights and dignity to black Africans in southern Africa.

Our council in 1963 said:

> The oppressed in South Africa are completely unable to organize effectively for the redress of their grievances. It appears therefore that without pressure from the outside world there is little chance of remedial action—

And recommended to the churches that they—

> Urge the Government of the United States to place every legitimate economic pressure upon the Republic of South Africa, and especially to place an embargo on the shipments of oil, consistent with the United Nations General Assembly recommendation that economic sanctions be applied;
>
> Urge the United States Government to take affirmative action within the United Nations to assure the establishment of human rights in South Africa.

Our council has for several years been concerned with the hypocrisy of America's opposition toward movements for independence and liberation.

Fourth: In the policy statement, "New Directions," of 1965, the council declared that:

> War is now more than the great calamity it has always been. War has become irrelevant as an instrument of national policy. It can no longer serve as a means to any worthful end . . . Given the arsenal of weapons and delivery systems now in the possession of the United States and the Soviet Union, the pursuit of further military superiority makes no sense.

In a resolution adopted in February of this year, the council urges the U.S. Government to continue its talks with representatives of the U.S.S.R. on the question of arms control and disarmament to the conclusion of an agreement on the reduction of armaments, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in 1968 and 1969; and calls upon national leaders to pursue a policy that would indicate to all concerned our readiness to negotiate differences until such a meaningful agreement has been reached.

The General Synod in 1969 urged our Government to ratify the 1925 Geneva protocol against the use of chemical and biological warfare.

Fifth: In 1959, General Synod called for a full implementation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and adopted in 1964 a resolution on Human Rights Conventions. In our most comprehensive policy statement, "New Directions," our Council urged that the United States ratify the three Human Rights Conventions, adopted and recommended by the United Nations: Political Rights of Women, Abolition of Slavery, and Abolition of Forced Labor. The ratification of these conventions, and also the long overdue ratification of the Treaty on Genocide, would help to make clear that this country is serious about the furtherance of human rights everywhere.

May I add that we have since ratified the Abolition of Slavery.

Sixth: At the request of President Nixon, identical bills were introduced in the Senate (S.J. Res. 173) and the House of Representatives (H.J. Res. 1146) authorizing an appropriation of $20 million as the U.S. Government's contribution to an $80 million project to expand the headquarters buildings southward to 41st Street east of First Avenue. This expansion is urgently needed for the expanding work of the United Nations whose various offices are now housed in scattered buildings at expensive rents, to expand the overcrowded Delegates' facilities, and to relieve the mounting pressures for further dispersal of U.N. functions to Geneva and other areas around the world. Ambassa-

dor Yost told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last March that such a dispersal would not only be administratively inefficient, its "worst results * * * would be a diminished U.S. role in, and commitment to, the United Nations of the future * * * a whole posture of leadership in the organization would be bound to diminish."

In line with our general policy favoring the United Nations we urge Congress to take action immediately, as the U.S. contribution is a key to the $80 million package, the rest of which will be contributed by the regular U.N. budget, New York City, and two U.N. agencies (UNDP and UNICEP) as commuted rent, the whole project will be in serious danger.

Seventh. We believe, as was stated in our policy statement, "New Directions":

> Nations that are serious about peaceful settlement of disputes will help to extend the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. For the United States this means, to begin with, the repeal of the Connally amendment to our acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

The concern of our church for the United Nations is well stated in the following editorial from a secular publication, the Manchester Evening Herald, Manchester, Conn.:

> There is perhaps no greater crime, no greater betrayal, in the world today, than that of the inertness, the complacency, the inability to bestir ourselves, with which we meet the unspeakable fact that the word is beginning to treat the United Nation in the way it treated the League of Nations. If that ever becomes really and finally so, we have nothing left.
>
> We are choosing war or peace, life or death, whether we wish to or not, whether we realize it or not. One choice lies in letting things go as they are. The other is in the United Nations, and never possibly anywhere else.

We believe, as stated in "New Directions," that:

> Around the clock and in almost every part of the world, the U.N. works to mend the brokenness of the world and to overcome the deficiencies of purely national action. Whatever changes may come to the organization and whatever the difficulties and defeats, there must be no turning back in an enterprise whose reason for being is not in any theory, but in the plain human needs of the contemporary world.

Thank you.

Mr. FASCELL (presiding). Thank you very much, Miss Johns. I appreciate your concern and the excellent study which your church has shown with major problems confronting all peoples.

I notice on page 1 of your statement with respect to Red China admission, I don't know what the United States could do with respect to the admission of Red China to take its rightful seat at the U.N. under the conditions imposed by the Red Chinese. I am talking about branding the United States as an aggressor and expelling Nationalist China.

Do you have any views on this?

Miss JOHNS. We are making recommendations at a meeting tomorrow on the new China policy that we are trying to formulate.

I think that if we can be a little more flexible, if we can open the door a little wider—I think we have opened it a crack—I think the Chinese will come through. I don't think they can continue being belligerent. I personally don't think so.

Mr. FASCELL. I hope you are right. It remains to be seen as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Burke?

Mr. BURKE. I have no questions.

Mr. FASCELL. What are your views on the proposal to establish a U.N. Commission on Human Rights and the establishment of the Human Rights Court?

Miss JOHNS. I think it is a very good idea, but I wish, first, we in this country would ratify more of the human rights conventions. I think one of the tragedies at the United Nations is the fact that while the U.S. delegates have been in the frontline, have been deeply concerned with the human rights declarations, have helped a great deal in formulating the wording of all our conventions, it has become almost lip service when they haven't ratified, and I personally don't think that even with the Human Rights Commissioner we are going to get anywhere unless the United States helps the United Nations in getting some of these human rights conventions ratified.

You have before you the Genocide Convention. Do you think it will go through?

Mr. FASCELL. I don't know, but it is still before the Senate.

Miss JOHNS. Does this committee have to make any recommendations on that?

Mr. FASCELL. No, we don't. But having listened to some of the debate in the U.N. with respect to human rights problems, I think it is fair to say that since the convention is agreed to, and were we to ratify, I don't know whether it would change anything in the debate that occurred on human rights in the commission itself.

The same arguments seemed to be repeated ad infinitum without any disposition on the part of the Governments to do anything. This is my impression.

Miss JOHNS. This is one reason we need to strengthen the United Nations. As you know very well, the United Nations is made up of member nations. It has no world power. It is not a world organization as such, and unless each member nation is willing to give up some of its sovereignty, is willing to accept almost a world law, the United Nations has no power, and will go around in circles in any aspect—human rights or political—or development in the economic sphere.

We still go around in circles because we are so definitely at various stages of our nationalistic concept. The developing nations are very, very nationalistic, and I think that the older nations, the developed nations, are projecting their sovereign rights as well, and I cannot personally see us working for a world community unless we are willing to see peoples as one world, meaning we are all human beings in this one world and must work together in that concept.

If we pitch color against color or ethnic group against ethnic group, then we are going to have problems.

Mr. FASCELL. I am not sure that enforcement procedures with respect to the protection of human rights at the U.N. level would do anything for discrimination in an area where there is no means of enforcement.

You can have declarations, and human rights is an international law now without a need for declaration. It is useful to achieve a consensus. That is what the Genocide Convention is, and as far as adhering to the concept, the philosophy, I can see no argument.

But I think when it begins to be translated into a specific area of the world, you begin to have a real problem. I just cannot see how this is

translated into enforcement. If there were a court that would decree the end of something, how would you enforce it? By force?

Miss JOHNS. I think the United Nations recognizes this and this is one reason why, when the declaration on the elimination of racial discrimination was ratified and became law, a committee was formed for the implementation of declaration. This is the first time in human rights conventions we have had such a committee; and this is one of the reasons why we as NGO's in this country were so very anxious last year, in particular, for the United States to ratify this particular covenant, because we wanted you to be on it.

Mr. FASCELL. I understand that, from the standpoint of creating a moral position in the world, I can see how it would be useful in an open society that has institutions that provide for the kind of flexibility you are talking about. But I see no effort on the maltreatment of the Jews in the Soviet Union, or the maltreatment of political prisoners in Cuba, or the blacks in South Africa.

How would you achieve that kind of enforcement? That is the problem. However, the declarations are essential, and community of interest is essential and the effort to strive for an ideal is essential, I agree with all that.

Miss JOHNS. I think we just have to continue trying. I think every one of us, every nation that is a member of the United Nations is willing to adhere to what they have signed.

Mr. FASCELL. Of course.

Miss JOHNS. And if we can get a high commissioner who is empowered to see that it is done, I think we would make headway.

Mr. FASCELL. I think so, too, I would be interested to see the establishment of a high commissioner and see the response he is able to obtain the minute he decides he wants to investigate anything anywhere except in the United States. I don't think he will have any trouble in the United States. That is why I think the proposal is important.

Thank you very much.

The subcommittee will stand adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 4:15 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

TUESDAY, JULY 14, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:25 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee will come to order. Since February of this year the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements has been holding hearings to commemorate the 25th anniversay of the United Nations and to ascertain what should be the future role of the United States in that organization.

We have heard from a long list of distinguished witnesses, including former U.S. Representatives to the U.N. and persons who have worked closely with that organization. We received many recommendations for improvements in the structure and operations of the United Nations. All of them will be taken into account when the subcommittee begins to draft its report at the conclusion of these hearings.

I should like to mention that the President has recognized the need for a closer look at the United Nations in his appointment last week of a 45-man Presidential Commission on the United Nations.

Today, as we draw to the end of this series of public hearings, we are pleased to welcome a panel of distinguished witnesses from the United Nations Association of the United States. I am certain that they will contribute greatly to our undertaking.

The first statement to be delivered was prepared by the former Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, the Honorable Earl Warren, who is the new chairman of the United Nations Association. He was unable to be with us today. In his absence, his statement will be delivered by Mr. Porter McKeever, president of the association. Mr. McKeever, you may proceed.

However, Mr. McKeever, before we ask you to proceed, I would yield at this time to my colleague, Congressman Wolff.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity you have given me. Although I do not serve on the subcommittee, I am a great admirer of the United Nations.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce to the committee a very distinguished constituent of mine, a resident of my district, who is Chairman of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Association.

Mr. Robert Benjamin has had seven appointments by two Presidents and actually served five times as the President of the United Nations Association and served 9 years as President of the Association. He was a delegate to the General Assembly, the 22d session, recently appointed director of the Corporate Public Broadcasting organization. He is vice chairman of Brandeis University. He is chairman of the United Artists Corp., and a very distinguished legal light in both our community, in the environs of New York, and in the Nation.

It gives me great pleasure to present him to the committee, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Wolff.

Mr. BENJAMIN. May I have the opportunity to express my appreciation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes; you certainly may.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I would like to express my appreciation to my Congressman and friend, Representative Lester Wolff, for his generous and gracious remarks. I best can say even at the risk of immodesty that what he says shows we have a mutuality of respect that we share. So thank you, Lester.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Our other witnesses are the former Deputy Secretary of Defense, and one of our most distinguished Americans, who is now chairman of the UNA Policy Studies Committee, Cyrus Vance.

David Dull, the newly elected president of the Collegiate Affiliate of the United Nations Association, as well as Mr. Elmore Jackson.

Mr. McKeever, I would ask you to proceed.

STATEMENT OF PORTER McKEEVER, PRESIDENT, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF THE USA

Mr. MCKEEVER. I am Porter McKeever, president of the United Nations Association of the United States of America.

Chief Justice Warren, the chairman of our association, asked me to express to you his deep regret that a long scheduled commitment on the west coast prevented him from being here today. Ever since he joined the Supreme Court he has declined to appear before congressional committees out of respect for the separation of powers doctrine. However, in this instance, he was prepared to depart from that practice since the hearings are not directed at specific legislation but deal with the general subject of how our country might help to make the United Nations a more effective instrument for peace, progress, and justice.

His high regard for the committee's purpose in conducting these hearings prompted him to prepare, prior to his departure, a short statement.

Before presenting this statement it might be helpful to the committee if I described briefly the components which make up the United Nations Association of the United States of America, because UNA-USA embraces and serves a large and diverse constituency.

There are individual dues-paying members who currently number 52,000. Incidentally, this membership has more than doubled in the last 3 years.

Many of these members are active in 176 local UNA chapters in every section of the country.

There is a council of organizations composed of 139 civic, service, business, labor, religious, fraternal, educational, and professional associations.

If I may, I will file with the committee a full list of the 139.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Without objection, it will be inserted in the record at this point.

(The information follows:)

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

COUNCIL OF ORGANIZATIONS

African-American Institute
Altrusa International
Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America
Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
American Association of University Women
American Association for World Health
American Baptist Convention, Division of Christian Social Concerns
American Civil Liberties Union
American Ethical Union
American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizatio
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees
American Federation of Teachers
American Friends of the Middle East, Inc.
American Friends Service Committee
American Jewish Committee
American Jewish Congress
American Jewish Congress, Women's Division
American Women's Voluntary Services
Americans for Democratic Action
AMVETS
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
Association for Childhood Education International
Association of the Junior Leagues of America
B'nai B'rith
B'nai B'rith Women
Boy Scouts of America
Boys' Clubs of America
Brandeis University National Women's Committee
Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks
CARE, Inc.
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Center for War/Peace Studies
Church Women United
Committee for Economic Development
Committee for World Development and World Disarmament
Communications Workers of America
Community Development Foundation
Cooperative League of the USA
Council for Christian Social Action, United Church of Christ
Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs
Council on Religion and International Affairs
Episcopal Church in the USA
The Experiment in International Living
Farband Labor Zionist Order
Foreign Policy Association
Friends General Conference
Future Farmers of America
Future Homemakers of America
General Federation of Women's Clubs
Glass Bottle Blowers' Association

Hadassah
Industrial Union Dept., AFL–CIO
Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America
Institute for International Order
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers
International Council of Industrial Editors
International Cultural Centers for Youth
International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union
International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers
International Union of Operating Engineers
International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink and Distillery Workers
Jewish War Veterans of the USA
League for Industrial Democracy
League of Women Voters of the U.S.
Lions International
Lutheran Council in the USA
Methodist Board of Christian Social Concerns
Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.
National Association of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc.
National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.
National Association of Social Workers, Inc.
National Catholic Educational Association
National Conference of Christians and Jews, Inc.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers
National Council of Catholic Men
National Council of Catholic Women
National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA
National Council of Jewish Women
National Council of Women of the U.S.
National Education Association of the U.S.
National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.
National Federation of Music Clubs
National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers
National Federation of Temple Brotherhoods
National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods
National Grange
National Jewish Welfare Board
National League of Cities
National Maritime Union of America
National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of the U.S.A.
National Urban League, Inc.
National Women's Conference of the American Ethical Union
National Women's League of the United Synagogue of America
Pan Pacific and South East Asia Women's Association of the USA
People to People
Pilot International
Planned Parenthood-World Population
Promoting Enduring Peace, Inc.
Quota International, Inc.
Railway Labor Executives' Association
Retail Clerks International Association
Sales Promotion Executives Association
Salvation Army
Service Employees International Union
Soroptimist Federation of the Americas, Inc.
Speakers Research Committee for the UN
Textile Workers Union of America
Transport Workers Union of America
Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism
Unitarian Universalist Association
Unitarian Universalist Women's Federation
United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers (UAW)
United Furniture Workers of America
United Mines Workers of America
United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.

U.S. Catholic Conference
U.S. Committee for UNICEF
U.S. Council of the International Chamber of Commerce
U.S. National Student Association
U.S. Youth Council
United Steelworkers of America
United Transportation Union
Utility Workers Union of America
Women United for the United Nations
Women's American ORT
Women's Division, Methodist Board of Missions, Methodist Church
Women's National Book Association
Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Women's National Farm and Garden Association
World Federalists USA
World Peace Foundation
World Peace Through Law Center
YMCA
YWCA
Zionist Organization of America
Zonta International

Mr. McKeever. Together, this membership totals tens of millions, and reaches into every community. They probably represent a sizable majority of the thoughtful organized citizens of the country having an interest in international affairs. Mr. Benjamin will comment on joint endeavors that result from this relationship. A list of the organizations is appended to this statement.

There is a collegiate affiliate, the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs—CIRUNA—which has units on approximately 500 campuses and provides us with a very lively communications bridge across the generation gap. You will be hearing later from the Yale University student who was just recently elected by the delegates to their annual student leadership institute as the new president of CIRUNA, Mr. David Dull.

UNA-USA provides the central secretariat services for the national observance each year of United Nations Day, led by a national U.N. Day chairman appointed by the President of the United States, and guided by a presidential proclamation followed by similar proclamations by Governors of nearly all of the States and hundreds of mayors. This usually involves providing materials and program services to local observances in 1,200 to 1,500 communities across the country.

Finally, UNA-USA represents the United States in the World Federation of United Nations Associations, made up of citizen organizations from more than 60 countries. Similarly, its collegiate affiliate represents the United States in the international student movement for the U.N., which is allied to the world federation.

UNA's overall policies and management are guided by a board of directors, one of whom I am happy to say is your colleague on this committee, Representative Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen. A full list of the board of directors will be submitted for the record.

Mr. Gallagher. Without objection, it will be put in the record.

(The list follows:)

United Nations Association of the United States of America

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

I. W. Abel, President, United Steel Workers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15222

Mrs. David M. Allyn, 3250 East Ave., Rochester, N.Y. 14618
Robert O. Anderson, Chairman of the Board, Atlantic Richfield Co., 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Mrs. Dana Converse Backus, 1158 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10029
C. Lloyd Bailey, Executive Director, U.S. Committee for UNICEF, 331 E. 38th St., New York, N.Y. 10016
Ben Barkin, Berkin, Herman & Associates, 735 N. Water Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202
Frank E. Barnett, Chairman & Chief Executive Officer, Union Pacific Railroad Company, 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Frederick S. Beebe, Chairman of the Board, Newsweek, Washington Post, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Mrs. Margaret L. Belcher, President, National Asso. of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2861 Urban Avenue, Columbus, Georgia 31907
Karl R. Bendetsen, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, Inc., 777 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
Robert S. Benjamin, Chairman of the Board, United Artists Corporation, 729 Seventh Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019
Mrs. Joseph Berenson, President, Southern N.Y. State Division UNA, 93 Baraud Road, Scarsdale, N.Y. 10583
Lee S. Bickmore, Chairman of the Board, National Biscuit Co., 425 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Mrs. Shirley Temple Black, 115 Lakeview Drive, Woodside, California 94062
Steven Blaske, 27389 Pierce, Southfield, Michigan 48075
Jacob Blaustein, Director, Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 1 North Charles, The Blaustein Building, Baltimore, Maryland 21203
Robert S. Boas, Chairman of the Board, Carl Marks & Co., Inc., 20 Broad St., New York, N.Y. 10005
Giovanni Buitoni, Chairman of the Board, Buitoni Foods Corp., 444 Madison Avenue, Room 2403, New York, N.Y. 10022
Ralph J. Bunche, Room 3853 A, United Nations, New York, N.Y. 10017
Gen. Lucius D. Clay (retired), Director, Lehman Brothers, 1 William Street, New York, N.Y. 10004
William K. Coblentz, Partner, Jacobs, Sills & Coblentz, 555 California Street, San Francisco, California 94104
William H. Cochrane, Chairman of the Board, Neptune Meter Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020
Herbert J. Cohen, Cohen & Wolf, 955 Main Street, Bridgeport, Connecticut 06603
William T. Coleman, Jr., Partner, Dilworth, Paxton, Kalish, Kohn & Levy, 2600 The Fidelity Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa. 19109
James W. Davant, Managing Partner, Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, 140 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10005
Jose de Cubas, President, Westinghouse Electric International Co., 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
Oscar A. de Lima, Chairman of the Board, Roger Smith Hotels Corporation, 276 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10010
Mrs. Edison Dick, 612 Woodland Road, Lake Forest, Illinois 60045
Fairleigh S. Dickerson, Jr., President, Becton Dickinson & Co., Stanley Street, East Rutherford, New Jersey 07073
Mrs. Robert K. Di Giorgio, 2330 Lyon Street, San Francisco, California 94115
Bishop John J. Dougherty, St. Rose of Lima Rectory, 50 Short Hills Avenue, Short Hills, New Jersey 07078
Robert W. Dowling, Chairman of the Board, City Investing Co., 767 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
David Dull, Yale University, 731 Yale Station, New Haven, Connecticut 06520
R. Edison Elkins, 2200 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009
Gustav S. Eyssell, President, Rockefeller Center, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020
Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., Honorary Director, Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., 1200 Firestone Parkway, Akron, Ohio 44317
Shelton Fisher, President, McGraw-Hill, Inc., 330 W. 42d St., New York, N.Y. 10036
J. Frank Forster, President, Sperry Rand Corp., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019
Mrs. Luther H. Foster, Tuskegee Institute, 520 Montgomery Road, Tuskegee, Alabama 36088

Henry H. Fowler, Partner, Goldman Sachs & Co., 55 Broad Street, New York, N.Y. 10004
Congressman Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen, U.S. House of Representatives, 2162 Rayburn House Office Bldg., Washington, D.C. 20515
Richard N. Gardner, Prof. of Law and Int'l Organization, Columbia University, 435 West 116th St., New York, N.Y. 10027
Dr. Zelma George, Executive Director, Job Corps Center for Women, 1588 Ansel Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44106
Jacob A. Goldfarb, Chairman of the Board, Union Underwear Co., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y. 10019
Mrs. Albert Greenfield, The Barclay, Apt. 19–A, Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Harold W. Greenwood, Jr., President, Midwest Federal Savings & Loan, 801 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Harvey W. Greisman, 2066–31 Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y. 13346
Ernest A. Gross, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle, 100 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005
Edward Gudeman, Partner, Lehman Brothers, 1 William Street, New York, N.Y. 10004
Walter A. Haas, Jr., President, Levi Strauss & Co., 98 Battery Street San Francisco, California 94106
Najeeb E. Halaby, President, Pan American World Airways, Inc., Pan Am Building, New York, N.Y. 10017
Dr. Armand Hammer, Chairman of the Board, Occidental Petroleum Corp., 10889 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1500, Los Angeles, California 90024
Walter E. Hanson, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co., 345 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Mrs. William Beasley Harris, 1742 Holly Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20012
Fred L. Hartley, President, Union Oil Co. of California, P.O. Box 7600, Los Angeles, California 90054
Harold H. Heath, President and Chairman of the Board, Heath Tecna Corporation, 19819 84th Avenue South, Kent, Washington 98031
William A. Hewitt, Chairman of the Board, Deere & Co., John Deere Road, Moline, Illinois 61265
Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, President, Anna M. Rosenberg Associates, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator, UN Development Program, Room A 3004, United Nations, New York, N.Y. 10017
Richard J. Hughes, Hughes, McElroy, Connell, Foley & Geiser, 24 Commerce Street, Newark, New Jersey 07102
Paul Jennings, President, International Union of Electrical Radio & Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Joseph E. Johnson, President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017
Joseph Keenan, International Secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005
Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman of the Board, Urban Investment & Development Co., 401 Michigan Ave., Suite 2850, Chicago, Illinois 60611
Harry W. Knight, Chairman of the Board, Knight, Gladieux & Smith, Inc., 299 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
Sam Lambert, Executive Secretary, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
John W. Larsen, President, The Bowery Savings Bank, 110 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017
Arthur Larson, Director, Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706
John E. Leslie, Chairman of the Board, Bache & Co., Inc. 36 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005
Franklin A. Lindsay, President, Itek Corporation, 10 Maguire Road, Lexington, Massachusetts 02173
Mrs. George A. Little, 10 West Way, Old Greenwich, Connecticut 06870
Henry Cabot Lodge, 275 Hale Street, Beverly, Massachusetts 01915
John L. Loeb, Senior Partner, Loeb, Rhoades & Co., 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005
Leonard F. McCollum, Chairman of the Board, Continental Oil Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020

James S. McDonnell, Chairman of the Board, McDonnell-Douglas Corporation, P.O. Box 516, St. Louis, Missouri 63166
Porter McKeever, 318 Cliff Avenue, Pelham, New York 10803
Mrs. Carmen Carrington Marr, Commissioner, State Human Rights Appeal Board, 250 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007
Kenneth L. Maxwell, 208 Laurel Circle, Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Carl J. Megel, American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005
G. William Miller, President, Textron, Inc., 10 Dorrance Street, Providence, Rhode Island 02903
Otto N. Miller, Chairman of the Board, Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, California 94120
Robert E. Montgomery, Vice President, Industry Affairs, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020
Thomas W. Moore, Chairman of the Board, Ticketron, Inc., 375 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Forrest D. Murden, Jr., Murden and Company, 39 East 51st Street, New York, N.Y. 10022
Robert D. Murphy, Chairman of the Board, Corning Glass International, 717 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
William B. Murphy, President, Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, New Jersey 0888101
Waldemar A. Nielsen, President, African-American Institute, 866 United Nations Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10017
Earl D. Osborn, President, Institute for International Order, 11 West 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10036
Congressman Richard L. Ottinger, 235 Bear Ridge Road, Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570
Leslie Paffrath, President, The Johnson Foundation, 33 East Four Mile Road, Racine, Wisconsin 53402
Gregory Peck, President, Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, 1041 North Formosa Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90046
Mrs. Richard Persinger, 26 Judson Avenue, Dobbs Ferry, N.Y. 10522
Peter G. Peterson, Chairman of the Board, Bell & Howell Co., 7100 McCormick Road, Chicago, Illinois 60645
Mrs. Harvey Picker, Edgewater Point, Mamaroneck, N.Y. 10543
Francis T. P. Plimpton, Debevoise, Plimpton, Lyons & Gates, 320 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Mrs. Ralph Pomerance, 83 Orchard Street, Cos Cob, Connecticut 06807
Mrs. Marsha Hunt Presnell, 13131 Magnolia Blvd., Van Nuys, California 91403
William S. Renchard, Chairman of the Board, Chemical Bank, 20 Pine Street, New York, N.Y. 10015
Nicholas A. Robinson, 326 West 101 Street, New York, N.Y. 10025
H. I. Romnes, Chairman of the Board, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broaway, New York, N.Y. 10007
Robert V. Roosa, Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., 59 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005
Burns W. Roper, President, Roper Research Associates, Inc., 566 East Boston Post Road, Mamaroneck, N.Y. 10543
David L. Rosenbloom, 57 Front Street, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140
William Ruder, President, Ruder & Finn, Inc., 110 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022
Bayard Rustin, Executive Director, A. Philip Randolph Institute, 260 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y. 10010
Miss Catherine Schaefer, U.S. Catholic Conference, 323 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017
Donald A. Schmechel, Davis, Wright, Todd, Riese & Jones, 4200 Seattle First National Bank Bldg., Seattle, Washington 98104
Mrs. James Schramm, 2700 South Main Street, Burlington, Iowa 52601
Joseph M. Segal, President, The Franklin Mint, Inc., Franklin Center, Pennsylvania 19063
Manuel Seligman, 218 South Thurston Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90049
Joe Byrns Sills, President, Delta Education Corporation, P.O. Box 2701 Uptown Station, Nashville, Tennessee 37219
Herbert M. Singer, Esq., Singer, Corkin & Bobrow, 10 East 56th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022

Brad Lee Skinner, Portland State University, Educational Activities, P.O. Box 751, Portland, Oregon 97207
Professor Hugh H. Smythe, 345 Eighth Avenue 20-F, New York, N.Y. 10001
Emile E. Soubry, Room 1250, 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020
C. Maxwell Stanley, President, The Stanley Foundation, Stanley Building, Muscatine, Iowa 52761
Herman W. Steinkraus, 106 Compo Road South, Westport, Connecticut 06880
Robert Stevenson, President, Ford International Automotive Operations, Ford Motor Co., The American Road, Dearborn, Michigan 48121
Miss Anna Lord Strauss, Interchange, 345 E. 46th Street, Room 1012, New York, N.Y. 10017
Mrs. Robert J. Stuart, 1209 South Grove Street, Spokane, Washington 99204
Obert C. Tanner, President, O. C. Tanner Company, 1930 S. State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115
Maurice Tempelsman, President, Leon Tempelsman & Son, 529 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
Mrs. Ronald Tree, Llewelyn-Davies Associates, 410 East 62nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10021
H. S. Turner, President, Turner Construction Co., 150 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017
Cyrus R. Vance, Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett, 1 Battery Park Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10004
Rawleigh Warner, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Mobil Oil Corporation, 150 East 42nd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017
The Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the U.S. (retired), Supreme Court Building, Washington, D.C. 20543
William A. Wexler, President, B'nai B'rith, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Edwin C. Whitehead, President, Technicon Corporation, Tarrytown, N.Y. 10591
James R. Wiggins, Carlton Cove, Brooklin, Maine 04616
Dean Francis O. Wilcox, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, 1740 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
Sidney H. Willner, Senior Vice President, Hilton Hotels International, 301 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022
Joseph C. Wilson, Chairman of the Board, Xerox Coropration, Rochester, N.Y. 14603
Kendrick R. Wilson, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Avco Corporation, 1275 King Street, Greenwich, Connecticut 06830
Edward B. Winn, Lane, Savage, Counts & Winn, 3330 Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Texas 75201
George D. Woods, Director, The First Boston Corporation, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017
Samuel H. Woolley, Chairman of the Board, The Bank of New York, 48 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10015

Mr. McKeever. These Directors are elected by a biennial convention of delegates from the components outlined above.

Obviously, with such a diverse constituency, UNA-USA is a nonpartisan education and research organization.

Our national policy panels, for example, are objective efforts to develop recommendations aimed at strengthening international institutions and U.S. participation in them. The recommendations are those of the Panels themselves; officers and directors of UNA-USA are not asked to endorse them. In the same fashion, each of us appears here today as individuals. We do not undertake to speak for the association in any way that would commit any of the organizations associated with us. But we can undertake to speak with the advantage of a persistent involvement with U.S. participation in the work of the U.N. and its related agencies.

This, then, is the association which Chief Justice Earl Warren now heads. On behalf of the Chief Justice and my colleagues may I express our appreciation to the committee for its invitation to appear

before you. We wish especially to emphasize our appreciation for the opportunity the committee has afforded many other citizen organizations to discuss with you the current state of the United Nations.

Your initiative in establishing this dialog is a highly appropriate way for this country to observe the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. Building democratic ideals and practices into the world order that must be constructed is certain to be advanced by your recognition in this fashion of the interest citizen groups have had in the work of the U.N. and its related institutions from their very beginnings.

If I may, Mr. Chairman, I will now present Chief Justice Warren's statement to you. The Chief Justice's statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF EARL WARREN, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE UNITED STATES (RETIRED), AS CHAIRMAN OF THE UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF THE USA

The objective of this series of hearings—to review the work of the United Nations for the past 25 years, and to assess its capabilities for the decade ahead—is of unusual importance. The steps that we take during the next 2 or 3 years to strengthen the fabric of international life may prove to be the most important decisions of the decade.

I have spent the last 17 years of my life in judicial work. Because of the importance of the separation of powers in the Constitution, I have always in the past declined invitations to testify before committees of the Congress.

In May, however, I agreed to accept the chairmanship of the United Nations Association of the U.S.A. I did so because I believed it was imperative that the world move toward a more reliable world order. It is as the chairman of the UNA-USA, and because of my deep concern, that I submit this testimony. I understand that no legislation on the subject is present before the committee.

I was Governor of California during those historic days in San Francisco when men of vision shaped the United Nations Charter. I indeed had the honor of welcoming the delegates in San Francisco and I attended many of the conference meetings.

In the 25 years that have elapsed since the United Nations was forged out of the agony of World War II, we have made some strides in re-ordering international life. But I am certain we all are more impressed with the problems before us than we are with those we have put behind. Communications and space technology are "shrinking" our planet and at the same time illustrating its uniqueness. Our national and international institutions are under challenge. And at the same time the quality of life on our planet is being jeopardized by rapid population increase, the pollution of our environment, and the great difficulties men and nations have in putting aside the fiction that war is an acceptable pathway to justice.

The problems of world order in the 1970's will clearly be different from those of the 1960's. But they are not likely to be less severe.

Looking back on the past 25 years, we can be grateful for the work of the United Nations, and the contributions it had made to world order:

1. The U.N. provided the framework for an orderly approach to decolonization.

2. The U.N. brought cease-fires or truces to armed conflict in Indonesia; in Kashmir; in Palestine in 1949 and 1956; in the Congo; and in Cyprus.

In the last three of these conflicts, the U.N. developed what will probably prove to be the beginnings of the international police force of the future. I'm sure Cyrus Vance will be referring to the report of one of our National Policy Panels that deals specifically with this issue.

3. The U.N. provided the instrument through which the international community mounted a collective response to aggression in Korea.

4. The U.N. has administered over $1.4 billion in economic development funds over the past 25 years, which in turn has attracted another $2.8 billion in follow-up funds from recipient countries for a total of $4.2 billion in development aid—helping the less developed countries strengthen their capacity to meet the "flood tide" of expectation in these countries for a better life.

5. The U.N. and its agencies have also provided the means through which much of the new technology has been brought under international regulation and control. For instance:

The International Telecommunications Union regulates the allocation of radio frequencies between nations;

The World Meteorological Organization administers, through a World Weather Watch system, the release of what would otherwise be 100,000 separate daily weather reports.

So, we are talking about a world organization with a record of some success.

It is when we look at what the U.N. has not done, and at what lies ahead, that our principal questions arise.

The U.N. Members appear still not to be convinced that national objectives should be sought exclusively by peaceful means. And they are not yet prepared to arrange in advance either to mobilize political support to suppress unilateral military action, or to organize a U.N. standby peacekeeping force to quarantine it.

The U.N. is only now beginning to develop programs which can make a major difference in the rate of population growth.

New sets of problems are emerging:

In the preservation of the ecological balance in our environment;

In how to handle the resources of the sea;

In how to develop and utilize space communications.

Already there has been a proliferation of international agencies, without sufficient coordination, without sufficient centralized planning, and without adequate attention to their effective management.

And there is an area in which you would expect me to be especially concerned, the development of international administrative law, of traditional international law, and of the international judicial system. Very little progress has been made in these vitally important fields.

It is difficult for Americans to think of an organized human community without an effective court system. We realize that the greatest Constitution is not enough: That it gains life and actuality through the cases and controversies that are brought to the courts for solution.

We recognize that laws are not enough; that laws also have to be interpreted and applied.

From my perspective, I would like to see the United States seize the initiative in reinvigorating the International Court of Justice.

The attainment of world order simply does not reside in a charter or in an alliance. It lies in the will of men to give life and meaning to agreements which can only attain the force of law if a respected tribunal exists with powers of adjudication.

These are some of the important challenges which lie ahead.

I congratulate the committee for having initiated this series of hearings. The very distinguished chairman of this subcommittee has shown the foresight to undertake them in a manner that can only strengthen our resolve to forge a stronger world organization. Indeed, I believe the American public wants a stronger and more effective United Nations, and that it will give strong support to U.S. participation in such an organization.

Robert Benjamin, the chairman of our Board of Governors, will be commenting on what we believe to be the mood of, and the concern of, the American public on matters related to the U.N. and its future.

Cyrus Vance, the Chairman of UNA-USA's Policy Studies Committee, will be telling you something of how we have approached major issues before the United Nations and how we are attempting to deal with emerging problems in the international organization field.

I want only to contribute these few thoughts about the past 25 years— and about the enormous responsibility, and the unique opportunity, that now lies before us all.

May I express to you, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Chief Justice and my colleagues, our appreciation not only for our invitation to appear before you, but to emphasize our appreciation for the opportunity you have given to many other citizen organizations to appear before this committee. We think this is a very appropriate way in which to observe the 25th anniversary of the U.N.

Thank you very much.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate very much the comments you have made.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words at this stage of the hearing. Unfortunately, I have another meeting and will not be able to stay until the end of this session, but I did want to take the opportunity to commend the United Nations Association and the work it is doing. I think the presentations here today are a good illustration of their fine work.

One of the things that has really made a difference in the work of the United Nations Association under the leadership of Ambassador Benjamin, Mr. McKeever, and others, is that in recent years they have taken a very active role in the creation and formulation of policy statements. Under Ambassador Vance's leadership, the Council on Policy Studies has come forward with some really remarkable documents that I think have made a great difference in all of our thinking about the U.N. I would like to make mention of one of the recommendations which is mentioned in Ambassador Vance's paper: the establishment of the Peace Fund. About a year ago many of us urged the

administration to come forward and support this measure in the General Assembly. Just last week I introduced legislation with a number of cosponsors from both parties which I think might have a bearing on the success of the establishment of such a fund. That would be to make the contributions to the United Nations and such funds as the Peace Fund tax deductible for purposes of the U.S. tax laws. I think there is a great opportunity both in terms of attracting support from foundations and other sources. I recognize that it might create problems with the Association itself, but I am sure the Association would be willing to sacrifice its own interests in the interests of building a wholly new and possibly a major source of financial support for the United Nations.

I would also like to just mention one other thing that is touched on very lightly and very tactfully in Ambassador Vance's statement, that is the reaction to the Jackson report in Geneva the other day. My own feeling is that this was a rather inadequate report. I think it will hurt the United Nations Development Fund here on the Hill and I hope, as you suggest, Ambassador Vance, that this is just the beginning, and that further and much more determined steps will be taken to build confidence in the United Nations development program so that it can realize its potential.

Again I compliment all of you gentlemen for your presentations and for the work you are doing. We welcome, those of us who believe in the importance of the work of the United Nations and its related agencies, recognize the work of your association is enormously important in building the constituency the United Nations ought to have around the country. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Bingham.

Our next witness, Mr. Robert Benjamin, as my colleague has mentioned, is Chairman of the Board of Governors of the United Nations Association. Will you proceed?

STATEMENT OF ROBERT S. BENJAMIN, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF THE USA

Mr. BENJAMIN. May I say for the record, Mr. Chairman, I am Robert S. Benjamin, Chairman of the Board of Governors, which functions as the Executive Committee of the UNA-USA. I am also chairman of the board of United Artists Corp. I should also like to mention that I have had the pleasure of serving together with your colleagues, Congressmen L. H. Fountain and William S. Broomfield, as members of the U.S. delegation to the 22d session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

My background, Mr. Chairman, has enabled me to read with particular appreciation the exceptionally perceptive report submitted to this committee by Represetative Fascell and Representative Whalley following their service at the 24th session of the General Assembly. I know of no single document which has more accurately assessed the current state of the United Nations. And you will see from Ambassador Vance's statement that we in UNA-USA are endeavoring to respond most earnestly to the first of their recommendations.

There is far more than politeness in my appreciation for the opportunity to be here today and for the action of the committee in holding this series of hearings in connection with the 25th anniversary of the United Nations.

My experience as a delegate, and as a chairman for more than 9 years of UNA-USA and its predecessor organizations has increased my appreciation of the importance of these hearings, the quality of your invited participants, the searching inquiries of the committee members, and the stimulating dialog that has ensued. You can tell, Mr. Chairman, that I have read most of the minutes of the hearings. The reaction of my colleagues and myself is reinforced by the work of one of our recent policy panels, which was headed by Justice Arthur J. Goldberg and the president of Dartmouth College, John S. Dickey.

The panel's report, entitled "Beyond Vietnam: Public Opinion and Foreign Policy," had this to say:

> The United States democratic process faces a growing discontinuity between the necessity for expert management by the specialist and the demands of the concerned citizen that his views on issues that vitally affect his existence be taken into account by government . . . In no area is this contention between the necessity of expert management of subtle complexities and the demands of the citizen for a responsible role in determining government's course greater than in the area of foreign affairs . . . In a period of rising public involvement with foreign policy, the development of patterns which encourage the creative involvement of the concerned public in the foreign policy process is an urgent requirement.

The panel commended the President for his initiative in sending to Congress a "State of the World Message," and suggested that there be legislation providing that such a report, modeled on the economic report, be submitted annually. This arrangement, the panel stated, "would provide under legislative authority an opportunity for the executive branch, the Congress, and the concerned public to face at least once each year the task of examining in a coherent fashion the major elements and concerns of U.S. foreign policy."

The panel advanced other recommendations. Many of them directed toward strengthening the role of Congress in relation to foreign policy. The particular devices suggested may or may not commend themselves to you, but I suspect we are in unanimous agreement on the vital importance of enhancing the role of the representatives of the people—the Congress of the United States—in the issues of war or peace, of progress toward world order or anarchy.

However, my point here today is a more limited one. I see these hearings as an important step in the direction pointed out by the panel; as heartening evidence of the readiness of this committee to develop additional patterns for constructive dialog.

These hearings, it seems to me, have afforded substantial evidence of one of the most remarkable phenomena in our history: The steadfast allegiance to the United Nations of so many of the American people over a quarter of a century.

For years public opinion polls consistently showed that between 75 percent and 90 percent of the American people looked upon the United Nations as the best hope for peace in the world.

To be sure, the disappointments, disillusionments, and stresses of recent years have eroded some of that support. But, even now in the midst of a war which has placed great strains on our entire society

and disrupted all manner of political commitments, more than half of the people continue to place their hope in the United Nations.

Many concerned people see their frustrations resulting not so much from the limitations of the United Nations Charter and concepts, but from the unwillingness of the governments to use it. They see an urgent need to make the U.N. more effective in meeting profound changes that are resulting from the scientific and technological revolutions of our era.

However, it is inevitable, in my view, for frustration to grow in a period when the U.N. can do little to end one conflict and prevent another after years of unrealistically overoptimistic hopes for its prowess.

Nevertheless, the constituency for the United Nations is indicated, I believe, by the national participation last October in United Nations Day. In his report to President Nixon, Mr. H. I. Romnes, the chairman of the board of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the 1969 National U.N. Day chairman, reported that 37 States, three Territories, and 1,225 cities responded favorably to the request that they issue a U.N. Day proclamation, or appoint a U.N. Day chairman, or do both, to stimulate local observances of U.N. Day.

President Nixon this year has appointed Mr. Frederick L. Ehrman, the senior partner and chairman of the executive committee of Lehman Brothers, as U.N. Day chairman. And even though U.N. Day is not until October 24, Mr. Ehrman tells me that 23 Governors and 425 mayors are already committed to naming U.N. Day committees to lead local observances.

I should point out here the strong support of American business and labor for the entire U.N. Day program. The funds which finance the activity come primarily from an annual Business and Labor Come to the U.N. Dinner.

Each year between 1,500 and 2,000 business and labor leaders come to New York for briefing sessions with U.N. officials, a reception with Secretary General U Thant, and a dinner at which the National U.N. Day chairman receives his appointment from the President.

I am placing before the committee the programs of the last two of these events. There you will find listed the business executives and labor leaders who respond to the invitation of the National U.N. Day Chairman to join a National U.N. Day Committee. I am sure you will agree with me that it is an impressive list.

May I call your attention also to one other outstanding demonstration of the support our efforts have received from industry. That is the 25th anniversary commemorative edition of UNA's magazine, Vista. Although the editorial content is of interest, may I especially point out the advertisements. In their quantity they provide strong evidence of the support of the business community for the United Nations. * * *

But I hope you can also take the time to note what the advertisements actually say about the attitude of business toward the U.N. On page after page, industrial, manufacturing, commercial, and financial institutions have used their advertisements for original, thought-provoking messages on the need for the U.N. We at UNA are especially indebted to James S. McDonnell, chairman of McDonnell-Douglas,

for it was under his inspiring chairmanship that U.N.–25, like U.N.–20, was created.

And please note, too, that the inclusion of the special supplement reporting the proceedings of our 25th anniversary convocation in the great hall of the U.N. General Assembly, beginning on page 16, was made possible by a grant from the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.

Perhaps less spectacular, but at least equally significant, are the year-round activities carried on by our own chapters and the units of the organizations associated with us. * * *

Congressman Gross might be particularly interested to know that a few days ago, on behalf of our UNA chapter in Burlington, Iowa, we presented to the Representatives of four of the U.N.'s specialized agencies, checks totaling $10,000 raised by the high school and college students of that community by "A Walk for the U.N."

In virtually every aspect of the work of UNA-USA, the voice of youth comes through not only loudly and clearly, but responsibly and constructively, through the close relationship with our collegiate affiliate, the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs. Through CIRUNA, we have students serving on our board of directors, including the executive committee and all standing committees and policy panels. We may not always like what we hear, but this lively and effective communication with the college-age generation is, in our view, one of our most valuable assets. I surmise that the committee shares this assessment from the friendly reception you gave at an earlier hearing to Harvey Gresisman, the Colgate University student who was then the president. I am pleased that we have here with us today his successor, the new president of CIRUNA, David Dull, of Yale University.

Ever since De Toqueville pointed to the vigor and variety of volunteer citizen activity in our young republic, this quality has been one of the most vital characteristics of the American scene. We, therefore, place a special value on the relationship we have with the wide range of volunteer citizen organizations associated with us. The steady growth of cooperative endeavors in behalf of a stronger U.N., we believe, is a significant development worthy of being called to your attention.

Last year, for example, 47 organizations cosponsored with us a basic handbook and program guide in relation to International Human Rights Year.

This year, 20 organizations have joined us in sponsoring a similar guide in relation to International Education Year.

Also, this year, 24 organizations have joined the League of Women Voters and UNA-USA in producing a brief brochure called "The United Nations After 25 Years," the results of such cosponsorship are indicated by the fact that the prepublication orders for this year totaled 300,000 copies.

Samples of these materials are being presented to the committee.

Finally, I would like to cite to you some of the evidence now coming to us of the strong and persistent commitment of the voluntary organizations of this country to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

We are now receiving from the organizations associated with us, copies of resolutions being adopted by their convention and their board of directors in connection with the 25th anniversary of the U.N.

Already such material has come in from 54 national organizations. Appreciating as you do the influence of these groups in our society, I am appending excerpts from a representative sample of these resolutions. We know that others are coming in, and at the end of the year the collection will be presented to the President and to Secretary General U Thant. We would be pleased at that time to present the committee with a complete set.

The samples I am appending to my statement here today come from—

The Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO.
Lions International.
The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.
The National Grange.
The League of Women Voters.
The General Federation of Women's Clubs.
The Association of Junior Leagues of America.
The American Association of University Women.
B'Nai B'rith.
The National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
The National Catholic Educational Association.
The Lutheran Council.
The Salvation Army.
The United Methodist Church.
The United States Catholic Conference.

Let me cite just two of these to give you a flavor of their content. Their message—repeated in many others—states what I think should be our national response to this 25th anniversary.

The statement of the League of Women Voters, for example, declares that:

> Local Leagues throughout the country look upon this anniversary year as a time of reaffirmation of their long-standing support of the organization and of re-dedication to strengthening it for the peace-keeping and peace-building tasks that lie ahead. * * * The commitment of the League of Women Voters to the United Nations and its purposes remains strong and wholehearted as it seeks even more effective implementation of the principles of the Charter in the future.

The Catholic Bishops of the United States on April 22 adopted an extended statement, the full text of which is worthy of your attention. Let me merely quote these two sentences:

> As Americans we must acknowledge the realization of our massive power and take the lead in sharing it through strengthening the world organization. * * * We remind all of the words of Pope Paul VI to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1965: "This organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of the world peace. Go Forward."

Mr. Chairman, the inevitable conclusion from all this, it seems to me, is that in our national interest and for the sake of human survival, we must, indeed, "Go Forward."

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Benjamin, for an excellent statement.

Mr. BENJAMIN. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Our next witness is the former Deputy Secretary of Defense, Ambassador Cyrus Vance. Mr. Vance is Chairman of the

Policy Study Committee of the UNA and a partner in the firm of Simpson, Thacher & Bartlett.

I would like to say on a personal note that, as a member of this committee for the past 12 years, I know of no American still active who has made more meaningful contributions to some of the greater events of our decade, and always with the highest measure of devotion to the national interest of the United States than our next witness.

Please proceed.

Mr. VANCE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF CYRUS R. VANCE, CHAIRMAN, POLICY STUDIES COMMITTEE, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF THE USA

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you the work of the Policy Studies Committee of the United Nations Association of the USA (UNA). I am a member of the Board of Directors of the UNA and Chairman of its Policy Studies Committee.

Chief Justice Earl Warren, now the Chairman of the UNA, has indicated some of the general concerns of the Association as we consider the United Nations and its future. Ambassador Robert Benjamin, Chairman of our Board of Governors, has described several of the programs through which we reach the larger American community. I will be followed by Mr. David Dull who will be speaking on behalf of UNA's collegiate affiliate, the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs.

This morning I will describe the manner in which the Association has attempted to treat with several of the fundamental issues that have been before the United Nations, and with the central questions of whether the U.N. can be strengthened, and, if so, how this can be done.

Since October 1966, the UNA has issued six major national policy panel reports. Other studies are currently in progress, which I will briefly discuss later in my testimony. The six reports which have already been issued are: "China, the United Nations and United States Policy" (Chairman, Robert V. Roosa, former Under Secretary of the Treasury); "Stopping the Spread of Nuclear Weapons" (Chairman, Burke Marshall, former Assistant Attorney General); "Toward the Reconciliation of Europe: New Approaches for the U.S., UN, and NATO" (Chairman, Theodore Sorenson, former Special Counsel to the President); "Controlling Conflicts in the 1970's" (Chairman, Kingman Brewster, President of Yale University); "World Population" (Chairman, John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation); "Beyond Vietnam: Public Opinion and Foreign Policy" (Chairman, Arthur J. Goldberg, former permanent representative to the United Nations).

The quality of each of these reports reflects the knowledge and wide experience of the members of each panel. Moreover, it is important to note that each report sets forth the analysis, the conclusions, and the recommendations of the panel members rather than of the Association. The UNA itself does not take policy positions on current issues.

The purpose of these studies and reports is to inform the public and to stimulate thought and, hopefully, action on major problems affecting the United Nations and U.S. policy in the U.N. I believe that each

of these reports has had an important impact. I shall briefly elaborate on two of these reports with which I am most familiar.

I know that many of you on this subcommittee have seen the report released about a year ago entitled "Controlling Conflicts in the 1970's." I had the privilege of serving as one of the members of that panel.

After reviewing recent multilateral and unilateral experiences in peacekeeping, the report concluded that it would be in the U.S. national interest to take the following steps:

First. To give the United Nations what it should have had in the beginning—armed forces available on call when they are needed to keep the peace. The panel specifically recommended the establishment of a 40,000-man standby U.N. force to be supplied by the middle and small powers—25,000 men available on approximately a week's notice, and with an earmarked reserve of 15,000 men on 2 to 8 weeks' notice.

Second. The establishment of a Peace Fund—at an initial level of $60 million—to finance the early months of a peacekeeping operation. The Fund would be established primarily with voluntary governmental contributions and would be replenished as needed.

I should like to note in passing that, as one who has had firsthand knowledge of the U.N.'s peacekeeping operations, I believe that such operations have well served the national interests of the United States—both politically and in terms of financial cost. Therefore, I believe that we should be willing to put up a substantial portion of the cost of each U.N. peacekeeping operation.

Third. A vigorous upgrading of U.N. mediation and conciliation capabilities to prevent conflicts from breaking out and to move more quickly to resolve them when they do. There is a growing conviction within the international community that U.N. peacekeeping efforts must be linked more directly with effort at peaceful settlement of the issues underlying the dispute. Peacekeeping must not paperover a dispute, nor should it be a device for suppressing legitimate pressures for social, economic, or political change.

The recommendations of the Brewster panel were given general endorsement by 59 Members of the House of Representatives and 21 Senators in a letter in August of last year to Secretary Rogers. Several members of this committee were signers of that letter. I believe six of you signed that letter.

I can say from firsthand knowledge that a number of ambassadors to the United Nations, from small, middle-sized, and large countries, have said that they found the report to have been of substantial help, and believe it will be of genuine assistance in the further work of the Committee of 33 on the issue of U.N. peacekeeping. This is the committee, as most of you know, which is charged with the responsibility of developing the needed changes in U.N. peacekeeping.

Another important aspect of the U.N.'s work was considered by the panel on world population, which was chaired by Mr. John Rockefeller. The panel made recommendations for a substantial expansion of the U.N.'s work in the population field. Despite the subject's political sensitivity and the fact that the panel was composed entirely of U.S. citizens, the United Nations moved promptly to implement the principal recommendation of the report—namely, that the United Nations should appoint a "Commissioner of Population" within the framework of the U.N. development program. We were encouraged both by the prompt U.N. action and by President Nixon's favorable

comments on the panel's report in his message on population subsequently sent to the Congress.

I would like to turn to several of the additional questions which I believe to be crucial as we look at the decade ahead—and to suggest approaches which might be useful in dealing with them.

On the political side, the United Nations is not—as of now—an effective instrument. The failure lies, I believe, in two areas.

First, the United Nations has not, as yet, found a way of adjusting its organizational and procedural arrangements to meet the problems resulting from the influx of so many new members, some of them very small in size. Nor has it developed the measures for coping with the proliferation of items on the annual agenda of the General Assembly. As has been said, under existing circumstances, the U.N. is in danger of drowing in a sea of words. It is obvious that some streamlining of organizational arrangements is required—as well as some new approaches to U.N. membership.

Second, a new assessment of priorities is needed by member governments. It is submitted that the long-term advantages of building the political viability and political structure of the United Nations outweigh what some members have considered to be short-term advantages of keeping certain political issues off the agenda—for example, the failure in 1967 to bring the requested withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force in the Middle East to the General Assembly or to the Security Council, and the recent reluctance to consider in the United Nations the international involvement in the debilitating crisis in Nigeria.

On the economic and social side of the U.N.'s work, and in the U.N.'s regulatory work in the field of technology, I do not believe sufficient attention has been devoted either to organizational streamlining or to the application of the management skills which have been developed in other settings.

The effective management of the United Nations and its system of agencies is a major enterprise.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt to ask a question at this point?

Mr. VANCE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Do you think a U.N. bureaucracy has grown the same way that the bureaucracy has grown in Washington? When the bureaucracy moves there is nothing you can do to get it to respond to problems.

Mr. VANCE. I do. I am not without hope, however, that nothing can be done to improve it. I think it is possible to make some organizational changes, but I think one has to continually fight in any large organization—whether it be the U.N. or the U.S. Government—against the creeping growth of that bureaucracy and all that that brings with it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You cited two classic examples of U.N. inability to meet real crises. The cases where the U.N. has been successful are at the very minimal.

Mr. VANCE. There are a number of cases where it indeed has either prevented war or stopped war—not as many as you or I or all of us would have liked.

I think it's unfair to say in effect that it really hasn't done much good. It has done some good. Hopefully it can do a lot more good, but not unless certain necessary changes are made.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Do you have any real belief that those changes will be made in the foreseeable future?

Mr. VANCE. Not unless people get very strongly behind it, including people in the Congress.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The people can't get behind it because the record of success is so minimal. It's sort of a vicious circle.

Mr. VANCE. Yes, but I think just because you have a record of success in the past which is not satisfactory is no reason for saying that you throw up your hands in despair and say you are not going to try to improve it.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The point I am getting at is a personal thing. After 8½ years in Congress I am tired of kidding people. I am tired of rhetoric that says if we do thus and so everything will be O.K. For 25 years you have been saying these things. For 25 years the delivery system is in fault. This isn't a personal thing vis-a-vis you and me. This is true of the U.N., of us, of everything—the same old tired rhetoric, if we do thus and so everything will come up roses.

Mr. VANCE. I have not said that.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Everything isn't coming up roses anymore.

Mr. VANCE. I have not said that.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I didn't mean that you said it. I am talking generically you, us, we. I think we have to be realistic, but I don't think we have to give up our ideals in trying to achieve good objectives.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I think you should finish your statement, Mr. Vance.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Yes.

Mr. VANCE. Over the past 15 years there has been a proliferation of U.N. agencies with inadequate coordination. If the U.N. is to administer substantially increased amounts of development assistance (and I hope it will be in a position to do so), there must be some rationalization of the system, with more centralized control. The round of U.N. decisionmaking just now being completed in Geneva—which is the first round following the release of the Jackson "capacity study," should be considered as only the first step. Questions about organizational relationships were raised in the Jackson study which need continuing consideration.

There are also major questions of U.N. financing and personnel, including key questions of Secretariat and Agency leadership, which need prompt and vigorous attention.

We now have policy panels at work on the implications of the new communications technology for the U.N. and the U.N. system, on the international implications of environmental pollution, and on several of the southern African issues that are before the U.N. Of primary importance, we are planning over the summer to establish a National Policy Panel to take a fundamental look at the U.N. It will take a hard look at U.N. capabilities in the political, economic, and social, financing, and leadership fields, and make recommendations for the initiatives which the United States could take to strenghen the organization in the decade ahead.

We believe it is important that the United States go to the next session of the U.N. General Assembly—the 25th session—with several new approaches for strengthening the U.N. We hope to be of some assistance in suggesting approaches. I am sure that this committee will

also be of help. We realize that we cannot complete our work before the next session of the General Assembly and, therefore, will plan to devote our attention to this set of problems over a longer period of time.

I am not one who believes that there are easy answers to these problems. The United Nations has fallen short of the original—and over-optimistic—expectation. We are all acutely aware of these shortcomings, but we must not let this become a cause for despair or paralyze us from taking needed action, for the development of better arrangements for preserving peace and promoting economic development, under which there will be a greater sharing of responsibility, is one of our highest—indeed one of the world's highest—priorities.

From our standpoint, this is not primarily a matter of straining United States financial resources, or the avoidance of international criticism which has been directed against essentially unilateral efforts. It is the fact that, to an increasing degree, unilateral, big-power peacekeeping efforts tend to generate worldwide political resistance which can defeat the very purpose of the intervention. And, in the areas of U.S.–U.S.S.R. strategic conflicts, there is the serious risk of precipitating direct confrontation between the two countries.

In conclusion, I believe that nations can and must construct a better system for preserving peace than that which exists today. If this is to be accomplished, it will depend in substantial part upon the development of a stronger and more effective United Nations. We must face the reality that until we succeed in developing a stronger United Nations, the world and all its members—strong and weak alike—will remain dangerously insecure.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Ambassador Vance.

Our next witness is Mr. David Dull, the newly elected president of the collegiate affiliate of the U.N. association, and a student at Yale University. We have heard from your predecessor, Mr. Greisman. We welcome you here today.

Mr. DULL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF MR. DAVID A. DULL, PRESIDENT, COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND UNITED NATIONS AFFAIRS

Mr. DULL. It is a great honor for me to be invited by the committee to participate in this series of hearings in connection with the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the United Nations. I am the newly elected President of the Council on International Relations and United Nations Affairs (CIRUNA), the collegiate affiliate of the United Nations Association, and the only major national student organization dealing directly, on a day-to-day basis, with student concerns about the U.N. and its activities. As the chairman just noted, Harvey Greisman, the immediate past president of CIRUNA, appeared before the subcommittee on April 28—2 days prior to the Cambodian intervention. Since his testimony is available to the committee members, I want to cover in my brief remarks today a few areas and some attitudes that have assumed increased importance to our organization in the subsequent 11 weeks.

Many of your distinguished witnesses have touched upon various ways in which youth might be involved in the work of the United

Nations. I do not wish to add to their testimony now except to note that the previously discussed World Youth Assembly is now in progress at the United Nations Headquarters in New York. Over 600 participants from more than 100 countries are centering their concern in the 9-day session on those subjects that are most crucial to international cooperation, and, indeed, to international survival, in the 1970's: Problems of world peace, man and his environment, global development, and education. The Assembly was made possible principally through the contributions of a large number of private benefactors and through the unstinting efforts of several staff members at the U.S. Mission, the U.N. Preparatory Committee for the 25th anniversary, and a planning committee composed of 13 international youth and student organizations. I regret to report, however, that our Government did not see fit to ease the serious financial burden of the Assembly through a monetary contribution.

The events of the past 3 months in the United States have evoked a great deal of concern on the part of governmental leaders as to the perspective with which young Americans view our foreign policy and the things that they would change within it. For example, in his annual U.N. Day Proclamation last Friday, President Nixon called specifically for the participation of young people in the determination of our country's future role in the United Nations. I fear, however, Mr. Chairman, that just as each of the committee members here must have found little common agreement beyond a chant of "Peace Now!" among his dissenting constituents on the war, so the President is likely to find little agreement among our youth as to what our goals and policies should be at Turtle Bay.

I want to explore today some of the reasons why many members of my generation are turned off to the U.N. and what my organization is attempting to do in order to revive their interest. Made cynical by a war which to them has no valid justification, many American young people could hardly care less about the United Nations. We are that first "succeeding generation" to which everyone refers, and we have not been spared the scourge of war. We have seen the U.N. fail—and fail miserably—to deal with the problems of Vietnam and Biafra. We have seen it be sorely ineffective in establishing a long-term solution for the Middle East; the short-term one seems every day precariously closer to an end, an end which could include the involvement of major powers in the old balance-of-powers game. The stakes are well expressed in terms of millions of tons of TNT.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, while I, personally, may be critical of the U.N.'s peacekeeping and peacemaking capacity in recent years, I am neither blind to its successes nor overly pessimistic about its future. I can agree with Chief Justice Warren in his chronicle of the things in which the U.N. should take pride. I can see hope in the areas where the major powers are finding common interests or where the smaller states are insistent upon U.N. action. And like Faulkner, I believe that mankind will prevail—though man may learn the necessity of international cooperation only when the alternative is clearly an end to his own existence.

The problem my organization faces in this decade is just how we communicate these ideas, these possibilities, to the American student community. My generation is increasingly alienated by conflict of

ideology and by institutionalized structures. The U.N. has far too much of both, as Representatives Fascell and Whalley observed in their excellent report. The volume of oratory is so great, and the load of paper so heavy, that it is next to impossible to determine any more just what the U.N. is doing. But these are procedural and administrative problems that will be worked out. My purpose in using them here is only that they serve to demonstrate the fundamental shortcomings to which many young people object: that the U.N. is an organization of governments, ideologies, and not necessarily of peoples, and that it is an institution, with as much bureaucracy and formality as any member country. To a generation raised on instant communication and the bomb, a generation that wants to cut across national boundaries, that is internationalist in its very assumptions, and that is antagonized by the vagaries and vicissitudes of politics—either at home or in international organizations—the U.N. seems stiff, archaic, and void of meaningful purpose. These are formidable stumbling blocks, and many, especially in this age of immediacy are not willing to undertake the task of fundamental reform that is required to make the U.N. the tool that they might like it to be.

CIRUNA is attempting to combat this situation in two ways. We are undertaking a new effort to make American youth aware of the successes of the United Nations and of how it might function successfully in Congress with their goals and their hopes for a truly international peace and for justice and progress in all parts of the world. More importantly, we are developing a body of effective student leaders in international affairs—not simply leaders of other students—but individuals who are able to link the various elements of American society together at the community level, for the purpose of understanding global problems and for urging effective American action for their solution. We do not take stands on policy issues as an organization; indeed, if we are going to succeed in bringing together various elements of the community for common goals and newly gained awareness of the international effects of national programs and priorities, such positions would be a hampering factor. Rather, we focus on presenting balanced information on the issues, on training individuals who can think for themselves, and on communicating the views of our constituents to bodies that can act upon them.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that all of the distinguished members of this committee would like to see more effective international affairs programing in their home districts, that each wants more involvement by citizens of the communities he serves in the world affairs decisionmaking process. The Goldberg Policy Panel report mentioned by Ambassadors Benjamin and Vance makes some very definite proposals on this. We in CIRUNA believe that the key to effective community communication programs on world affairs is the student. Students possess several natural advantages in community leadership: Openness and flexibility to new ideas and opportunities; contagious enthusiasm and dedication; ability to muster large numbers of volunteers to get a job done. What is more, they are new blood in their communities and can fill leadership voids that desperately need filling.

Of course the idea of developing students into community leaders is new and somewhat revolutionary. A problem exists as well in that

most students lack the leadership skills necessary to make a creative and constructive impact upon the community. We are working to alleviate the second problem through increased concentration upon the development of leadership techniques among participants at our various meetings across the country each year. As for the problem of student-community leadership, we feel that the solution will evolve quickly—provided that we begin now to bring students and adult community leaders together to discuss world problems.

We began this process in March, when CIRUNA involved students, corporation executives, and talented resource people in national discussions on the U.S. role in global development in the 1970's. It is my hope that we can expand these discussions to include each region of the Nation in the coming year and that we can hold these symposia on the level of the local community. At that level alone can we bring students and community leaders together to work upon both planning and participatory stages of the program. Once together, we hope that these individuals can design continuing efforts to build awareness and citizen participation in foreign policy development.

Through all of this we can point to the U.N. as a prime tool with which economic and social progress, as well as international peace, might be effected. As long as we talk in terms of issues, and not of structure, of the original hopes and goals of the U.N., and not of its dismal failures, we have the attention of a growing number of American students. We hope to expand that number manifold in the next 5 years.

I would not, Mr. Chairman, want to end without a serious note of caution. My organization is working with American young people, the most privileged in the world. In my opinion, it will be a bitter lesson, but eventually my generation will learn what others before us have learned—that the cost of peace is high. Hopefully that toll will not be exacted in terms of human lives, but it might well be expressed in terms of retarding our own economic growth so that other peoples might assume greater opportunity in the global economic structure. The gap is growing between the developed and the less developed nations, and the whole world is watching. If we continue to spend 200 times for national security the amount we spend for the support of international organizations, if we are unwilling to help underwrite closure of the development gap, then I see little prospect for the success of the United Nations. Indeed, I fear that man's last, best hope for peace will be his last, and a poor one at that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you very much, Mr. Dull. I would also like to introduce for the record Mr. Elmore Jackson, vice president for policy studies of the U.N. Association, who is with us this morning. We welcome you here this morning.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Representatives from the U.N.'s headquarters have cited the Organization's achievements in perhaps three major areas: 1. Politics: helping most of the African nations obtain independence; 2. peacekeeping and arms control: the Congo and the Middle East in 1948 and 1956, Kashmir, Korea, Cyprus, the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the agreements barring nuclear weapons from space; 3. In the economic and social field: the U.N.'s record of building a tradition of international coop-

eration has been developed in combating disease, promoting education, and increasing respect for basic human rights.

For those who feel that the U.N. has played no great part in these developments, I would like to ask a question generally, and anyone can respond to it.

In your opinion was the U.N. a major factor in those achievements—some perhaps temporary at the time?

Mr. VANCE. I would be glad to answer that from the knowledge that I have on some of those. I am sure Ambassador Benjamin, who was present when some of these took place, can add a great deal more than I can.

I think it's certainly clear in the whole area of decolonization that the achievements of the U.N. have been very substantial. I think there are very few people who would argue with that point.

With respect to the action in the Non-Proliferation Treaty area, I think it made a substantial achievement.

I think that it's hard to argue that some progress was not made in the treaty relating to outer space. This was a substantial step forward.

The cease-fires, which were achieved in such places as Indonesia, in the Middle East in the past, and the Cyprus operation are all substantial achievements.

I think that the only reason that you have peace on Cyprus right now is because of the U.N. Peacekeeping Force that exists there. The reason that the thing didn't explode in 1967 again was because the U.N. was there as a framework within which to work out a settlement which was acceptable to all of the parties concerned. If there had been no U.N., there could have been no settlement at that time which prevented it from exploding into another war.

So that from a few of those standpoints, certainly, in my judgment, there have been successes.

Mr. BENJAMIN. Mr. Chairman, I don't know how to answer that question except to say yes and no. There are times when the powers that can influence a situation want the U.N. as the forum through which they will work to make it work. When they do not want it to work in any form, it cannot work because it's, after all, a system of governments, not a system of peoples. There are no people voting for certain effective action to be taken. There are Government representatives.

I am not going to argue whether that is good or bad. It's a stated fact. I'd like to associate myself with Ambassador Wiggin's testimony in this regard when he said, "We have to be very clearheaded and aware in our clearheadedness of the imperfections of the U.N. But we should labor to eliminate the imperfections and not the U.N."

I would like to also allude to the statement I made before: If we have unrealistic overoptimistic expectations, the net result of those overoptimistic expectations is frustration.

It is a function of the U.N. to try not to be a rooting section for the U.N., but to inform and educate not only about the assets of the U.N. but its liabilities, its restrictions, and its limitations in the hope that with knowledge, with education and with involvement the imperfections can be worked out.

I repeat, yes and no. There have been times when, but for the U.N. as an instrumentality for working the will of the super powers on

Cuba, perhaps we would not have had as peaceful a solution as we had. They were using a face-saving device. Secretary Ball called it a fall-backing institution. Others called it a face-saving ladder on which people can climb down gracefully. Whatever the phrase, its an instrumentality of governments which is usable when they want to use it and clearly not strong enough to be used when they don't want to use it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Dull.

Mr. DULL. I think that Ambassadors Vance and Benjamin have done quite a good job of answering the question.

I would like to add that personally I question just how effective the U.N. is going to be in peacekeeping in the future, except where neither of the major powers are directly involved in a situation. I don't know what is going to be effected in the Middle East, although I hope something can be effected. The other achievements that you were talking about—education and development—I think are very significant, because it seems to me they point toward the major direction that I feel the U.N. is going to take in the next 25 years, its going to become a multilateral agency for doing things upon which many nations can agree.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Let's hope its going to last another 25 years.

Mr. DULL. I take that as an assumption. Perhaps its not completely justified. I still feel that these are the areas where the U.N. can be effective: where nations can get together and agree on some specific things that need to be done.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Ambassador, as you know, we are presently considering a bill to expand the U.N. For the record, would you like to give your position on this?

Mr. BENJAMIN. It's very easy to say yes without equivocation. I read in the testimony how many of the representatives who worked at the U.N. were previously in the State Department, and they all felt the same way. Ambassador Wadsworth liked to refer to himself as a person who was often called a critic, but he asked us to do everything we could to preserve the U.N. and strengthen it. I think one way of strengthening it is to expand its facilities so that by its proliferation it isn't weakened, which I think is the net result of proliferation by the institution.

Mr. KAZEN. When you expand facilities you also expand bureaucracy. That comes with it.

Mr. BENJAMIN. If I were managing it I would say no. By expanding our facilities in my company we contracted our bureaucracy because we put everybody closer together. We could reduce our personnel by proximity, but that depends on management. I quite agree, that is a very serious problem at the U.N.

Mr. KAZEN. I think this is the crux of the problem.

Mr. MCKEEVER. Mr. Chairman, if I may add to that. We are in touch, as you might expect, with many of the delegations at the U.N., and for reasons often that are political to be sure. There is a growing dissatisfaction with the presence of the U.N. in the United States. The lack of appropriate facilities makes their arguments much easier to gain the adherence of delegations that are on the fence.

As for proliferating U.N. locations—if they decide to go to Geneva, Vienna, or other places, this is going to be an encouragement to the

development of the bureaucracy and will hamper the efficient control of the organization.

I think the longer we delay in the provision of efficient facilities in New York, the more we feed the arguments of those who want to get the U.N. out of New York and proliferate agencies in other areas of the world. I think this is a terribly important decision not only for our national interest to have the U.N. within an American setting—but I think from the standpoint of the management of the U.N. itself, it's terribly important to keep the facilities centralized at the headquarters in New York.

Imagine the U.N. Industrial Development Organization which is designed to promote the flow of technology between the developed countries and the underdeveloped countries, being located in Vienna, which is neither developed nor underdeveloped. It was entirely a political decision without any regard for the efficiency or the purpose of the institution. This is a good example of what happens when there is an easy argument, a political argument, for locating a U.N. agency somewhere other than at U.N. Headquarters.

Mr. KAZEN. As you know, there is a bill pending in the committee that would allow us to expand these facilities, providing additional facilities that the U.N. needs in New York. I know, Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this committee has been very active in this field.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is why I am going to lobby a little bit.

Mr. BENJAMIN. We are not allowed to lobby, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You get it over my objection if you get it out.

I want to state for the record, I support the bill but I don't support the contribution by the city of New York of $20 million. I think it's a very poor arrangement that was made. I don't think the Congress should put a stamp of approval to it.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Perhaps I should be opposing it because the headquarters expansion isn't going to be across the river in New Jersey. Actually I am very much for the expansion even though it happens to be proposed for Manhattan. I hope the fact that $20 million isn't enough, in Mr. Rosenthal's opinion, is not going to keep the House from approving what the Senate has already approved as of last Friday by a decisive vote.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The U.N. devotes nearly three-fourths of its resources and the budget for its staff to work in the economic and social field. The other night at the White House, Secretary General U Thant pointed out that each citizen in the United States pays the great sum of 20 cents a year to keep this going. I am not sure whether that was a compliment or how, exactly, he intended it. I had a feeling that he felt we should pay a great deal more.

I would like to ask you gentlemen if it has proved to be a good investment, in your opinion?

Mr. VANCE. Has the U.N. proved to be a good investment?

Mr. GALLAGHER. No. No. The U.N. is devoting three-fourths of its resources and the budget of its staff to the work in the economic and social fields. Has this proved to be a good investment?

Mr. BENJAMIN. I am not an economist and I am sure if I were I would have many areas of constructive criticism. I have no hesitancy in praising the work of Paul Hoffman in the field of economic development and the way he has gone about putting seed money into projects in developing countries.

I am not sufficiently an expert on the subject to know whether or not 80 percent is the right figure, because I'd like to see more money put in peacekeeping and peace building. Consequently, percentages always drive me to frustration. I should think that we could afford more money for peacekeeping and peace building irrespective of the percentage arrangement, because that will help preserve our economy against efforts in defense or in Vietnam, as an illustration.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Ambassador Benjamin, in your statement you indicated that support has declined substantially, perhaps from 90 percent to a little more than one-half of the American people who were polled. Do you think this trend can be reversed? How should it be reversed? What has your association done?

Mr. BENJAMIN. One of the troubles with the decline is that it's hard to say that something as precipitate as that is anything more than a temporary bit of frustration. When a Gallup poll is taken in the heat of an on-going war and with the threat of tremendous involvement in the Middle East, I should think that it is an inevitable consequence that the support for the U.N. decline.

I should like to call the committee's attention to the fact that the patience has also receded. Therefore I think there has become an apathetic attitude, even manifested in this room. It has failed to do so much that we wanted it to do that I begin to lose faith in its competence to do anything. That is why I alluded back to the fact we should tackle the imperfections rather than merely criticize the institution.

So we are in a period where frustration is rampant and, of course, when frustration is rampant you ask somebody about the U.N. or any political candidate at a time when his campaign isn't going so well, they say, "My God, he is not working." Therefore I am very apathetic. What are you going to do when you get into the booth? Of course I will vote for him. But the apathy is manifested. That is what I think the Gallup poll shows.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What do you think the Congress can do about generating greater public support? What can the President do?

Mr. BENJAMIN. Supporting the U.N. in the various ways that the Government can support the U.N.—not cutting back but increasing the contributions to international cooperation in the various fields, be they economic or be they peacekeeping and peace building. We talk of a peace fund. It is being willing to make a contribution to that fund. In the last analysis as a personal view, not as an association view—because we make no judgments on these subjects—that is a cheap way of saving money, in my opinion.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Of course, I think that Congress does this. There is a point at which the Congress feels it is counter-productive for the United States alone to do this. There has to be an encouraging increase in contributions that are made by the other participants and member nations in the U.N.

Mr. BENJAMIN. Yes. Yes. I read Congressman Gross' examination of Ambassador Yost on this subject and I am very well aware of the understandable frustration when we go in and we make a contribution in the expectation that once the coercion has not been imposed on the other countries they will make theirs. Years go by and they don't. So it's understandable.

I don't think, as somebody else said in his testimony, we ought to let them call the shots for us. We ought to do what we think is in our

national interest irrespective of what other countries do in order to "teach us a lesson or make us carry greater than our share."

The question is what share is in our interest and that should be the determining factor and the Congress addresses itself to that.

All I am pleading for is a more sympathetic approach, because one needs more, that is all.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Ambassador Vance.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. Chairman, I think that one specific area in which we can make a real contribution is if we push harder in the area of strengthening the peacekeeping capabilities. I think it's fairly concrete, some of the things that can be done there. There is a degree of receptivity. I think if we pushed harder there that something might come of it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, I agree. This is the area of frustration in the U.N. I think your suggestion is one that has great merit. The overreliance on the peacekeeping ability of the U.N. that has the capacity is one of the most troublesome areas, I think.

Mr. MCKEEVER. That is the point I was going to make, Mr. Chairman. I think a lot of the advocates of the U.N. have in a sense done a disservice over the years by pointing to the amount of work being done in the economic and social field and rationalizing that in terms of the U.N. fulfilling its role; whereas its primary role is, and ought to be, in the political and security field where its record of achievement, I think, has been lacking and has, in fact, been declining. I think it's this which is the essential source of frustration about the U.N.

Admittedly, in a period of conflict between the United States and U.S.S.R., we are not going to be able to recommend this progress but we do feel that steps can be taken in building the peacekeeping forces that are practical and feasible and which can help turn around a lot of this disillusionment. And I think turn around this imbalance of investment.

It seems to me that as long as you have 80 percent going into economic and social affairs, even as important as that field is, and such a small percentage in the operating and security field, this is a prima facie case of the imbalance in the U.N. system. I think the Congress is entirely right in insisting that our progress in the economic and social field be in step with the willingness of other countries to contribute to their own advancement. I do think it would be in our national interest to be more generous in our approach to the contributions in the political and security field.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I should like to express my appreciation and pleasure at seeing so many old friends testifying here today. As one who is associated with the U.N. Association, I have been very much interested in the discussion. I should like to single out particularly for commendation the testimony of Mr. Dull. He certainly did not live up to his name in his intelligent and articulate presentation.

I was a little disappointed, I must add, with my friend, Mr. Benjamin, describing the apathy manifested in this very room. I would have thought that we were unusually interested in the discussion. There are not perhaps as many members of the subcommittee here as he may have expected but I might say we have somewhat more here

than is usual in the subcommittee. I might also explain that there is an important conference underway involving a discussion of the fundamental rules of the operation of the House. I hope you will excuse those who were not here, and that you will not think that those who are here are not interested in what you are saying.

Mr. BENJAMIN. You misunderstood me, Mr. Congressman. Mr. Chairman, may I reply for 1 brief second? You were not here when Congressman Rosenthal took the U.N. apart slightly.

Mr. GALLAGHER. It's a question of New York priority, not that he took the U.N. apart.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I was responding only to that.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I did come in late, but I did hear part of the diatribe and I would not say that was an apathetic approach.

Mr. BENJAMIN.I stand corrected.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I would like to ask a couple of easy questions about the changes that perhaps should be made. Both Mr. Dull and Mr. Vance talked about the importance of doing something about the excessive paperwork. Mr. Vance talked about drowning in words, and Mr. Dull referred to the problem.

Is there any practical way in which the volume, or at least the quality, of what goes across the desks of people at the U.N. can be controlled? Do you see any likelihood of stemming this flow? I don't know who would like to answer the question. It sounds easy, but if we had to stem the volume of paperwork that comes across our own desks, I would not be very optimistic about a practical way of doing this. What can be done?

Mr. VANCE. I agree, it's an awful lot harder than it sounds. My reply is that one way can perhaps be in cutting down on the number of committees and subcommittees that exist. For every committee or subcommittee that you have you are going to increase your paper flow by that proportion. I think that if you can slice away, that that is one avenue that might be fruitful.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Is it practical, Mr. Vance? Do you think there is any possibility, once you get the bureaucrats established in 17 committees, to reduce the number to nine? It would be difficult to do it in Congress. Perhaps the U.N. is more pliable but I would assume that it might not be. It might even be less pliable, because it is an international organization and each country feels perhaps its proprietary rights in the way the structure is presently designed.

Mr. VANCE. I am discouraged by the action of the governing counsel where he was urging the greater centralization and cutting down on the kinds of things we were talking about and his recommendations seemed to be put on the shelf for the time being, at least by the governing counsel. It's fairly discouraging.

Mr. BENJAMIN. I am merely faced, in the time when I was there, after you were there, with the Soviet Union pressing for making the Russian language an official language so that everything will be printed in Russian. So they keep on proliferating the paperwork by the many translations.

I should say it's a very difficult problem. But it can be done mostly by addressing ourselves to the entire structure. That is one of the panel reports we hope to create in the ensuing 2 years.

Mr. McKeever. One source of optimism, Mr. Chairman, I think can be gained if you consider that all of the procedures and structures and methods of operation of the U.N. were designed when there were 50 member states and they have continued all of those procedures and methods and structures now until there are 126. No one has taken the time to step back and assess whether or not, having more than doubled the membership, the procedures and structures should be revised.

This is something we are hoping to do in the next year. We think that we can come up with some solution that might have some chance of recognizing the differences and the changes that ought to be introduced with a membership that has more than doubled in this period and adapt those procedures to that factor.

Mr. Frelinghuysen. You bring me to my next point, and Mr. Vance mentioned this also. He talked about the numbers of member states as creating a problem. Do you have any optimism that there could be recognition that some states are really too small to qualify as full-fledged members or that the major members should have some special rights? Could new states that might like to apply be restricted because of the fact that there are a number of small states already in the U.N.? Is this a practical way of controlling and chaneling the nature of the U.N. operations?

Mr. McKeever. It's a terribly difficult one. I don't know what the answers are. I hope one of the panels we are setting up can come up with some answers that will find acceptance over the years.

I think there is some basis for not feeling defeatist about it in the development of various methods to be sure of weighted voting in various U.N. agencies. This has happened in some. And I think it is possible to develop some rational approaches that can be sold over a period of time. I think that a lot of new states are very jealous of the opportunity to have a full-fledged membership when they first arrived, but I think once they have been there a while they will become more interested in making the organization operate effectively than in the initial period when they are very anxious to demonstrate that they are there.

Mr. Frelinghuysen. I wish I could share your optimism, Mr. McKeever. It does seem to me this is a keystone of progress. If there could be some way the major contributors could have a role that was somewhat different, it would seem to me it would form the basis for the rationalization of substantially increased U.S. contributions.

Mr. Benjamin spoke up very strongly for increases because this would be in our national interest. So did Mr. Vance. But it seems to me that that isn't really the problem. The problem is to keep our role proportionate. Of course, we could put up more. I am not saying that we will. It makes me unhappy to see the indifference in Congress to the very modest increases that have already been imposed. I don't know what the effect of an appeal for a voluntary contribution to a standby peace force of some kind would be. It would be received more favorably if some way could be found of showing that the major contributors had control over the organization, not in the sense of refusal to allow others to participate but to show that it was being guided in a responsible way and not simply drowning in words without accomplishing anything.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, the Security Council does have under consideration the question of small states, the admission of new small states to the U.N. I hope that one of our panels during the next few months will be considering this among other questions.

There are two general possibilities in the field. One is that some kind of associate membership status might be developed for very small states. Another is that certain of them might be convinced that they would be better off indeed to have some kind of observer status at the U.N. itself and be members perhaps of certain regional commissions of the U.N. There are various possibilities that can be considered, and I think probably will be offered the next few months.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. The trouble is, I think, you are locking the barn door when the horse has skipped. That isn't quite the metaphor I want. But you already have member states which are substantially smaller in numbers than the congressional district which I represent. There is a serious disproportion among present members. I doubt whether you could get approval by the U.N. for a demotion for those who are presently fully qualified.

Mr. JACKSON. On the financing of U.N. peacekeeping, in our own panel report there was a recommendation that the establishment of a peace fund in the U.N. would be accompanied by the establishment by the General Assembly of a weighted voting committee that would have a role in the disbursement of funds from the peace fund.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That is an area where I hope progress can be made.

I am a little disappointed in Mr. Dull's emphasis on the "miserable failures" which he says the youth generally recognize in the U.N. Surely if youth feels this way—and I suppose there are others besides the young people who point to those miserable failings, in Vietnam Biafra, and even the Middle East—it's the result of a failure to appreciate the very real limitations of the U.N.

Why should anyone expect the U.N. to be able to cope with this kind of a problem? Certainly under the present structure of the U.N., they are not equipped. The United States tried hard enough to dump Vietnam in the laps of the U.N. It was, quite rightfully, unsuccessful in that effort because the situation wasn't ripe for the U.N. to play a useful role. We hope it will be ripe soon also in the Middle East.

Surely this attitude reflects a misunderstanding of what the present limitations are. I don't think we should feel that these should be pointed out as miserable failures. Maybe it does point to weaknesses. Maybe we should strengthen the peacekeeping effectiveness of the U.N. It is going to be mighty tough to get real progress, even though your panel has pointed this out as a crucial area, really more important than the undramatic and economic and social programs of the U.N. If something can't be done to strengthen the hands of the U.N., it may well lose a considerable stature among people generally. So far the American people have been pretty solid in their support for the U.N. because they recognize its potential.

I have no questions, Mr. Chairman, except to say it was a good idea to have these gentlemen here. I wish we had more people with whom to discuss these problems.

Mr. DULL. Could I respond to your last point?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Yes, please do.

Mr. DULL. When I talked about a miserable failure it points up something that I am sure all of you have realized: perhaps the reaction of many young people to the U.N., as far as Vietnam and Biafra are concerned, is much like their reaction to the Congress or the Executive over the Vietnam war—that these are institutionalized structures and that it takes an inordinate amount of time and an inordinate amount of effort on the part of a number of people in order to effect what they feel are very small efforts in the right direction.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. What I am saying, Mr. Dull, is that impatience with institutions may reflect ignorance as much as anything. That would certainly apply to the institutions in Washington as well as those of the U.N.

Mr. BENJAMIN. U.N. and university, Mr. Chairman, as well.

Mr. ROYBAL. I agree with the statement Mr. Dull has made in regard to the miserable failures of the United Nations. Perhaps there are certain barriers and problems that have not been overcome that makes ultimate result impossible. But nevertheless, the ultimate results have been failures.

One of your most interesting statements was with regard to the technique that your organization has developed for student meetings with community leaders in the development of leadership. I think this is long overdue, and not enough has been done in this area, in an effort to sell the United Nations to the general public. Most of the people, as do students, care less about what is going on in the United Nations and look on this thing as an overgrown monstrosity that is not getting anyplace. However, more knowledge about the United Nations has to be made available to community people all over the United States. Assuming that this program is to be instituted on a wide scale throughout the Nation, don't you think that the next logical step would be for these students and these community people to meet with Members of Congress to discuss the program of the United Nations?

Mr. DULL. Absolutely. I think my whole intention here, and that of the last sentence of the paragraph where I was talking about the student meetings, is that they could build continuing programs. It certainly seems to me that if the planners or participants are going to develop continuing programs—and not necessarily organizations, since students seem to be turned off toward organizations these days—one of the things they would want to do is to involve very deeply the Members of the Congress from their own districts in these discussions to let them know how their constituency feels on certain matters, as well as perhaps advising them. This Congress-community communication area is a very open field and something that certainly, in the world affairs aspect, has not been utilized very much.

Mr. ROYBAL. I would like to see a situation where this subcommittee, and the whole committee, would be involved in discussions with community leaders on world problems. The committee then could reflect the true feeling of the American people. But I think we must go a step beyond that and that is that the administration, whether it be this administration or any other administration, would have to be cognizant of the fact that these discussions are being held, and that the committee can represent the true feeling of the American people. In this way, we, as members of this committee, could take part, at least some minor part, in the formulation of foreign policy. It is my opinion at the present time we do not.

Mr. DULL. I can only say I agree with you. Certainly there are a number of areas where students and community leaders alike would like to see the Congress take more of the responsibility. The New Policy Panel Report, "Beyond Vietnam: Public Opinion and Foreign Policy," talks about this to a great degree.

Mr. ROYBAL. I want to commend you for your statement. It is excellent. Thank you very much.

Mr. MCKEEVER. Mr. Dull is too modest to mention this because he was one of the authors of the particular section, but in developing this program at the Student Institute for the campus-community dialogs and developing the techniques for training campus leaders, the Syllabus, they prepared started off by saying that first and foremost among the techniques in developing effective campus-community dialog was "plain old-fashioned good manners." I think a lot of people concerned about this generation would look at that paragraph in that Syllabus produced by these young people perhaps with an air of disbelief. I confess I read it twice when I first read the paragraph. I think it is indicative of the constructive and responsible approach that a lot of these young people have in trying to establish dialog between their generation and the people who are shouldering the burden of responsibility at this time.

Mr. ROYBAL. A good example of a Member of Congress reacting to attitudes of his community was the statement made by Congressman Rosenthal, where he was objecting to $20 million being appropriated by the city of New York for the United Nations.

In my district there are objections to making available any amount of money for the United Nations. If the United Nations were very popular, we would be saying just the opposite; instead of $20 million, let us increase it to $30 million. So the overall feeling on the part of the American people is that the United Nations is not worth the money that is being spent on it. I do not believe that to be a fact. I think we have to reverse this trend, and in reversing the trend we have to make the United Nations stronger.

Mr. MCKEEVER. The materialistic approach is limited in any event. I do not know whether any of the witnesses that appeared here before have referred to the Brookings Institution study done several years ago which indicated that the expenditures made by the U.N. and the missions present in New York and the funds that the U.N. maintains in American institutions are direct return from the presence of the United Nations in the United States and I think exceeds our contributions to it.

One could argue that we are indeed making a profit from the presence of the United Nations in the United States on a strictly material measurement.

Mr. ROYBAL. Are there any statistics that would show that the city of New York is not doing too badly by appropriating $20 million?

Mr. MCKEEVER. Yes, sir. I think this is in a study done by the Brookings Institution about 3 years ago. I cannot recall immediately the author but I remember seeing a paper done by the Brookings Institution done along this line 3 years ago.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It seems to me that the city's fathers had their wits about them when they agreed to a contribution of this size. If they were getting nothing out of the activities of the U.N. in New York,

they would surely not be considering a fairly substantial contribution of this kind. I think the record actually speaks for itself in spite of the eloquence of Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. ROYBAL. Can that be made available to the committee?

Mr. MCKEEVER. I can get in touch with the Brookings Institution and see whether that document is still available.

Mr. ROYBAL. I would appreciate it if that were available for further discussion.

Mr. MCKEEVER. I will do that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. I might say, Mr. Roybal, in the discussion of the U.N. expansion bill there have been statistics made available to us on precisely this subject.

Mr. Kazen.

Mr. KAZEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me add my words of appreciation to all of you gentlemen for being with us this morning. I think you have made a very, very significant contribution to the deliberations of this subcommittee, and hopefully to the course that the Congress eventually will take.

Let me just discuss some things with Mr. Dull.

Mr. Dull, I am not one of those that thinks that the young generation has gone to the dogs. On the contrary, I think we have one of the finest group of Americans that this country has ever produced in the so-called "now" generation or your generation. I want to commend you for the work you are doing. However, let us just discuss a few things. Most of the things that are brought forth by youth today are idealistic, and sometimes you get frustrated because what you think is right just does not happen to jive with the facts. You have got to face facts as they are. This is an international organization. What you and your organization are doing, as far as discussing issues with the communities, getting community leadership and all of this, is real fine.

However, you eventually reach your goal, getting to the United Nations and getting action on the projects in which you are interested, where you come face to face with the reality that we are dealing with other countries whose youth in most of those countries may not feel the same way that the youth of our country feel. So wouldn't it be logical to work through a world youth conference, or some other type of organization, where students and the youth of the entire world may reach some kind of agreement on certain issues. After all, this is your world. You are going to be running it pretty darn soon. You are making a good start. I think the fallacy of our youth today lies in the fact that they have certain ideas and they assume the rest of the world feels the same way. Yet the feelings of people in other countries may not coincide with the same feelings you have. What are you doing about communicating with other student groups in other countries?

Mr. DULL. That is a very good question. First of all, as far as the World Youth Assembly is concerned, I think exactly what you said is the main prospect of the assembly: bringing together youth from 112 nations, to discuss these things, and finding out how they feel on specific issues that are common to all of us. There has been up there in New York quite a bit of controversy, and quite a bit of argumentation back and forth, as to whether ideology should be introduced in the assembly. This comes mostly from the Eastern bloc because most of the Western bloc feels that these people should be dealing as individuals, for that is where we are going to get someplace, if we get anyplace.

I also want to point out that my organization specialty is the American affiliate of the International Student Movement for the United Nations, which is composed of some 40 United Nations student associations throughout the world.

Mr. KAZEN. Are they as active in their country as you are in ours?

Mr. DULL. Some are, some are not.

Mr. KAZEN. It makes no difference what I feel or what this Congress feels, when we start dealing with other countries. We have to face the reality that we are not dealing on the same terms and they do not have the same objectives that we have. Nothing has been more frustrating through the last few years than to have the Presidents of this country trying to obtain peace in Vietnam and not having the other side at the conference table meet us half way. President Johnson said we would go anywhere and do anything that is necessary to get these people to talk to us. It is frustrating as all get out when the other side just will not talk. So what is the purpose of our knowing what we want, if we cannot communicate with the other people because their feelings are not the same as ours?

Mr. DULL. Certainly I do not think there is a universal panacea for this problem. We have been dealing with international relations for 2,000 years. On the other hand, perhaps the fact that we have not been able to attain agreement in Paris—even on the shape and size of the conference table for a long time there—may be an indication that some of the things we are saying the other nations do not agree with. That is their way of telling us they do not agree.

Mr. KAZEN. How do we get them to at least start talking?

Mr. DULL. I think that is what the United Nations is there for. I do not think we have used it in that way. I think that so long as it does not have universal membership, we are not going to succeed in that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. If the gentleman would yield, perhaps we could get Mr. Vance to give us his feelings on how we can get the other side to start talking.

Mr. KAZEN. What I am trying to point out, Mr. Dull, is that you are on the right track, but you have to go beyond the borders of this country when we are dealing with world problems. The solution of those problems does not depend solely on our point of view. There has to be some willingness of peoples all over this world to actually do something about these things. The mere fact that we feel a certain way about it does not get the job done. When you don't get results you will be frustrated. You are young, you have the ideas, you have the enthusiasm, you have the will, but you do not yet have the experience. You are getting it awfully fast when you run up against a stone wall and have to back down and start all over again because things just don't work out that easy.

Mr. DULL. I agree with you wholeheartedly. Getting agreement is a very serious problem. It does require experienced people and frequently I think you will agree with me the experience is rather negative more than positive. Personally, I would like Ambassador Vance to talk about the shape of the conference table.

Mr. KAZEN. I just threw that out as an example. There are so many other examples about how we feel, what we would like to do, but we do not get any response from the other side. If it is a domestic issue, we have no problem, because we alone are the masters of our own do-

mestic destiny. But not in international affairs where we are dealing with other ideologies and problems of other people.

This is where you, the youth, have a responsibility, and really a challenge to do something about this, because it makes no difference how many of the young men and women in my district tell me that they like something, I cannot deliver for them because it is not within my exclusive power to deliver, because the other Members don't see it as I do. I heard a man once say, and this is not the right kind of phrase, "Don't tell a fellow to go to hell if you can't make him go there, because he may not want to go." He may think it is too hot and he wouldn't like it there. Don't tell him unless you have the right and power to send him there.

Ambassador Vance.

Mr. VANCE. You might be interested to know that there are two parallel studies going on at this point between subcommittees of our United Nations Association and their equivalent counterparts in the Soviet Union. The two subjects are on adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and international aspects of environment. Each side has written a basic paper. The two groups will meet in the fall for conversations on these two papers, and we will see what comes out. Whether anything constructive will come out or not we do not know, but we think it is an interesting experiment to see whether or not two private groups talking in these areas may come up with something that may be helpful and constructive.

Mr. KAZEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Gentlemen, do you care to add anything? If not, I want to thank you on behalf of the subcommittee for appearing here and for the outstanding contribution you have made to our hearings and the great job you have done.

Mr. VANCE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The committee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.)

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 1970

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
ORGANIZATIONS AND MOVEMENTS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10:10 a.m., in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The subcommittee will come to order.

We meet this morning to continue our hearings on this 25th anniversary of the United Nations. In the past few months, our subcommittee has held 13 hearings on this subject.

With the help of numerous expert witnesses, we have discussed the present condition of the United Nations, the organization's past achievements and failures, and its prospects for the future.

Today the subcommittee is extremely pleased to welcome the Honorable William P. Rogers, Secretary of State, who has accepted our invitation to share with us his thoughts about the United Nations and its relation to U.S. foreign policy.

The Secretary is accompanied by the Honorable Samuel De Palma, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, who has been most helpful to our subcommittee, especially in our current undertaking.

Mr. Secretary, we appreciate your taking the time from your busy schedule to be with us this morning. Your willingness to contribute your views to this series of hearings suggests to the committee that President Nixon's administration considers U.S. participation in the United Nations an important aspect of our national policy. This is most encouraging.

Before I ask you to present your statement, Mr. Secretary, I would like to say this: The United Nations is involved in many activities, some of them of a rather sensitive nature. I am referring in particular to recent developments relating to the Middle East. And I would like to make it clear that we are not meeting today to discuss these matters on the Middle East.

We are here for an overall view of the United Nations, to gauge its utility in a conflict-torn world, and determine its potential for advancing the twin causes of peace and human progress.

I would therefore urge the members of our subcommittee, in directing their questions to the Secretary, to respect the framework of these hearings.

Mr. Secretary, we are indeed pleased and privileged to have you here with us this morning.

Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS, SECRETARY OF STATE

Secretary ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen.

I welcome this opportunity to appear before your subcommittee to discuss the United Nations.

As you have stated, Mr. Chairman, its 25th Anniversary is an occasion "to ascertain where the United Nations fits in the overall framework of United States foreign policy for the decade of the 1970's".

We all know that U.S. participation in the United Nations must be grounded on policies that protect our national interest and that are convincing to the Congress and to the American public if they are to be successful.

Last fall, the President reaffirmed to the United Nations General Assembly our fundamental national interest in maintaining that "structure of international stability on which peace depends and which makes orderly progress possible".

He urged that the United Nations not only pursue its efforts at peacekeeping but to concentrate as well on activities which contribute to peace-building. For example, he stressed protecting the environment, sharing the benefits of space technology, fostering economic development and population control, and securing the safety of international air travel.

As I have stated in previous congressional appearances, this administration will, to the extent feasible, look to multilateral institutions—and particularly to the United Nations—to deal with threats to security and to promote peaceful settlement of conflicts.

Though considerably short of our hopes, the United Nations' accomplishments in keeping the peace are substantial, that is, by turning back aggression in Korea, by preventing and containing violence in Cyprus, the Congo, Kashmir, and over many years in the Middle East.

In addition, the United Nations has successfully fostered arms control agreements, raised living standards in developing areas, drafted rules of law to regulate the behavior of nations in outer space and the oceans, and facilitated the orderly process of decolonization.

Certainly in implementing the provisions of the charter with respect to economic development, human rights and self-determination, there has been much more progress than might have been expected at the inception of the United Nations.

Yet, with all of its achievements, the United Nations has fallen short of the world's hopes and needs. It must be acknowledged that with respect to problems of war and peace confidence in the United Nations has waned. Some of its difficulties are the aftermath of its early successes, particularly in speeding the transition to independence for hundreds of millions of people in scores of new nations. Others are the result of unrealistic expectations that attended its creation.

This anniversary year is a time for stocktaking and we are undertaking a candid appraisal of the United Nations strengths and shortcomings.

Along with other nations, we are searching for measures to make the United Nations more responsive and effective. We are enlisting the talents and energies of leading citizens and experts in this exercise.

The President on July 9 appointed a Commission for the Observance of the 25th Anniversary, under the chairmanship of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge. Broadly representative, its membership is drawn from across the Nation and includes eight Members of Congress, including the chairman of this committee. As you know, Mr. Chairman, the first working meeting was held yesterday, August 5.

The Executive order establishing the Commission provides that it is to undertake a searching reappraisal of the potential of the United Nations to promote international peace and stability in conditions of justice and progress, to consider measures to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations and of U.S. participation therein, and to recommend new proposals to assist the President in his determination of U.S. policy toward the United Nations.

Mr. Chairman, without anticipating the recommendations the Commission may make, I should like to indicate very broadly four key areas in which we believe that steps could be taken to make the United Nations a more effective instrument to meet changing world needs.

First, there is a clear need to strengthen the United Nation's capacity to deal with political crises, to take emergency peacekeeping action and to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The United Nations is not yet able to undertake peacekeeping operations in a systematic way, nor to finance them properly. The financial picture, in particular, is disturbing, in that no agreement has been reached on overcoming the United Nations deficit caused by the refusal of the Soviets and French to pay certain peacekeeping expenses in the early 1960's.

We believe that every effort must be made to wipe out this deficit and we are pleased that the Secretary General has initiated discussions to that end.

Clearly there are limits to what can be expected of the United Nations in the field of peacekeeping, but we believe the time is ripe for a new effort to arrive at a more reliable understanding on ground rules and procedures for the conduct of peacekeeping operations. We have been discussing this matter directly with the Soviet Union and in a special United Nations committee.

We are searching for an understanding whereby, without prejudice to the General Assembly's residual authority, the Security Council would authorize and define the mandate of peacekeeping operations and the Secretary General would implement the mandate in consultation with member governments most concerned.

One of the principal questions at issue is the degree of flexibility to be left to the Secretary General to adapt operations to the circumstances of each case. We have stressed the need for flexibility in this regard since we do not think it practical to subject all operational decisions to the risk of a veto.

I can report to the committee that our discussions with the Soviet Union on this subject have been businesslike and that they are continuing.

We believe that an agreement along these lines is the key to other steps needed to improve advance arrangements for making available observers, military contingents and logistical support when needed.

Various proposals for standby forces and for more reliable financing have been advanced at your hearings, and in recent studies. We are studying these carefully and will look for opportunities to make progress on them.

We are also concerned with the peaceful settlement of disputes. This includes enhancing the capacity of the United Nations for alleviating tension, for conciliation, and for early warning of impending conflict. We are therefore making a special effort to revitalize provisions of the charter relating to timely action by the General Assembly and the Security Council in recommending methods of adjustment of international disputes, and for engaging the Secretary General in their early stages.

The involvement of the United Nations in the Arab-Israeli dispute illustrates both the Organization's strengths and weaknesses in keeping the peace and promoting the peaceful settlement of disputes.

The chairman has indicated the parameters of this hearing. I would merely say that we are encouraged by recent developments as a result of our recent initiative in the Middle East.

The second area is in finding ways to strengthen the International Court of Justice. The Court did not have a single case on its docket until a week ago, and a revival of the Court's functions is long overdue.

As I noted in an address to the American Society of International Law last April, there are numerous ways in which the role of the Court might be enhanced. Among these are: greater use of chambers of the Court, meetings of the chambers outside The Hague; establishing regional Chambers, particularly in the developing world; and giving regional organizations access to the Court.

We are engaged in consultations with a number of governments to find a basis for appropriate action at the coming General Assembly on the role of the Court. The major problem, of course, is the failure of states to submit disputes to the Court.

For our part, we are examining various disputes to which we are a party to determine whether the Court might be brought into play. In this connection we were pleased to join in support of a Security Council resolution on July 29 requesting an advisory opinion from the Court on the legal consequences for states of the continued presence of South Africa in South West Africa.

The third area we are examining is how the United Nations system can improve its performance as an operating institution. Raising the performance level means attention to budgetary and financial problems and to parliamentary and administrative procedures.

Along with many of the larger contributors to the United Nations budget, we have become increasingly concerned, as I know Congress is, about rising costs, and about the need to insure adequate accountability on the part of the United Nations and specialized agencies for the uses made of our contributions.

It seems clear that the United Nations must organize itself to assure better coordination of priorities, better budget planning, and, in general, a more efficient use of resources.

The need to improve the organization's effectiveness underlies this administration's request for a contribution of $20 million toward the cost of expanding United Nations headquarters in New York. This will prevent a further fragmentation of central headquarters, which could lead to lower efficiency and increased operating costs.

I strongly hope that the necessary authorization and appropriation can be voted by the Congress before the opening of the General Assembly on September 15.

As many of the witnesses before this committee have stressed, basic structural changes in the United Nations Charter probably are not feasible at this time. Yet, certain procedural reforms could help expedite United Nations action.

Selecting members for the main councils with more attention to their ability to contribute to constructive action as the charter requires, streamlining parliamentary procedures, and avoiding emotional excesses and impractical recommendations are among the steps required for better performance.

In particular, the United Nations system will have to adopt certain institutional reforms to put it in a position to handle larger resources for economic development programs in an efficient manner. A recent study by Sir Robert Jackson of Australia underscored what needs to be done to improve the managerial capacity of the United Nations development program.

It stressed the need to accord more authority and to provide better management tools to the United Nations development program so that it can serve as the overall coordinator of the entire United Nations system's effort in economic development and provide direction to the efforts of the various specialized agencies that operate in this field.

We have strongly supported these reforms and I am pleased to report that good progress has been made in achieving a wide consensus among member governments in support of those reforms we consider essential.

We shall now watch carefully to see that they are implemented promptly by the Administrator of the United Nations development program and the agencies concerned.

The fourth area we are examining is the possibility of greater use of the United Nations system for technological cooperation aimed at the orderly development of resources and the widest dissemination of the benefits of new technology.

For the near future, a principal value of the United Nations may well be its ability to draft rules and provide a mechanism for facilitating international cooperation in dealing with new technology.

We want to strengthen its capacities in this field, with urgent priority to the international task of protecting man's environment, to the dangers of excessive population growth and to the need to halt the epidemic of abuse of dangerous drugs.

With respect to the seabeds, we have taken a major initiative and are pressing for early action.

On May 23, 1970, the President called for a treaty under which nations would renounce all national claims over the natural resources of the seabed beyond the point where the high seas reach a depth of 200 meters and would agree to regard these resources as the common heritage of mankind.

Under this proposal, an international regime would provide for the collection of substantial mineral royalties to be used for international community purposes, particularly economic assistance to developing countries.

On August 3, the United States submitted as a working paper for discussion a draft United Nations Convention on the International Seabed Area.

The problem of safeguarding the environment is of paramount international concern and, at our initiative, it is now under consideration in numerous international forums, including NATO, the OECD, and the Economic Commission for Europe.

As you are aware, intensive preparations are being made in the United Nations for a conference in Stockholm in 1972 which, for the first time, will focus attention on environmental problems on a global scale. We are cooperating with many government agencies and private institutions in these preparations.

We are also working in the United Nations, and by other means, to carry out the President's pledge to share with other nations the benefits from our exploration of outer space.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the four areas in which we have been working to enhance the United Nations effectiveness. In mentioning them, I do not mean to minimize other tasks. We shall continue to support realistic and constructive United Nations efforts to facilitate peaceful decolonization and self-determination.

Our recent actions in support of United Nations goals with regard to the questions of Southern Africa are proof of our continuing opposition to policies of apartheid and the denial of the right of self-determination in that part of Africa.

In the area of human rights, we shall press for the early establishment of the Office of a United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights.

Finally, as you know, the administration has requested the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification of the Genocide Convention.

We are acting on this broad range of issues because of our conviction that the United Nations is not only a diplomatic forum for harmonizing the actions of nations, vital as that is. It is also an action agency with important assignments for the 1970's.

The United Nations has developed in many ways little foreseen by its founders. Its purposes remain as stated in the Charter, but its operations have changed and greatly expanded. Horizons are both more limited—as a result of present constraints on the United Nations' ability to take collective action for peace—and wider, as development needs and the new technology put an even higher premium on international cooperation.

We must be alert to recognize the interrelationship between international peace and security and these new areas of international concern and cooperation. Individual steps in both fields—dealing with the whole complex of conditions that generate national and international tension and dissatisfaction—are the components out of which we must try to build security in the future.

Finally, in closing, let me say that there are those who say that the United Nations is experiencing a lack of confidence. That may be, but there is no question, it seems to me, of its relevance to us and to the world of today and tomorrow. The only realistic choice we have then is to make it more effective, to renew its confidence, to help it gain greater public support.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I believe your statement points up the fact that has sometimes been overlooked during hearings: That is, the fact that the United Nations has lasted 6 years longer than the League of Nations. This fact indicates, I think, that the hope span of mankind is increasing, not decreasing.

We thank you.

Mr. Secretary, looking to the future, do you envision the United Nations playing a more important role or a declining role in world affairs, from the basis of your experience?

Secretary ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, my opinion is that the United Nations will play a more important role in world affairs.

I think that the role that I referred to here in the field of technology and environment, social causes, population control, and things of that kind, will assume much greater importance in the years ahead. I have no doubt about that.

In the field of peacekeeping, I think it is probably not wise to make a prediction. I would hope that the review that is being made this year and the additional attention that is being given to United Nations problems by all nations might result in greater effectiveness on the part of the United Nations in the peacekeeping role.

I would think that if it had one success, one major success now, it would be a shot in the arm for the United Nations, and all of us, I am sure, join in the hope that possibly the Middle East will be an area where it can achieve success. We mention this with caution, because all that has happened is a small step, but this is an area where, if the United Nations could work out a peaceful settlement, it might give a whole new impetus to the United Nations concept, and I certainly think we all hope that. There is no other forum, international forum, that is comparable in any way to the potential that the United Nations has in the role of peacekeeping, and we hope that it can live up to that potential in the years to come.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Secretary, participating in the hearings, I find a great deal of emphasis on the United Nations involving itself in the great problems of pollution caused by the new technology and the advance of science. I would hope that we can go beyond this. There is another pollution that I think is disturbing, and that is the pollution of the spirit, the impact of technology on human values, and the possibility of academic institutions surviving in the future.

I would hope that the United Nations would initiate studies in this area. The U.N. has the broad spectrum of expertise in many countries to review the impact of this problem as it affects individuals who must inhabit this polluted world.

Mr. Secretary, would you say that the U.S. participation in the United Nations constitutes an integral part of our national foreign policy? If so, could you elaborate, for the record?

Secretary ROGERS Yes; I think it does.

The United States certainly has been a major factor in both the creation and the continuation of the United Nations, and our foreign policy relates to the United Nations very directly.

Many members of this committee have served in the United Nations, and I am sure that all of you would agree with that.

Now, as I say, I think the principal disappointment in the United Nations has been its lack of effectiveness in the peacekeeping role.

There is some indication that there is a new awareness of the importance of the peacekeeping role on the part of many nations. We have had discussions with representatives of the Soviet Union on this subject, and although I don't have anything to report today, I would hope that the Soviet Union might appreciate the value of the United Nations in that capacity.

So, to give a short answer to you, Mr. Chairman, we consider the United Nations a very important aspect of our foreign policy, and that is particularly true, of course, in the roles that the United Nations plays apart from peacekeeping.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Secretary, you mentioned in your statement the expansion program in New York, concerning the United Nations, and I am hopeful that we can shortly surface the program in the House. I expect the bill will be reported out of committee, hopefully, very soon.

I would like to ask you for the record: Is it in the long-range interest of the United Nations and the United States to keep the central management of the United Nations, and of the United Nations development program, in New York? And, does this contribute to the efficiency of these operations? And, if so, as a result of our deliberations, should the United States contribute the proposed $20 million to the expansion of the United Nations Headquarters?

Secretary ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, of course the question you ask is a very important question, and if you will permit me, I have some figures I would like to refer to.

We believe that the United States in carrying out its responsibilities as the host of the United Nations should do its part in keeping the principal activities of the United Nations in this country, for the following reasons:

First, the United States is in a better position to provide constructive leadership to the work of the United Nations in New York than overseas. Americans are more likely to take United Nations jobs in this country, and their skills are needed for the efficient performance of United Nations tasks.

The contribution that we are asking for is $20 million. The domestic economy of the United States benefits substantially from the location of the United Nations in this country, both in terms of United Nations procurement and in terms of expenditures of United Nations employees.

For example, the salaries alone of the United Nations employees who would occupy the new proposed building would result in more than $12 million annually being added to the United States balance of payments, an advantage that would be lost were the expansion to take place overseas and these United Nations employees relocated there.

Moreover, practically all of the $80 million cost of construction would be expected to be returned to the U.S. economy in domestic expenditures.

The United Nations would benefit from this new construction through the strengthening and rationalization of its headquarters complex, resulting in opportunities for more efficient and economical direction of United Nations activities.

The further fragmentation of headquarters personnel that would result from relocating more of them abroad would be bound to result in increased operational costs and reduced efficiency.

The legislation authorizing a grant of $20 million has passed the Senate, and is pending before this committee. We would hope very much that the committee could see fit to report it out favorably, and the Congress enact this legislation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, it is a pleasure to see you here before this committee. I have listened with interest to what you have said.

I am tempted, but I don't suppose I dare to disregard the chairman's warning that the Middle East is off bounds for discussion, because you have been so provocative about it. You say, for one thing, that it illustrates both the strengths and the weaknesses of the United Nations, and I would certainly agree with you. You point out that if progress is made in the Middle East, that it would be a shot in the arm for the United Nations, and would give new impetus to it.

I know it is a subject that I should avoid but it doesn't seem to me that the Middle East, if there should be progress towards peace, owes too much to the United Nations. Surely it is primarily because of the initiative of this country that there is some progress, if it is to develop. I don't see how we can give much credit, friends as we may be of the United Nations, because of what it has done. It has done nothing.

It may be a useful device to move the negotiations along, and certainly Ambassador Jarring is a fine individual. I would like to give the United Nations credit where it deserves it, but it doesn't seem to me that it deserves much, except to demonstrate that it has weaknesses, with respect to the Middle East dispute.

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I think if I give a very complete answer, we will get started on this subject, and won't get off.

Let me say, though, that I agree certainly in part with what you say. The reason, though, that we were able to take the initiative we took was because of a Security Council resolution, and if the initiative is successful, as we hope it will be, and as there are indications it may be, then the United Nations will take over, and the negotiations under Ambassador Jarring will be pursuant to that Security Council resolution.

Now, if progress is made from that point on, and we certainly hope it will be, then I think the U.N. deserves credit. That is why I think that it shows both its weaknesses and its strengths.

Certainly, if you look back over the history of the struggle in the Middle East, there are some things the United Nations deserves credit for. I am glad, though, that you do acknowledge the fact that the United States did play a leading role in this initiative, and we are very pleased that other nations have worked with us, cooperatively, to make it successful to date.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I not only acknowledge it, but I am already boasting about it, even before much has been achieved except the possibility of some progress. I think it is an initiative that we should take credit for.

Secretary ROGERS. Well, as I said, I think, to the chairman on the way in, it is a little bit like talking about a no-hit game before the game is finished.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. You mentioned the clear need to strengthen the capacity of the United Nations to deal with peacekeeping problems, and you say the time is ripe for a new effort.

I recall very well in 1965 serving with you at the United Nations when we were worrying abut the financial inadequacies of dealing with crises, let alone the capacity of the United Nations to move, because there were no forces in being, that sort of thing.

Do you mean that the time is ripe to resolve the financial crisis? And without some resolution of the financial incapacity, are we likely to make much progress even if the need is real?

In other words, I am wondering if we are not simply pointing at a big weakness, without suggesting any way to overcome the weakness?

Isn't it because the members that have the capacity are reluctant to commit themselves, or even to pay past bills? And, what can be done to overcome this?

Why is the time ripe to resolve this question?

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I agree with everything you say, Mr. Frelinghuysen. I think you have put your finger on the problem.

The time is ripe, but it has been ripe for some time to solve these financial problems. I think that there is some indication that everyone recognizes that this failure to solve the financial problem is fundamental, and that a good deal of talk and negotiation is being conducted now to see if we can do something about it.

Mr. De Palma is very active in it. I might have him address himself to this problem, if he will, please.

STATEMENT OF HON. SAMUEL DE PALMA, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AFFAIRS

Mr. DE PALMA. Mr. Secretary, I really have little to add, except to point out that these matters are interrelated.

One of the reasons that we have a financial deficit is that the Soviets and the French withheld their payments, because of disagreements that arose in the conduct of past peacekeeping operations. That is why we are working to see if we can develop some new ground rules about future peacekeeping operations.

If we get such an understanding, we would certainly expect that the major powers, for example, who would vote for an operation in the Security Council, would pay their share, and it would be part of the understanding.

We would also hope that we would then have a firmer basis for going back and trying to work out an arrangement for liquidating the past deficit.

One of the things that has made it difficult to do that is not just that people argue about how much is owed, but they have in mind the disagreement that led to the deficit, and without having resolved that disagreement, there is no certainty that you could wipe out the deficit and keep from accumulating a new deficit. So, these things are all intertwined.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Well, I would like to share your sympathy for the delinquent nations, but it does seem to me that we don't need to be too sympathetic for them because they are worried about the reasons for the debt having developed.

There is no excuse for them not to do something constructive about future situations. I would guess if experience proves anything that this would sharply limit the capacity of the United Nations to deal with future crises. In other words, if there is a definition of responsibility it will be so narrowly limited it will sharply restrict the ability or the willingness or the capacity of the United Nations to move into a Congo situation.

I would guess the experience proves that the United Nations henceforth will never be useful, in a way that is generally recognized was useful in the past. So there again, I don't think that we should be overly optimistic about what the definition is going to be, because it seems to me it is going to reduce the usefulness of the United Nations as an instrument for keeping the peace, and not increase its potential.

Secretary ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to just make one comment.

I agree with everything that you have said, Mr. Frelinghuysen except that I don't have a feeling of despair. I think that it is possible, in the future, that we can improve. It may well be that the Soviet Union will feel in the future that it is to their advantage to take a more positive attitude toward peacekeeping.

I think your analysis of the past is totally accurate; but I would hope that the future might hold out some better prospects.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Fascell.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I am very happy to welcome you back, and to add my commendation for your personal initiative and the initiative on the part of the United States with respect to the Middle East situation. I share your cautious optimism, and hope that all goes well.

I also must add my commendation for the very strong initiative regarding the United Nations. I want to include our U.S. mission in New York, Ambassador Yost, your International Organizations Division, headed by Sam De Palma, and yourself. Without this complete cooperation, internally in the administration, we really wouldn't get very far in presenting to the President a complete program. This is absolutely essential, it seems to me, if the United Nations is going to continue, and if the United States is going to have a meaningful role in the United Nations.

I submit now for you another initiative, Mr. Secretary.

Recently, there has been public attention directed to the dumping of chemical munitions off the Florida coast. This has drawn a stream of strong protest, understandably, from those of us in Florida, and other places. I am advised that the British either have, or are considering, a strong protest.

Don't you think the time has come for reappraisal of the whole policy of using the world's oceans as a garbage dump for garbage, sewage, munitions, chemical agents, and other possible pollutants?

Secretary ROGERS. Yes, Mr. Fascell, I certainly do.

I think the whole question of pollution of the oceans is a major one And I think that recent studies have pointed up the risks to mankind.

You know, the ocean seems so huge, you don't think of any real problem developing, but there is no doubt that it could, if we neglect it, so I very much support your complaints.

Let me also say that we in the Department of State are very appreciative of the efforts and the endeavors that Members of Congress have made when they have been delegates to the United Nations, particularly members of this committee. You have been very helpful, and I think all of us appreciate it very much, the work that you did last year, and Mr. Whalley, and so many of you who have served there. We appreciate it.

Mr. Frelinghuysen and I served together, and I think that it is a very worthwhile experience, and I notice that each time a Member of Congress serves, he comes back as a strong supporter of the United Nations. We appreciate it.

Mr. FASCELL. I can certainly add my own testimony to that, Mr. Secretary. Serving at the United Nations was a very useful experience for me. I received a new awareness of the difficulty of our mission working for and reaching an agreement on anything.

It is a very, very useful experience for Members of Congress to be there, and I hope we never change that policy.

It is extremely difficult to change international conventions, and yet I recall under the sponsorship of the Department of State, with a little help from committees of the Congress, that the United States was able to obtain approval for amending the Convention standards of Safety at Sea. Amazingly quick action was obtained at the international level, to get an upgrading of the safety standards of vessels for passenger protection.

In that same spirit, I shall introduce a resolution which I hope will be submitted to the Department for its consideration and approval, which would urge the United States to propose or support a high priority consideration at the Stockholm Environmental Conference in 1972, for an amendment to the present Convention on the Law of the Sea.

But that obviously needs to be strengthened and made more specific to prevent or prohibit pollution. Perhaps we need a new international agreement for the total prohibition of dumping of military material or otherwise polluting the oceans and other international waters. If exceptions are to be made which would involve a high degree of risk to mankind, if not allowed, we will need some kind of mechanism for international scientific review.

The 1972 United Nations Conference on Man and the Environment gives us the opportunity. If we start our initiatives this far in advance, it seems to me that, based on prior experience, that we could expect reasonably to have some success.

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I would agree with that.

As you know, we are now having very active discussions with Canada on this question of pollution of the oceans. They claim jurisdiction out to 100 miles over pollution in the Arctic regions, and I think it is a subject that deserves very active consideration.

Of course it also relates to the whole subject of territorial waters and seabeds, and so forth. But it is a major new subject that we have to face up to, and we will look with great interest on your proposed resolution.

Mr. FASCELL. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Fascell.

Mr. Findley?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Secretary, I would like to add to the comments of several others my heartiest congratulations to you on the initiative taken in regard to the Middle East.

This has been described in headlines as the Rogers plan and it is a pleasure to salute the author of the plan. I realize that it is based upon a Security Council resolution but, nevertheless, the initiative was a U.S. initiative, and we are all grateful that this breakthrough has occurred. It has brought promise to an otherwise very bleak situation.

Mr. Secretary, on the bottom of page 7 and the top of page 8, you state in regard to the World Court that the major problem is the failure of states to submit disputes to the Court.

Then you mention that the United States did join in a request for an advisory opinion.

I talked with the Legal Adviser to the State Department several times about this problem, and so far as I can determine, the United States has been as guilty in the past as any other nation in failing to take the initiative to present disputes to the Court. A review is under way—for which I commend you—but, to my knowledge, we as yet have not found any matters that we will submit, and the problem I see is that if every nation takes the position that it should not submit a dispute, unless it feels that it would thereby run no risk to its own position, the Court is never going to have any business.

Would you comment on that?

Secretary ROGERS. Yes, Mr. Findley; I agree with you and, of course, it does go back to the Connally amendment, which provides essentially that we don't have to submit a case to the Court's jurisdiction unless we want to. It gives us the right to decide, and certain other nations have the same restriction.

I don't think it is timely to attempt to have that repealed now. I don't think it would get anywhere. But we have done several things. One, and I think most important, we have included in many of our treaties recently a provision that disputes under the treaty will be submitted to the Court. To that extent, we provide automatic jurisdiction for the Court. And now we are looking for cases to submit to the Court, and we hope we will find some.

Mr. FINDLEY. To take a "for instance", have we tried hard to put the *International Petroleum* case, involving Peru, before the Court?

Secretary ROGERS. Yes; we have. Unsuccessfully.

Mr. FINDLEY. I see. I commend your initiative.

Secretary ROGERS. I have tried that myself, on several occasions, with no success.

I think your basic indictment is correct. We have not been very active in helping the Court get business.

Mr. FINDLEY. As one of the leading exponents, if not the leading exponent, of the rule of law in international affairs, we ought to set a good example, I should think, which I don't feel we really have up to now.

Mr. Secretary, the basic functions that I think most people look to the United Nations for are, first of all, as a forum for discussion and, secondly, as a place where nations can join together in joint projects, over which there is almost no controversy, and, thirdly, the peacekeeping role.

The United Nations, of course, is weakened in fulfilling all of these functions, really, because it is not truly a universal organization. Neither Germany, Italy, nor China are members.

I have been gratified at some of the developments that show a changing attitude on the part of the United States toward mainland China. The most recent development was the approval of the Italian truck order, which involves U.S.-made engines destined for China, and I congratulate the administration on that. This is an evolving attitude, which I am gratified to see.

Can you say anything at this point which would indicate the position of the United States in regard to Chinese membership in the United Nations? Are we eager to see that day come?

Secretary ROGERS. Our position in this next General Assembly is going to be the same position that we had at the last General Assembly.

As you know, Communist China insists that the Republic of China be expelled from the United Nations before they would be willing to become a member. We don't think that is appropriate at all. We think the Republic of China has been a very good member of the United Nations; it has served on the Security Council with distinction; and we would not favor expelling the Republic of China. Therefore, our position will be the same this fall.

On the question of our relations with Communist China generally, as you know, and you made reference to, we are trying to improve our relations with them. We would like to see Communist China become a member of the international community, take part in international life, and drop its position of isolationism and belligerency to the outside world.

When you analyze their policy, you see that they are strongly opposed to the Soviet Union, the United States, Japan, India and, as far as one can see, this hostility, at least in their rhetoric, continues.

We have had some discussions with Communist China. We are prepared to have additional discussions. If they show any disposition to change their policies, and to become more outgoing, we are prepared to meet them more than halfway. That's why we have liberalized some of our trade restrictions. That's why we have indicated a willingness to have more exchange of personnel with Communist China. But things like that, to improve our relations with another country, it requires some mutuality. You can't do it by yourself.

Mr. FINDLEY. I realize that, Mr. Secretary, am I correct that we have put no restrictions on the agenda for talks with the Chinese at Warsaw or elsewhere, so these conceivably could include things like strategic arms control and trade and other matters?

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I don't want to suggest that we are talking to the Communist Chinese about strategic arms control. But you are correct, we haven't placed any restrictions on what we could talk about.

Mr. FINDLEY. May I make one additional comment, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. FINDLEY. The reason I brought up China initially is that I have a constituent, Maj. Philip Smith, who has been a captive of the Chinese in Peking for nearly 5 years, without trial, and there has been no way to communicate directly with him. When you get down to personal cases like that, it impresses a Congressman on the importance of having communication between governments. I was gratified to see the report the other day in the press that President Nixon in a conversation with a newsman had stated that he would like to see diplo-

matic relations established with China. I think that is a gratifying comment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Findley.

Mr. Rosenthal?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I, too, want to offer my kind words, and I think I should say publicly what I told you privately. I am very pleased with your stewardship of the Department of State and, frankly, very proud of the fact that you are a New Yorker. I don't recall every saying anything like that in the past 8½ years at any time.

I do have one problem, though, and it does relate to New York City and this United Nations expansion.

I strongly support the United Nations, but I think it is a very bad arrangement, indeed an outrageous one that has been worked out for financing this new expansion.

I don't know whether it has been brought to your attention, but the city of New York is supposed to put up an equal amount of money, in cash, with the Federal Government. In other words, the deal is that the city is to give the land, which is worth about $5 million, lose an additional couple of million dollars of potential tax assessments, and, furthermore, give $20 million cash. In other words, the city is to match the Federal responsibility.

Now, in this day and age, when the city is so short of funds and urban areas are being so deprived and denied priorities under the Federal budget—this is my view—I think it is a very bad arrangement that the city should have to match the Federal moneys for the U.N. expansion.

I offered an amendment in the subcommittee which was defeated, to make the Federal responsibility $40 million. In other words, instead of authorizing $20 million, that we authorize $40 million. Now, this would seem to me to be the fair way to handle this thing, and I tell you very frankly I am going to offer that amendment again in the full committee, and probably vote against the authorization, if we can't make this arrangement.

Now, I suspect that before you got into this Department, this arrangement was made, and it was because some people seemed to think that unless that arrangement were made, it couldn't pass Congress. Now, I don't believe that. I think that the Congress, if it takes into account the views you have expressed today of the U.S. interest in maintaining the United Nations in New York, would support a $40 million authorization, and for the city—repeating myself for emphasis—to have to match the $20 million authorization is just an outrageous arrangement. I don't know what we can do to resolve this thing. I am embarrassed to have to vote against this, but I will.

Is there anything we can do to get another look at this arrangement?

Secretary ROGERS. Mr. de Palma says that he doesn't think so. He says it has been thought over for 2 years, and he thinks it is probably beyond the point of return now.

But, in any event, I am delighted to hear what you had to say. It is pleasant to have a Member of Congress that wants to increase the money, and we will take it either way, either the $20 million or the $40 million.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Well, given the possibility that I may be able to defeat it on the floor, would that change the thinking of the Department?

Secretary ROGERS. Yes; we hope you wouldn't be that successful.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Well, let me say this: I am going to try.

Secretary ROGERS. Thank you.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FULTON. Maybe you could have the expansion in Philadelphia. We might work out an arrangement for you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Roybal.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just reflecting or thinking about the questions that Congressman Rosenthal was asking you, and also thinking about the possibility that this matter may be defeated in committee, just what would be the consequences actually, if Congressman Rosenthal's position would prevail in the House?

Secretary ROGERS. In other words, if the Federal contribution were $40 million, and the city didn't have to pay the 20 million?

Mr. ROYBAL. That's right.

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I will let Mr. De Palma——

Mr. ROYBAL. Would that in any way change the situation with regard to the Department or the United Nations?

Mr. DE PALMA. No, sir; it would not. That is what is essential. There is $40 million to come from U.S. sources, as proposed, $20 million from the Federal Government, $20 million from New York City, but it is $40 million that is important for this package.

Mr. ROYBAL. Right, but if the entire matter was defeated, that is, the $20 million now being proposed was defeated, then it would hurt.

Secretary ROGERS. It would hurt very much. I feet very strongly that it would be a serious mistake not to enact this legislation. I really think it is highly important to keep U.N. activity focused in New York. True, it has already proliferated to some extent, but if there is further proliferation, I think it will weaken our position. Moreover it is not even in our best economic interest.

Mr. ROYBAL. Yes; and then it would also, of course, weaken the true intent of the work of the United Nations, would it not?

Secretary ROGERS. No doubt about it. No doubt about it.

Mr. ROYBAL. I made in my district a comment some time ago that the United Nations should be receiving the credit for turning back aggression in Korea, for preventing violence in Cyprus and the Congo and Kashmir, and so forth, and there was a great deal of opposition to that statement. I remember a gentleman taking the floor and saying that this would have happened, even if the United Nations was not in existence; that the big powers would have gotten together anyway; to do what has already taken place; that it was not the United Nations that was responsible at all.

Now, how would you have answered that gentleman, had you been in my place at that particular time? What would you have said?

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I am not sure how I would say it, and I think it would depend on who he was, but he was wrong.

Mr. ROYBAL. And whether or not you were running for office. But supposing that you as a lecturer on the United Nations were at that time confronted with that situation: How would you have told the gentleman that he was wrong?

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I think the facts are pretty clear, that the United Nations played a very prominent part in those situations. Frankly, I have never heard anybody make the argument that these peace actions would have happened anyway. I just don't think there is any basis for it. I think it is just a specious argument.

The United Nations deserves credit for those matters, and I think all people who have followed these matters and have studied them would agree with that conclusion.

Mr. ROYBAL. Well, some of the opponents of the United Nations have definitely been making these arguments right along. In justifying their position they say that the United Nations should not even be in existence, and that the money that we spend in the United Nations is completely wasted. They are most liable to say most anything.

Secretary ROGERS. Mr. De Palma was there at the time. Maybe he would care to say a word about that.

Mr. DE PALMA. I would just like to point out, sir, that in the case of Cyprus, for example, these other options were considered, and they proved completely unworkable, and it was fortunate we could do it through the United Nations. It was not possible to do it by big-power operations or any other kind.

In the case of the Congo, the United Nations intervention actually prevented what would have been a big-power confrontation in the Congo. The big powers were at various times involved there, but in a way which was distinctly not helpful. It was the United Nations action that put a damper on this situation of potential confrontation, and helped produce the result which we can all see of a peaceful and prosperous Congo.

Mr. ROYBAL. So there is no question, then, that the United Nations was definitely responsible for these actions.

Mr. DE PALMA. No question.

Secretary ROGERS. I don't think there is any question at all about it.

Mr. ROYBAL. Thank you very much.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Roybal.

Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Not being a member of the subcommittee, I appreciate the chance to participate in it, and I would like to add my voice to the others, Mr. Secretary. We thank you for this at least glimmer of hope of some kind of a settlement, in a very dangerous situation in the Middle East.

And I would like to say, also, while I share some of the frustrations that Mr. Frelinghuysen emphasized at past events in the United Nations, I like to agree with you that I think there is reasonable basis for hoping for a more effective operation in the years ahead.

But I notice in your statement you don't put much emphasis on the one thing that, at least in my view, the United Nations has really been very effective on, and gotten very little credit for, and that is the work of the specialized agencies that have been working on real problems where we have been able to get pretty general cooperation.

Do I take it that the fact that you don't emphasize it means that you don't share my view that this has been a very significant thing?

Secretary ROGERS. No; I do share your view, Mr. Mailliard, and I am glad that you have raised that point.

I think maybe it was an omission. Maybe I should have put more emphasis on it.

I do think that the work of the specialized agencies has been unappreciated, to a considerable extent. And I think that is one of the areas that will, in the years ahead, become more and more important, and the United Nations will continue to do excellent work in those fields.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Well, I wanted to ask one specific question.

There has been a great deal of interest, both domestically and internationally, in the problems of the illegal traffic in narcotics. Bills have been introduced by a great many Members of the House, or cosponsored by a fairly large number of Members, that take a very hard line on trying to tie U.S. military and economic assistance rather directly to the degree of cooperation of various countries in attempting to control this.

The Chairman, Mr. Gallagher, and I, with some other Members, have introduced another resolution, which would attempt to get the United States to take a very strong initiative at trying to do this through the United Nations, rather than trying to do it bilaterally with the various nations involved.

I don't know whether you have had a chance to see these. They are relatively new, and I realize it would be premature to ask you for an endorsement or a lack of endorsement. But I would appreciate any comments you might make.

Secretary ROGERS. Well, we, of course, share your concern about the problem of drug abuse, and we do think it is an area that the United Nations should be more effective in.

They, as you know, have done a considerable amount of work in it, but it is still not adequate. As a general proposition, we would favor anything that could be done to make the work of the United Nations more effective in this field.

But we also think that the United States unilaterally should do every possible thing it can, and we are working that way, too; so think our general attitude is we should work in every possible way, through the United Nations and otherwise, to try to prevent this terrible scourge from continuing.

To me, the sad thing about the drug problem, aside from all the other things that are sad about it, is that, particularly in the case of heroin, once a person has used it two or three times and become an addict; for all practical purposes, he probably can't recover. He certainly can't fully recover. He is just shot.

Now, there are a lot of things that can be done, and some people are partially rehabilitated, but if you look at the whole picture, it is a very, very dismal one.

And we have done a great deal of work in the Department, together with the Department of Justice, in this field, and I think that the sadness of it, the sadness of a youngster having his life destroyed and probably without any possibility of recovery, is just something we have got to overcome.

We have got to do something about it. Society hasn't faced up to it. And it is such an easy thing to circumvent the laws.

You know, I started out in the prosecutor's office in New York, and tried a great many drug cases, and I know how very difficult it is successfully to prosecute these cases. And when you think how

difficult it is to prosecute them, how tragic the results are if a person is an addict, and how easy it is to smuggle the drug, you have got a problem that society has to face up to. We have got to get those who are producing to stop the production, and we have got to control the production.

We can't afford to do in the future what happened in the last few years, so we are going to do everything we can in the Department of State to be active in this field.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Well, one final question.

Do you think that some expression of congressional interest in trying to get the United Nations to encourage its activities in this field would be useful?

Secretary ROGERS. Yes; I do, Mr. Mailliard. I think it would be helpful.

Mr. MAILLIARD.Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Mailliard.

We have about 10 minutes remaining, to the time when the Secretary must leave.

Mr. Adair, would you care to ask questions?

Mr. ADAIR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have no questions, however, it is always good to see the Secretary here.

Reference has been made several times to the initiative in the Middle East, and I would like to add to that my own personal satisfaction at the announced renewal of the Spanish bases agreement, which was carried in the morning paper. Let me say that I think it is equitable and fair, and the Department is to be commended upon that.

Secretary ROGERS. Thank you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Wolff.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAHGER. I would like to say we have three members remaining who are not on the committee, and we would like to allow them each a question or so.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Secretary, I am sure that you are aware it is rare when New Yorkers are able to agree upon anything today, and especially for Democrats to agree, but I want to agree with my colleague here from New York, Mr. Rosenthal, on congratulating you upon your stewardship of the State Department.

Also, since I have been redistricted now, and am a New York City Congressman as well as a suburban Congressman, on the support of his desire to see to it that New York City is treated more equitably and to inform you that I will support the idea of an increased $20 million for New York City. But, there is a small matter that I perhaps can focus on for just a moment, relating to a situation I don't know whether or not has been brought to your attention, something attendant with the United Nations, and that is the situation of the Soviet property in Glen Cove.

We are faced with a problem there of a secondary residence, of a vacation dacha of the United Nations representatives. We have been asked by the U.S. Government to shoulder their burden of concessions to the Soviets and for a small city like Glen Cove, it is an almost impossible task for them to forgo the real property taxes that are necessary to keep the city of Glen Cove in financial balance.

I have asked that some help be given to the city of Glen Cove so that one city must not bear the entire load for assistance that is said

by the State Department to be of benefit to our foreign relations and the U.S. Government as a whole. I was wondering whether or not you might have any comment on this. Since the consular treaty does not provide that we can own real estate in the Soviet Union, and there is not a comparable situation there, how can we be expected to forgo taxes in our area for the accommodation of a secondary residence such as this?

Mr. GALLAGHER. I hope this isn't another amendment to take out the $20 million.

Mr. WOLFF. It might be to add $50,000.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If he sees that I am successful, he is going to come in with that small-potato operation.

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I am, Mr. Wolff, reasonably familiar with the problem, because I worked on it when I was at the United Nations for a temporary period.

I am not really prepared to talk about the financing of it, whether Glen Cove should be compensated or not, but I would be glad to look into it. I am aware of the problem.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Wolff.

Mr. Whalley.

Mr. WHALLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I am not a member of the subcommittee, but I certainly wanted to be here, because I knew the Secretary of State was going to be present. It was a real privilege for me to serve with Congressman Fascell last fall at the United Nations. Even though I was only there a limited time, I learned first-hand the difficulties of trying to get 126 nations to agree on anything.

My congratulations to you on meeting with most of the 126 delegations the short time that they were there. I really believe that what has happened right now, with the possibility of peace talks in the Middle East developed or were helped greatly by you meeting with those folks at that particular time.

The 25th anniversary, of course, I believe, is a golden opportunity to check what has been done, where the United Nations has failed, and try to work together, so United Nations will take over a greater responsibility in the peacekeeping of the world.

But I think one of the most important things about the United Nations is the fact that the 126 nations have representatives there who you can talk with at all times, learn to know them, and develop friendships which I think greatly aid in the peacekeeping area all over the world.

Thank you very much, sir.

Secretary ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Whalley.

I think your observations are very sound, and I was impressed with the fact that in the discussions I had with these foreign ministers, I couldn't help but think that an element of trust does develop in these conversations, quite different from anything that could develop if you did it on paper or at a distance.

There is no doubt in my mind—I met with almost 100 of them—no doubt in my mind that the element of trust that does develop in these discussions is very useful, when it comes to problems that are difficult, and I appreciate your comments and, as I said earlier, I

think that you and Mr. Fascell made a real contribution to the success of the General Assembly last year.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Berry.

Mr. BERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Just let me say that we all think you are doing a terrific job. Keep it up.

I just want to ask the $64 question: Isn't it true that we can't expect Russia to take a large part in United Nations peacekeeping, when their whole policy is to create irritation among the countries of the free world?

Secretary ROGERS. Well, I think we have to hope that they will, and there is some indication from the discussions we have had that maybe our hope is not ill-founded.

Certainly in the case of the arms limitation talks, and, more recently, the talks in the Middle East, I think there is some reason for encouragement. You have to have hope in this business. Otherwise, what can you do, if you don't have hope?

Mr. BERRY. I suppose we can hope, too, that——

Secretary ROGERS. I don't think our hopes should overcome our good sense. We have to have good judgment. We ought to be sure that we are not overcome by a wave of hope and not conduct our affairs sensibly, but I think we can manage that.

Mr. BERRY. I think it will be a long time though, when the policy of Russia is to maintain irritation wherever she can.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Bingham.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I, too, would like to compliment you on the statement, and I know of your deep interest in the United Nations.

I would just like to touch on one point that you mentioned which is of great interest to me, and that is the question of the seabeds.

I was disturbed the other day by a newspaper account which said that under some pressure from our Senators on the Interior Committee, that the U.S. position had been somewhat softened in regard to the proposal of the treaty. Would you care to comment on that?

It seemed to me that the treaty was a major step forward. I hope very much that the administration will hold to its position.

Secretary ROGERS. Mr. Bingham, we do hold to our position, and we did. There was some question, some opposition to our submitting a draft convention, but we did go ahead and submit one for discussion purposes.

The changes we made were fairly minor, and we have no intention of changing our position. We obviously considered the views of those Senators that you referred to, and others, but our position hasn't changed, and it won't change.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the State Department have the primary responsibility in the executive branch for action in this area?

Secretary ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. It would seem to me that it should.

Secretary ROGERS. Yes; it does. We took the lead in drafting it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you very much.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you.

Mr. Fulton.

Mr. FULTON. I agree that you are a very excellent Secretary of State, and in a troubled, untidy world, your idea of basing it on hope and optimism is a very good approach, to me.

I compliment you on two things: No. 1, you haven't mentioned the cold war; and, second, you haven't talked of the immediate change that there would be conflagration, so that we don't feel this morning that we are acting under a threat of immediate destruction. I think it is a very wise, basic foundation in the State Department.

I have a recommendation, and I served up there as one of the delegates in the 14th General Assembly. Every other year, there were two Congressmen who go as delegates, and in the even numbered years, two Senators go as delegates. I think that it is so necessary that the people of the Congress in both Houses know about the United Nations and the actual working of it that I would have in the alternate years two alternate representatives go, either as representatives or as advisers.

Now, I have been analyzer to our U.S. mission on the peaceful uses of outer space since 1959, and it has been a great help to me on my work as the ranking member of the committee that handles science and astronautics and the space program. I would make one criticism.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Make it short.

Mr. FULTON. You say:

> The Security Council would authorize and define the mandate of peace-keeping operations and the Secretary General would implement the mandate in consultation with member governments most concerned.

That would seem to me to be placing the major emphasis on the handling of peacekeeping operations among the great powers. I like the peacekeeping operations procedures being centered in the General Assembly, where it moves away from the great powers, and the power of the veto.

Could you comment on that shortly?

Secretary ROGERS. Well, as I noted in the statement, these are things that are now under consideration, and we will take your views into account in any recommendations that we make.

And I think that the question of how much authority the Secretary General has and how much the Security Council has and how much the General Assembly has are all matters that should be very seriously considered. I don't think we have any final conclusions on it.

But we think it is important that the peacekeeping role be strengthened. We do think the Secretary General should play an important, active role in the operations of peacekeeping.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Secretary, would it be possible to submit that for the record?

(The following was submitted for the record:)

ROLES OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY, SECURITY COUNCIL AND SECRETARY GENERAL IN THE CONDUCT OF UN PEACEKEEPING

The US position remains that the General Assembly has an important residual role in peacekeeping. In cases when the Security Council, which has primary responsibility for peacekeeping, is unable to act the General Assembly under the Charter has the authority to recommend peacekeeping operations.

Article 24 of the Charter confers on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. All agree that the

Security Council should authorize an operation, lay down the broad lines of the mandate and maintain general supervision of its conduct once an operation is launched. The Soviets, however, have insisted that all operational decisions in any UN force—as well as its financing—be taken by the Security Council where, of course, they could use the veto on every detail and at every stage. They want to keep a tight rein on the Secretary General. We believe that effective peacekeeping needs flexible procedures and that the Secretary General should retain broad executive latitude to run the operation and to adapt it to the unique and evolving circumstances of each case. We recognize that the Secretary General should run the operation in consultation with member governments primarily concerned, but the detailed conduct should remain in his hands. The central point in the peacekeeping discussions is to find an acceptable balance of operational responsibilities as between the Security Council and the Secretary General which will reconcile these opposing viewpoints.

Secretary ROGERS. Yes, sir; I will. Thank you very much. I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

The subcommittee stands adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at the call of the Chair.)

APPENDIX—STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

Statement of Hon. L. H. Fountain, a Representative in Congress From the State of North Carolina

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this series of hearings into the past, present and future of the United Nations has been a worthwhile endeavor. The United States should never hesitate to review the history of its participation in such an expensive organization as the U.N. or to assess possibilities for improving the U.N.'s function in the world today.

In the 25 years of its existence, the U.N. has changed little, though the world has changed much. This might be taken as a good sign of stability in a world wracked by war and revolution; but it might better be taken as an indication of a certain lack of adaptability in a time of revolutionary ferment.

Frankly, I can see little progress being made by the cumbersome U.N. apparatus toward solving or even alleviating any of the basic ills of international diplomacy. The U.N. is still locked up today over many of the same problems confronting it three years ago when I had the honor to serve with the Hon. William S. Bloomfield of Michigan as members of the United States delegation to the 22nd Session of the U.N. General Assembly.

Despite my grave reservations about the U.N., I do incline to the view that some good comes out of it and that we should not let go of it until something better comes along.

But it is an expensive membership for the United States to maintain and we are not always certain that our dollars are wisely spent. For example, I note the General Accounting Office's recent criticism of the U.N. Development Program, which was established to assist technical, economic and social development in less developed countries.

Funds for the Development Program, which currently provides financing for projects in 140 countries and territories, are provided voluntarily by member governments, one of which is the United States.

The hard-pressed taxpayers of the United States have contributed more than $550 million to the U.N. Development Program and its predecessors during the past ten years.

Increasing funds each year are committed to this Program despite the fact that the State Department, according to the General Accounting Office, is not and never has been in a position to assure the Congress and the people of the United States that these funds have been used satisfactorily to accomplish intended objectives.

The G.A.O. is highly critical of the State Department's lack of success in prevailing upon the U.N. Secretariat to use these funds in a satisfactory manner.

But, the basic problem is not the quality of State Department administration of this one area of our relationship to the U.N. The basic problem is the U.N. structure itself.

As long as we have tiny new nations (some so small they can scarcely afford to support a delegation in New York) with an equal vote, we will have problems such as these. I would add that this is only one of the U.N.'s problems.

Unquestionably, the U.N. is a debating society for the nations of the world and this is not said critically. Debating can be a valuable function in our present-day world. It is certainly better to be debating than shooting.

All too often, however, the world seems to be talking in the U.N. *and* shooting, and the real stuff of diplomacy is still bilateral negotiation. Who can argue against the fact that the critical decisions of today are being made outside the U.N.?

What if the U.N. were to properly function as the idealists would have it? In this case the accomplishments of the U.N. would surely be greater than the record will show in the past 25 years.

However, I see little chance of such astounding progress being made in the foreseeable future. The two power blocs in the world, Russia and the United States, will have to agree on more than they do today before the U.N. millennium arrives.

As long as the free world strives for peace and the communists continue to engage in aggression, this standoff in the U.N. will undoubtedly continue. This is regrettable because the world would welcome a U.N. which could make the dreams of peace of 25 years ago come true.

Unfortunately, U.N. peacekeeping efforts usually fail, as happened in the case of the Arab-Israeli confrontation on the Sinai Peninsula. When U.N. Secretary-General U Thant pulled his U.N. peacekeeping force out of Sinai, the only result could be and was war. The current tensions, if not outright war, of the Middle East flow from this ill-advised action.

Since the U.N. is apparently stalemated on the great issues of war and peace, perhaps it should concentrate on becoming more useful to the world by furthering economic, technical and humanitarian cooperation among the nations.

Perhaps by building bridges in this area, where accomplishment is possible within the present international framework, future benefit in solving major issues could be derived. After all, it's the little things that count.

With a checkered past, an uninfluential present, and an uncertain future, the U.N. seems like a weak reed to lean on. But, despite all this, we should continue our participation in its affairs in the hope that out of the present muddle will eventually come a solid foundation on which to build a lasting peace for our troubled world.

No other avenues are open to us. The increasingly complex life of our overcrowded planet demands something more in international relations than the diplomacy of the past. We can only hope the U.N. will, with proper leadership, provide us with useful ways to meet future challenges.

At least we should work toward that end.

Statement of Hon. Lester L. Wolff, a Representative in Congress From the State of New York

Mr. Chairman, at a time when our nation faces some of the greatest internal and external challenges in its history, it is particularly fitting that we pay tribute to the United Nations on its 25th anniversary.

Conceived at a time in our history when we sought to end world strife and insure future generations a lasting peace, this organization has played an important part in world-wide peacekeeping. Although the United Nations has not been able to insure lasting peace—it has kept us from letting area conflicts becoming World War.

On its 25th anniversary however, I feel it is essential that we do not solely rest on praise for this organization. For the U.N. and its member nations have not totally filled their responsibilities.

The goals of the U.N. are geared not only to preserve nations and insure world calm, but just as importantly, they are designed to elevate each human being to his greatest potential.

In the areas of labor, education, health, land development and conservation, and many more, the U.N. has played a part in growth and accomplishment. However, the part that it has been permitted to play is much smaller than the work that still remains.

Both the needs for relevant technological agencies and relevant political agencies at the international level must be met. Yet, each member nation of the U.N. has in part failed to provide this organization with the opportunity for continual adjustment to a changing world. They have failed by virtue of not looking more to this organization, but choosing instead to go separate ways in power and points of view.

As you well know, the U.N. was established on the assumption that the world's great powers linked together could achieve lasting world peace and generate the achievement of maximum potential on both personal and national levels for all nations.

We have not seen this accomplished.

I am particularly dismayed moreover with the U.N.'s failure to maintain a leadership position in the crucial problems of Vietnam and the Middle East. For in these crises, which virtually threaten the future of all mankind, the U.N. has been derelict in its duty. It has kept silent despite the obvious need to lead all of us toward peace.

National influence must continue to receive expression. But this expression must be focused on working through the U.N. and not in opposition to its goals.

We know that without unanimous approval of the permanent members of the Security Council, no action can be taken in vital matters. Yet, we fail to realize that this type of paralysis, though occurring at a slower rate, will inevitably occur if each nation continues to turn within itself and the U.N. fails to act as a leader in major crises.

Former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, once aptly put this matter when he said: "True progress on behalf of the world community lies along the path on which the weak and the strong find ways to walk together."

If we ever hope to truly achieve world peace, we must learn to walk together. And just as significantly, the U.N. must find the strength to cry out against world injustices and lead us down the path of human integrity and away from the anguishes of war and suffering.

Statement of Hon. F. Bradford Morse, a Representative in Congress From the State of Minnesota

Mr. Chairman, we are in an era of realism—realism in assessing a new international situation and in reevaluating U.S. interests, commitments and capabilities to solve the world's problem; realism in facing our own problems at home, and finding more effective ways to solve them.

Make no mistake—this is not, and should not become a retrenchment from our goals around the globe. Indeed, the world has become too small to find a refuge to which one can safely withdraw.

It means, however, a lowering of rhetoric—rhetoric which at times has not matched our capabilities, and which has served too often to create commitments which we neither wanted nor were able to fulfill.

Our relationship with the United Nations has not been immune to this rhetoric, nor to unrealistic expectations and promises. This is not to deny the need to have high hopes, and to work toward them. But it is to point out that the United Nations to which we aspire will not be easily achieved. Success will come about through small and gradual steps, and will depend on our continued efforts and support.

That many objectives of the U.N. have not been realized in its first 25 years, is not to reduce the value of the organization. There has been much steady, quiet progress at the U.N., and its shortcomings—that occasionally seize the headlines—should not obscure this fact.

The President, in his recent State of the World Address, summed up the problems which the United Nations faces: "The United Nations," he said, "is both a symbol of the worldwide hopes for peace, and a reflection of the tensions and conflicts that have frustrated these hopes." "We have to recognize," he continued, "that the United Nations cannot by itself solve fundamental international disputes * * *. We can as easily undermine the U.N. by asking too much of it as too little. We cannot expect it to be a more telling body for peace than its members make it. Peace today still depends on the acts of nations."

Even more relevant on this particular occasion may be the President's comment that "the friends of the United Nations have a responsibility to study and apply the lessons of the past 25 years, and to see what the U.N. can and cannot do. The U.N. and its supporters must match idealism in purpose with realism in expectation."

Our firm support for the U.N. must continue, but it should not take the form merely of words, nor, at the other extreme, of placing on the institution's shoulders more than we know they can bear. Either of these routes leads to disillusion and the ultimate weakening of the UN.

We Americans should therefore think practically how the United Nations may be strengthened.

This means not only continued efforts to strengthen the U.N. in areas of major concern such as peacekeeping methods, human rights, environmental issues, eco-

nomic development assistance, and an ever-increasing number of other critical world problems, but it also means insuring, for example, that the U.N. has the physical accommodations that will allow it to sustain its increased work load at a proper level of efficiency. It means, also, insuring adequate funding through contributions, so that the organization can compete in the international job market for the first class talent it requires. It means encouraging the development of more effective personnel policies which will contribute immensely to a stable and more expert U.N.

Perhaps the best place to begin reform is at home, in the administration of our own budgetary contributions to the United Nations. I think it is clear, without spelling out specifics, that the U.N. as well as the U.S. Government will benefit from greater efficiency, coordination and control in our financial relationships.

The first 25 years of the United Nations has not been easy. The next 25 years promises to be more rather than less difficult for the life of that organization. As its membership continues to increase, so will its administrative problems grow accordingly, while proliferating political and social unrest increase the burden on the U.N.

We need an effective international organization, and I have but touched most briefly on some of the challenges at hand. The institution must be in better working order if it is to deal effectively with some of the substantive issues of peace. This is, at the very least, a practical minimum at which we might aim.

Statement of Hon. J. Herbert Burke, a Representative in Congress From the State of Florida

Thank you Mr. Chairman. As a member of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I listened with care and interest to the views of the distinguished witnesses who have appeared before us during the hearings on the United Nations. Our past Representatives to the U.N., including Henry Cabot Lodge and our current Director to the U.N. Charles W. Yost gave to us a good picture of the development and growth of this body.

Since we have now reached the 25 year milestone in the United Nations growth, I wish to indicate my agreement with the Chairman's statement of intent for a "review of the organization's performance, operations and future goals." I concur also that we must also "ascertain where the United Nations fits in the overall framework of our own nation's foreign policy for the upcoming decade of the 1970's."

He is correct, for we must decide, "what we expect of the United Nations and what will we be willing to further invest in the future in order to realize our own expectations?"

I was indeed impressed with the presentation of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Elmer Staats. President Nixon, himself set the tone of our committee's hearings when he commented in his state of the world message that:

"This year's 25th anniversary of the United Nations is an occasion for more than a commemoration. It is a time to acknowledge its realistic possibilities and to devise ways to expand them. It is a time to set goals for the coming years, particularly in such areas as international peacekeeping, economic and social programs symbolized by the second development decade and the new environmental challenges posed by man's technological advances."

The United Nations does seem to offer some hope and has demonstrated that it can be effective in certain specific fields. However, its role in many fields is nil, and in some may be effectively questioned. Our cost borne by the American taxpayer in the light of our economy at present must be balanced with these considerations.

I believe that our committee hearings have developed certain areas we must seriously explore:

(1) The rate of participation by the United States in financing the main body of the United Nations and the rate of participation in the twelve autonomous organizations linked to it.

(2) The effectiveness of the United Nations in its peace keeping role and the reliance we should place upon this body.

(3) The effect of the influx of smaller nations into the U.N. having equal voting rights with the major powers and the chief financial contributors.

In the light of these three fields of review I believe that we must, as the President said, "set goals" for the things we know from our 25 years of experience the United Nations can do. Likewise we must recognize the "realistic possibilities" that reveal many limitations experience has shown to be unrewarding, and live within those limitations.

The United States has been paying almost a third of all the expenses for this organization even though we are but one nation from among 126 member nations. In fairness to the American taxpayer, it is then imperative that a more equitable financing of United Nations expenses be found.

In addition, the rise in costs which our nation has assumed has become particularly apparent in recent years. For instance, we were assessed some $37.5 million for the general operations of 1967. This fiscal year we will be asked to ante up $105.2 million for the same purpose.

In addition, the American taxpayers were asked for an additional $80.1 million by the 12 other agencies connected with the U.N., and this year these voluntary donation requests have zoomed to $142.8 million.

In the spending of this money which the State Department offers as a gift it was pointed out by Comptroller General Staats that there is no assurance or figures offered to prove that "funds contributed by the United States are or have been used in an effective and sufficient manner to accompish the intended purposes." I think this is not only poor management, but is also disgraceful.

I would like to state that in my opinion the United Nations in the past twenty five years has been of little or no help in bringing to an end the brush fire wars, or peace in the bigger conflicts other than in the Congo. The wars in Vietnam, Nigeria and in the Middle East are classic examples.

Through the years we have been asked to spend more than a hundred million dollars of which 43.17 percent was presumably for peacekeeping operations. I hardly think we received our fair share for our investment since little or nothing has been returned. We must reappraise any reliance we have placed upon the U.N.

In fairness, however, there has been a number of the smaller and separate activities that operate within the United Nations, which have great appeal and have been doing a very credible job in their respective fields. Although I believe UNICEF needs review, nevertheless, the United Nations Childrens Fund—for which we contribute 40 percent, does perform a much needed service in health and refugee programs.

But, I stress again we must review our interests in these and other activities because of the almost complete domination by the other powers in the supervision of funds and the hiring of personnel, as well as the lack of information received with respect to the work results and dollar return.

I have no hesitency therefore in advising that we use extreme caution in our future financial committments to the United Nations, until we have greater jurisdiction in directing how and where our money is to be spent, and are sure of an adjustment to insure a more equitable division of the burden.

Finally, I think that the President perhaps should pause before he takes our problems to the U.N. for debate. We are obviously out-numbered by the non-contributor, who either refuses to pay or cannot. I do feel that we as a nation should be expected to yield to the intolerance or pressure of those whose goods would destroy the free world.

We are a strong nation and we must show our will to stand up at the U.N. and before the world to proclaim our aims toward world peace, which we cannot do successfully until we stop being the patsy of those who under the pretext of peace and unity contribute little financially, but take and take from our hard earned wealth while at the same time work to destroy our capitalist structure.

Statement of National Council of Catholic Women

National Council of Catholic Women,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1970.

Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, House Foreign Affairs Committee, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gallagher: The National Council of Catholic Women interested in the United Nations, even before the UN's foundation—NCCW had an observer

at the San Francisco Conference—presents to you and your subcommittee excerpts from a statement adopted by its Board of Directors, February, 1970, in support of the U.N.:

"*Twenty Fifth Anniversary of the United Nations.*—Great progress is represented by 'A giant stride for mankind,' but great problems also can ensue. Unless man learns to work and to live in harmony with his fellow man, nationally and internationally, his technological progress can be his undoing.

"This year, the twenty-fifth Anniversary Year of the United Nations, offers an excellent opportunity to put into our daily lives the noble goals and principles embodied in the U.N. Charter. The primary goal of peace is nurtured in the minds, hearts and will of the people—in their being concerned about other human beings, in unselfishly helping them to achieve adequate health, education, housing and employment * * * [We must] not tolerate mistreatment, mentally, physically, spiritually—of human beings, wherever they are, be it on our block or half way around the world."

At our last national convention in Denver, Colorado, October, 1968, the delegates present adopted several resolutions on international affairs. The high points include:

"Devoting one percent annually of our gross national product to bilateral and multilateral programs such as the United Nations Development Program, the World Bank, the Alliance for Progress, the Asian Development Bank; ratifying the long-pending conventions adopted by the U.N. on human rights; offering greater equality of opportunity in trade to developing nations."

We have had supporting resolutions over the years, but we present for your consideration these two latest.

We would appreciate your entering this statement on the record of your hearings.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. Norman Folda, *President.*

Letter From Women United for United Nations

Women United for the United Nations,
New York, N.Y., April 29, 1970.

Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gallagher: Women United for the United Nations, a group of women representatives to the United Nations dedicated to publicizing its work, has long followed its economic and social programs with special interest. For some years we have published a monthly press release devoted to these too little known programs. We were unable to send a representative to your hearings on the subject of the United Nations 25th anniversary on April 28th, but we were told that a statement by our organization would be included in the record. The statement is as follows:

"Women United for the United Nations would like to see increased efforts to organize more efficiently the United Nations economic and social programs, giving consideration to the recommendations of the Jackson and Pearson reports. We believe that with improved organization more funds would become available, enabling the U.N. to enlarge substantially its already excellent development assistance programs."

Sincerely yours,

Ellen W. Crawley,
U.N. Representative.

Statement of William F. Claire, Executive Director, World Federalists, U.S.A., and Chairman of U.N. Structure and Operations Committee, Washington Representatives to the United Nations

It is a great personal pleasure to appear before this subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and to appear before the distinguished Chairman from New Jersey who has done such a magnificent job in calling to the attention of this country the importance of the United Nations in this, its 25th year.

I am William F. Claire, Executive Director of the World Federalists, U.S.A. I am also a member of the Executive Committee of the Association of Washington Representatives to the U.N., and Chairman of their Committee on U.N. Structure and Operations. The World Federalists, U.S.A. headquarters are here in Washington, D.C., and we have over 100 chapters throughout the country as well as being affiliated with the World Association of World Federalists in 33 countries. World Federalists, U.S.A. is a voluntary, nonpartisan political action membership organization supported by dues and contributions from thoughtful Americans dedicated to the creation of a limited world federal government designed to promote world peace through world law.

It can be safely said that our organization has, for the past several years, been extremely concerned with the fate of the United Nations, and has worked in diverse ways to strengthen it. Therefore, we are deeply grateful for this opportunity to testify and to present our views. I should say that this testimony is shared by our distinguished President, a former member of the other body, Joseph S. Clark.

We are deeply grateful to Congressman Gallagher not only for holding these hearings but for his introduction of legislation which would set up a Presidential Commission on the United Nations. We feel that this legislation was a primary turning point in efforts to convince the administration that such a Commission is vitally needed. Whatever the ultimate complexion of the Committee, I think everybody will have a lasting gratitude to the Chairman for his initiative in this regard. We were also delighted that other members of the House sponsored identical resolutions, and it will be up to non-governmental organizations to convince the Commission of the importance of its assignment.

It is also pertinent at this time to congratulate the Chairman on his introduction of legislation to provide for new funding facilities of the United Nations in New York City. In terms of our national and international priorities, this seems to be a request that is not prohibitive and something that Congress should seriously consider. While the sum of $20 million may seem like a great deal to some, it is paltry in comparison —to take just one instance of our disjoined priorities— to a total of $39 million spent each year for Department of Defense Public Relations activities alone. And if we compare the cost of $20 million with some of our obsolete weapons system then it is a very miniscule amount for the ultimate importance and benefit that could accrue from such expansion.

The thrust of our testimony today concerns the policy positions of the World Federalists, U.S.A. and a report called "To Strengthen the United Nations" developed by our World Association of World Federalists.

Prior to these two position papers, I would like to make some general observations and to suggest some possible avenues of exploration. The primary point I would like to make is that increasingly it appears that the smaller nations of the world are now not only outvoting the superpowers on issues of worldwide concern but are demonstrating their increasing independence from us. This happened last year in several areas and votes taken on the Sea-bed and Charter Review indicate this trend. In this regard, we would urge the United States to keep an open mind on these subjects and not to have rigid positions which may prevent flexibility as time goes on. This would also include action on mainland China and the whole subject of universal membership. There is certainly a trend building for membership for China and we are pleased that the present administration has eased trade restrictions and is beginning to resume contacts with the regime in Peking. Here in the U.S. the Committee on a New China Policy is attempting to bring public attention and pressure to bear on the subject. It should be a priority matter that in this 25th Anniversary year a whole package of problems relating to Korea, Vietnam and Germany, as well as China and Taiwan, be discussed.

In the last General Assembly, for example, the big two powers were subjected to a crashing defeat on the question of the demilitarization of the Sea-bed, which continues to be an issue of prime concern for World Federalists. The U.S. and Soviet drafts, were, in a word, clobbered as they emerged from their secret sessions since the treaties covered only nuclear weapons and exempted conventional weapons. The rights of large coastal states were not covered in any systematic way and then the big two even inserted a veto over amendments to the treaty. This was not considered very seriously and countries like Sweden and Canada were able to develop a groundswell in the 24th General Assembly leading to a vote by acclamation to finally return the treaty to Geneva for more work. Everybody seriously concerned with the demilitarization of the Sea-bed was delighted with this action.

WORLD FEDERALISTS, U.S.A. POSITIONS

In the 23rd General Assembly in June, 1969, the World Federalists, U.S.A. adopted the following positions which should be of interest to the subcommittee. These positions were hammered out by our Policy Committee under the direction of Peter Sharfman, a member of the Cornell University faculty. He was ably assisted by Marion McVitty, the longtime and prominent World Federalist observer at the U.N. and other members of the Policy Committee of WFUSA.

PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

We support greater recourse to the International Court of Justice for the settlement of international disputes and urge repeal of the Connally reservation. However, we recognize that today many international disputes are more political than legal in nature. In order to resolve such issues by peaceful means, we advocate the following measures:

1. The Secretary-General's office should develop expert individual fact finders and competent mediators who will be available to the Secretary-General's office as consultants.

2. The good offices of these arbitrators and consultants as directed by the Secretary-General, should be used in troubled areas with the consent of governments involved to report to the Secretary-General on conditions and developments threatening world peace.

3. International disputes brought to the United Nations General Assembly should be referred initially to the Assembly's Sixth (Legal) Committee for evaluation and advice regarding any legal elements involved as an aid to more dispassionate discussion and disposition of the issues in Assembly politicial bodies.

UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING MACHINERY

We advocate the following closely related measures to improve U.N. peacekeeping capabilities:

1. Agreement should be sought among U.N. members on a definition of U.N. peacekeeping operations and on rules to govern the deployment and withdrawal of U.N. forces, their proper and effective use, and their financing by an equitable assessment formula.

2. U.N. peace forces should be established on a more reliable basis by constituting an independent, individually recruited U.N. force, by national contingents designated in advance which receive special U.N. training, or by a combination of these two methods.

3. Agreements authorizing U.N. peacekeeping operations should include an undertaking by the parties involved in a conflict situation to submit the issues in dispute to progressively more decisive methods for peaceful settlement at agreed intervals during the peacekeeping operations so that such operations can be safely terminated within a reasonable period of time.

UNIVERSAL UNITED NATIONS MEMBERSHIP

We believe that the United States policy of isolating the Peoples Republic of China from the community of nations has greatly limited the United Nation's ability to deal with disputes. We seek representation for the Peoples Republic of China in the United Nations. We urge our government to move directly toward the establishment of diplomatic, cultural and trade relations with the Peking Government. We believe that the Peoples Republic of China should be represented in international negotiations, especially in those that concern arms control and disarmament.

We urge a U.N. approved solution for the future status of Taiwan that will properly represent and safeguard the rights of Taiwanese and Nationalist Chinese and permit Taiwan a seat in the U.N. if it so desires.

Countries which are at present divided, such as Vietnam, Korea, and Germany, await political solutions. In the interim, however, we believe they should be fully represented in the United Nations.

We reiterate our belief in the principles of universal membership as an essential attribute of a world federal government. We recognise, moreover, that a world federation with properly constituted authority makes possible the toleration of different political systems, while performing essential law-making and law-enforcing functions.

RHODESIA AND SOUTHWEST AFRICA

The United Nations has made its position clear regarding the present regime in Rhodesia and the South African administration of South-west Africa.

We believe that these situations demonstrate the truth of our contention that the United Nations requires drastic strengthening. The United States will surely observe the mandatory sanctions voted unamimously by the U.N. Security Council. It is time that the United States revise its policy toward other nations, particularly South Africa and Portugal, which aid and abet the policies of Rhodesia.

Moreover, we condemn in the strongest terms the refusal of the Republic of South Africa to recognize that Southwest Africa is no longer under its jurisdiction. We call on the United States to support the United Nations machinery established for the administration of that territory. No confidence will remain in the U.N. if it is asked to accept a responsibility which it is not permitted to discharge.

OBJECTIVES

ADEQUATE WORLD AUTHORITY

We believe the United Nations offers the best available basis for world peace if it can be given adequate power to make, interpret, and enforce world law. We believe this can be achieved by amendments to the United Nations Charter which:

1. Grant the United Nations power to make laws implementing Charter provisions which prohibit any nation from using force or threats of force in international disputes, and which also prohibit the manufacture, possession, or use of armaments beyond those required for internal policing. These laws must be binding on individuals as well as on nations. At the same time, a schedule for universal and complete disarmament must be adopted.

2. Give the world organization the means to raise living standards through economic and technical aid, more equitable trade terms, monetary reform, and such other measures as may be necessary to increase production, purchasing power, and markets for goods and services.

3. Grant the United Nations power to govern the high seas and outer space, as well as other carefully defined international jurisdictions.

4. Grant the United Nations authority to raise adequate and dependable revenue under carefully defined and limited taxing power.

5. Establish a system for enforcing world law through inspectors, civilian police, courts, and an adequate armed peace force.

6. Establish a civilian executive branch of the United Nations, without the veto, responsible to the General Assembly for controlling the United Nations forces which will maintain law and order.

7. Provide a voting system on legislative matters more just and realistic than the present one-nation-one-vote formula in the General Assembly, and provide as soon as practicable for direct popular election of United Nations representatives.

8. Provide for universal membership without right of secession.

9. Confer on an expanded United Nations judiciary the final authority to interpret world laws, including existing international law; to settle disputes between nations by peaceful means; and to try all individuals accused of violating world laws governing disarmament and prohibiting aggression.

10. Provide a Bill of Rights protecting individuals against arbitrary or unjust action by the United Nations, and prohibiting United Nations interference with any rights or liberties guaranteed to citizens by their own national or state institutions.

11. Reserve to individual nations and their people all powers not expressly delegated to the United Nations, thus guaranteeing each nation complete freedom to manage its domestic affairs and to choose its own political, economic, and social institutions.

United Nations Charter revision should be approached both by comprehensive planning and by encouraging gradual development. The United States Government should undertake advance planning and consultation with other nations in preparation for a Charter Review Conference. Simultaneously, it should promote evolutionary developments in the world organization which will tend to make Charter Revision inevitable within the United Nations.

At this point I would like to include "To Strengthen the United Nations" that I mentioned at the outset.

I am deeply grateful to Donald F. Keys, United Nations Observer for the World Association of World Federalists, and for our own organization for the following paper which, we think, will be of genuine value to the Subcommittee.

PEACEMAKING—PEACEKEEPING—DISARMAMENT

These three aspects of world security are intimately interrelated. Peace will fail unless all three are given simultaneous attention. Since the matter of peace *making* has received relatively less attention by the United Nations, recommendations are first and urgently directed to this subject.

I. Peacemaking

While the League of Nations gave primary attention to the means for peaceful settlement of disputes, the Charter of the United Nations has given proportionately much less. It is true that Article 33 of the Charter calls upon parties to a dispute "to seek a solution by negotiation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements or other peaceful means of their own choice," but there is no provision in the Charter for the mechanisms for this purpose in political disputes, or disputes not of a legal character. Furthermore, it should be clear that in the absence of established and recognized modalities for the peaceful settlement of disputes, resort to armed conflict is inevitable.

Establishment of a United Nations Conciliation Commission.—A permanent United Nations Conciliation Commission should be established. The tendency in representations before the Security Council or other U.N. Bodies has been toward seeking condemnation of one party to a dispute—the fixing of blame and imposition of penalties. Greatly increased emphasis should be given to the *reconciliation of differences* through the good offices of the proposed Conciliation Commission, whose proceedings would normally be confidential. The Conciliation Commission would be activated in either of two ways: by direction of the Security Council under Article 33(2), or by the initiative of Parties to a dispute.* In addition, the development of a corps of trained U.N. civil mediators should urgently be undertaken which could be called upon to assist in the settlement of local disputes and their terms of reference set forth.

II. Peacekeeping

A. *Interposition.*—The framers of the Charter were unable to foresee the precise way in which the world's needs for peacekeeping would develop. They therefore developed with clarity only the means for carrying out armed enforcement actions against aggressor states. Another approach to ending armed conflict in the world community has evolved through experience, namely, the method of interposition, in which U.N. Forces are charged with ending hostilities and restoring peace rather than with settling the dispute through force of arms. This approach has now been generally recognized and accepted, as evidenced by the effort now going forward in the Committee of 33 to codify procedures for future observer and peacekeeping missions.

B. *Authority.*—In connection with these negotiations, it is understood that the most difficult decisions relate to the division of authority between the Secretariat, actually conducting operations, and the Security Council. It is important, of course, that major policy decisions be the purview of the Council. At the same time, it is essential that the effective execution of these decisions not be encumbered by the necessity for constant referral of operational details to the Council. The Security Council is not an appropriate body to carry out military operations, and the procedures agreed upon should reflect this consideration. In order, however, to maximize confidence in the conduct of operations by the Secretariat, it might be possible, for instance, to establish a small Liaison Committee on Peacekeeping, derived from the Security Council, to maintain close contact with the Secretariat. While the Committee of 33 should be wished every success in its work, several points are enumerated which should be incorporated into such agreements.

C. *United Nations Observer Corps.—A United Nations Observer Corps* should be established. All States would be required to permit U.N. Observers at any trouble spot and on both sides of contested areas or borders when requested by the General Assembly, the Security Council, or Secretary General, or one of the

*This Conciliation Commission is not to be confused with the responsibilities in legal matters, such as treaty law, of the International Court or the Conciliation Commissions envisaged in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

parties to the dispute. The Peace Observer Corps should consist in the first instance of especially trained contingents from Member States, and when feasible, of volunteer personnel directly recruited by the United Nations.

D. *A United Nations Interposition Force (UNIForce).*—The Provisions for mobilizing and deploying contingents of earmarked national forces for interposition duty should be codified without delay. All Member States for whom it is reasonable (other than the major powers) should designate instant-ready contingents, as well as larger back-up forces which could be readied in a short time. Governments should agree in advance that their contingents, once submitted, would be part of the U.N. Peacekeeping action until the action was concluded. They thus would not (as has frequently happened) withdraw their forces in the midst of an action, compromising the effectiveness of the UNIForce. They would, of course, in consultation with the commanders, be authorized to rotate the particular personnel committed. These contingents, to the largest extent possible, should consist of persons volunteering for U.N. duty. They should receive special training in interposition, suppression of violence, establishment of authority with use of as little force as possible. This training should either be carried out by the U.N. or according to curricula approved by the U.N. As soon as possible these contingents should be directly recruited U.N. volunteers trained by the U.N. for their unique and very special task.

E. *Enforcement.*—Preparations should be made to implement the provisions of Chapter VIII of the Charter with regard to enforcement action in armed conflict, should it be required. This includes the earmarking of national contingents trained for use in U.N. armed conflict.

F. *Peacekeeping Fund.*—Any peacekeeping function approved by the United Nations should not lack the financial means to carry it out. It is suggested that a Peacekeeping Fund be established. As soon as possible this fund should be derived from new sources of revenue which may be tapped to improve the U.N.'s financial position. Many possibilities have been suggested, and include a tax on postal service or telecommunications or satellite communications, as well as funds eventually from sea bed revenues. In the meantime the fund could be established by voluntary contributions.

III. Disarmament

A. *Obstacles to Disarmament.*—There is no technical bar to disarmament. The bars are psychological, political, and ideological. In these areas may be sought the reasons why, in 25 years of effort, the goal of a disarmed world has eluded us. What has been achieved is not without consequence. The various measures for non-armament in certain areas are to be welcomed. But it is doubtful that even these barriers will hold should the arms race continue unchecked. Disarmament requires specifically the following without delay.

1. *Participation of all nuclear powers in negotiations.*—There is a definite early limit to the degree of disarmament that will be possible without the involvement of China and France. France may be expected to take her seat presently. China, however, will not accept the invitation to disarmament negotiations as a non-member of the U.N. Therefore, seating of Mainland China is an urgent item on the list of priorities.

2. *Reduction of threat perception.*—The measures required for reduction of threat perception among ideological and political groupings are well known, but for the most part remain unimplemented.

3. *Progress in the U.N. peacemaking and peacekeeping processes.*—Until positive confidence in the ability of the U.N. to act quickly and justly to settle disputes and to keep or to restore peace is established, substantial disarmament will remain unattainable.

B. *Decade for Disarmament.*—The U.N. has accepted the Secretary General's suggestion, and designated 1970–1980 a Decade for Disarmament. In addition, the Assembly asked the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD) to "work out an outline for a comprehensive program" on all aspects of the problem of arms control and disarmament. However, no other plans were made for the Disarmament Decade, beyond urging ratification of present treaties, and publicity by the U.N.

1. *Disarmament Decade Committee.*—The 25th General Assembly should establish a *Disarmament Decade Committee to plan specific activities during the Disarmament Decade.* It should consider *inter alia* a special session of the General Assembly, a meeting of the Disarmament Commission, or other high-level conference, early in the decade.

2. *Ratification of Agreements.*—As a first act in the Disarmament Decade, Member States should accede to existing agreements as appropriate, including the Non-Proliferation Treaty, to bring it into effect at the earliest time, the 1925 Protocol on Biological and Chemical Weapons, the Treaty of Tlatelolco for Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, with its Protocol for nuclear powers (ratified by only one so far).

3. *General and Complete Disarmament.*—In connection with the call by the Assembly to the CCD to "work out a comprehensive program," work should be resumed by the U.S. and USSR to revise and update their draft treaties for General and Complete Disarmament. To this end, the U.S.–SU Statement of Agreed Principles on Disarmament (McCloy-Zorin agreement of July, 1961) remains as valid as a basis for negotiations on disarmament as when it was written. In addition, the nonaligned group at the CCD should undertake to prepare its own draft of a disarmament treaty, as might also independent peace research institutes.

C. *Strategic Arms Limitation.*—The United States and the USSR must be urged to respect the appeal of the General Assembly for a "moratorium on further testing and on deployment of new offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapons systems" since the pace of negotiations may be too slow to prevent irreversable steps in testing and deployment of antiballistic missile systems (ABM's) and multiple independently-targeted reentry vehicles (MIRV's) to take place, thus greatly complicating the task of halting the further escalation of the strategic arms race. An end to identifiable nuclear tests should likewise be agreed upon, to lend credence to the end of ABM and MIRV deployment.

As the SALT talks proceed the major powers must be urged to achieve the earliest possible agreement on a cut-off reduction of strategic arms and a cut-off in a production of nuclear weapons materials. As a *quid pro quo*, non-nuclear states should agree to measures to register and to halt or limit the sale and circulation of convential arms, particularly in certain specified areas.

D. *Chemical and Biological Weapons.*—All efforts to achieve parallel or consolidated treaties on the controlled prohibition of production, stockpiling and uses of both chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons, should be accelerated and supported.

CONCLUSION

All current efforts to achieve agreement on collateral measures of disarmament must be applauded, but renewed emphasis is required on the methods, measures and conditions for achievement of general and complete disarmament, recognizing that this cannot be achieved unless at the same time the United Nations becomes an effective agency for peacekeeping and peacemaking. The item on international security which will appear again on the agenda of the 25th General Assembly provides an opportunity for Governments to explore these interrelationships and make proposals for an integrated approach to peacekeeping, peaceful settlement of disputes and disarmament.

PEACEFUL USES OF THE SEABED

The present deliberations on the seabed and the "resources thereof" provide a test case on the will of Member States to achieve the common good of the world community. The principle now being debated that the seabed and its resources are the "common heritage of mankind" should be endorsed. These resources very probably give the world a "second chance" to meet the problems of economic misery which afflict so much of the world. This opportunity must not be lost through short-sightedness or selfishness. Therefore, all support should be given to the efforts being made to reach the necessary decisions on definitions and establishment of machinery. The 24th General Assembly has declared a moratorium on exploitation of the seabed beyond the limits of national jurisdiction. It has also requested the Secretary General to "ascertain the view of Member States" on the convening of a conference for defining clearly the limits of national jurisdiction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Member States should respect the moratorium on exploitation and should state their agreement to participate in a Conference on the Law of the Sea to be called at the earliest possible date.

2. The Sea Bed Committee should recommend, and the 25th General Assembly adopt, a further appeal calling for a moratorium on any extension of presently claimed national limits on the seabed, pending their definition by the proposed conference. It should be agreed in advance that no claims exceeding those to be established by the proposed conference would be recognised.

3. The Sea Bed Committee should recommend, and the 25th General Assembly adopt, a declaration that the seabed and the resources thereof are the common heritage of mankind and that the seabed and its resources beyond national jurisdiction are not subject to national appropriation.

4. The General Assembly should decide as soon as possible to establish an international regime closely related to the U.N. to control the licensing and regulation of exploration and exploitation of the seabed.

5. The General Assembly should agree that the U.N. shall receive income from licensing taxes for maintenance of the proposed international regime and for its general budgetary requirements as well as a substantial proportion of the revenue from exploitation of the seabed which shall be devoted to economic assistance and needs of the world community. (Licensing should be for a short term, with a stated limit, although such licenses as would be issued could be renewable.)

DEVELOPMENT DECADE

The efforts to accelerate economic and social development in underdeveloped countries have not been very successful mainly because the highly industrialized nations have failed to provide sufficient help. The 25th Anniversary of the U.N. at the beginning of the Second Development Decade, would be an appropriate time for the advanced nations to agree to *pledge a minimum of 1% of their national income* per year for economic and social development particularly in the form of "soft" loans and grants, channeled through United Nations programs, and related international institutions. This recommendation would take into account revenue returning from developing countries under previous arrangements. In the last analysis the achievement of well-being, justice and peace in the world community depends on such a commitment.

Control of commodity prices for primary products must be considered also, in order that developing countries do not suffer economic instability and failure from fall of prices and loss of revenue in these products. It is most appropriate and significant that the Secretary General has suggested a Disarmament Decade to coincide with the Second Development Decade. Progress in disarmament should make it possible to accelerate still further the sorely needed development programs, through investment of a substantial proportion of the savings from arms budgets.

The conclusion of two development-related studies can give new impetus and guidance to international economic development.

1. The recommendations of the report by the Commission on International Development, "Partners in Development," prepared under the leadership of the Rt. Hon. Lester Pearson, should be taken into account in design of Development Decade Programs.

2. In particular, the recommendations of the report on "The Capacity of the United Nations Development System" presented by Sir Robert Jackson should be urgently implemented which would move in the direction of a unified world development authority. These include:

a. Coordination of U.N. aid programs under a single, effective authority—the U.N. Development Program, granted tighter and improved control.

b. Strengthening, reform and streamlining of the UNDP to meet this expanded responsibility.

UNIVERSAL MEMBERSHIP

The concept and desirability of universal membership in the United Nations is no longer challenged. The 25th Anniversary Year is the proper time to call a moratorium on past disagreement on this matter with the seating of the major States remaining outside the World Organization. This year offers an unparalleled opportunity to clear up the anachronisms in membership which are currently crippling the functioning of the United Nations. Taken in this context, all States can make fresh moves in a spirit of magnanimity and good will. Politically, the situation increasingly is conducive, with the new situation in Central Europe, negotiations regarding USSR-China borders, and renewed U.S.

China meetings. There are ample *quid pro—quo's* inherent in a "package" revision in membership so that all States should find that more is gained than lost.

1. *China.*—The People's Republic of China should be recognized as the State referred to as the "Republic of China" under the U.N. Charter, thereby entitling it to the permanent seat of China on the Security Council as well as to membership in the General Assembly and other Bodies. At the same time, the credentials of Taiwan would be accepted as a State eligible for U.N. membership. Such an application would be without prejudice to any concept Taiwan or China hold regarding the status of Taiwan, or to any relationship they might later entertain or agree upon, so long as it was approached by peaceful means.

2. *Associate Membership.*—Suggestions for Associate Membership for very small new States providing adequate protection, economic assistance and access to international institutions should be considered.

THE SECURITY COUNCIL

In many instances it has not been possible for the Security Council to give effect to its decisions or even to reach decision on matters of the utmost moment to the International community. There are many possible approaches to enhancing the decision-making authority and ability of the Security Council. Among the suggestions, which have been mentioned, are the following:

1. *Change in membership of Permanent Members.*—Amendments to the Charter increasing the non-permanent membership of the Security Council from 6 to 10 came into force in 1965, reflecting the great growth in the membership of the U.N. and changes in its political character.

However, no changes were made at that time in the number of Permanent Members of the Security Council. If, as stated in the Charter, "due regard" is to be "especially 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" of non-permanent members, it seems clear that the same is also to be paid the permanent members, and that several other nations of great strength industrially or in terms of size or both ought to be added to the Permanent Members, and without necessarily extending the right of veto.

2. *Change in Requirement of Concurrence of Permanent Members.*—Presently all matters of substance require the concurrent votes of the Permanent Members (the "veto") in order to achieve adoption. While this arrangement reflected a certain reality as it existed during the early years of the Charter that reality has been modified by time. That this reality has changed is indicated by the present practice of requiring concensus for all Security Council actions—the substitution of one restrictive practice for another. Consideration should therefore be given to modifying this requirement to reflect the changing reality in voting on substantive issues such as peaceful settlement of disputes by requiring less than unanimity.

HUMAN RIGHTS

United Nations efforts concerning the realization and safeguarding of human rights are now passing beyond the task of codification to those of ratification and implementation.

I. *Ratification.*—United Nations Human Rights instruments, such as the two Covenants on Civil and Political, and on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination should be quickly ratified by all States.

II. *Human Rights Council.*—Consideration should be given to the changing of the Human Rights Commission into a Human Rights Council, with status equal to the Economic and Social Council, and the now largely inactive Trusteeship Council. The Human Rights Council should have authority to coordinate and integrate the various human rights activities of the U.N., as well as those activities to be initiated by the coming into force of the Conventions and Covenants.

III. *Regional Courts.*—The establishment of additional Regional Courts of Human Rights, such as the existing European Court of Human Rights and the planned Latin American Court, should be encouraged.

IV. *The post of a High Commissioner for Human Rights* should be established to consider communications on human rights and to render assistance to States which request his help, as embodied in the Resolution currently before the General Assembly.

V. *Study should be begun on establishment of a World Court of Human Rights* to supplement regional Courts of Human Rights. The World Court would have responsibilities analogous to the regional courts.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to express our views.

Statement on the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations Submitted to the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, by the American Ethical Union, May 5, 1970

The American Ethical Union is a liberal religious fellowship, made up of people from diverse religious, racial and ethnic backgrounds. Ethical Societies are organized in 30 locations around the country. The headquarters is in New York City at 2 West 64th St.

Ethical Culturists have pioneered in many important social movements since their founding by Felix Adler in 1876 in New York City. Just to name two of the innovative social programs which the Ethical movement has sponsored, there have been the Encampment for Citizenship, which brings together children of differing nationality and racial backgrounds each summer, and the International Conference on Race Relations.

One of the abiding concerns in the Ethical movement has been for world peace and brotherhood. That is why we have put so much stress on building strong international organizations, notably, of course, the United Nations. The American Ethical Union and its international counterpart, the International Humanist and Ethical Union, both have non-governmental organization representatives accredited to the United Nations.

The theme of the 25th Anniversary of the United Nations is *Peace, Justice and Progress.* The theme of the World Youth Assembly that will take place under United Nations auspices in July is *Peace, Justice and International Understanding.* These themes have a forward look.

In order to make United States participation in the United Nations most effective, we respectfully submit the following recommendations:

The subjects of our recomendations have been supported in varying degrees by the United States under different administrations. We hope that they will be continued in greater degree so that the U.S. will maintain leadership, somewhat submerged in these last few difficult years.

1. The U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations could well be a member of the U.S. National Security Council (not to be confused with the U.N. Security Council). In order to carry out the President's mandates, he must be in a position to explain and interpret to the National Security Council policy of U.N. member nations, and what he hears from United States citizens and organizations, deeply and sincerely concerned about their country's survival and development.

2. Curbing the Arms Race:

The U.S. should not proceed with MIRV and ABM.

President Nixon in his address to the U.N. General Assembly stated: "In this new age of 'firsts' even the goals of a just and lasting peace is a 'first' we can dare to strive for. We must achieve it and I believe we can achieve it."

Precedents for controlling destructive forces where the U.S. had the initiative can be seen in the following:

1946: Baruch Plan for sharing atomic knowledge—negated by the USSR
1953: Eisenhower Atoms for Peace Proposal
1957: Establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency
1961: McCloy-Zorin Statement on Disarmament with procedures for peaceful settlements of disputes and peace-keeping procedures

Treaties in force which assist in preventing disputes, include the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the Treaty on Outer Space, the Non-Proliferation Treaty. We recommend that the United States sign and ratify others.

Furthermore, a large number of responsible institutes, organizations, scientists and other citizens have written convincing documents on the need for curtailing the arms race in the interest of national as well as international security. We recommend that the United States respond to this collective wisdom. The U.S. should continue to work for agreements on the use of the sea beds, outer space and ocean floors.

3. Economics of Disarmament: Constructive steps should be taken in the matter of the economics of disarmament to insure an orderly change-over from industries and organizations now engaged in military-industrial projects to the many new activities that will be needed in the program to alleviate the problems in the human environment situation, ably described in the President's report. These programs, if carried out imaginatively at the local, national and international levels by business, labor and education would remove fear of unemployment, would introduce programs which give people a sense of involvement and help remove some of the unrest that has plagued the American community.

4. Encourage and Strengthen United Nations Peace Keeping Capabilities: Peacekeeping actions have been consistently supported in principle and with funds by the United States. The U.N. Commissions of good offices, of mediation, often accompanied by military observers, of representatives of the Secretary General and sometimes representative assistants from Regional Organizations, have all helped in stabilizing difficult situations.

Nations other than the major powers continue to provide the military and police contingents needed. In view of the seriousness of the world situation it would be well if the United States took the initiative in strengthening the peacekeeping operations and developing new ones.

5. Promoting the Advancement of Human Rights: It is imperative that the United States ratify all Human Rights Treaties. This includes some ILO and UNESCO Conventions, and—

U.N. Declaration on Human Rights;
U.N. Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and People;
U.N. Declaration on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women;
U.N. Declaration on the Rights of the Child;
U.N. Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.

The U.S. should also:

—assist the writing of Conventions promoting freedom of thought and religion and also freedom of information;
—continue to support population planning;
—prepare documents to prevent encroachment on human rights resulting from new scientific and technological discoveries;
—safeguard the use of satellites for purposes that will not induce propaganda or military uses;
—support actions that will help eliminate apartheid. In this connection, the United States should implement programs of education and action in 1971, which the U.N. has designated The Year to Eliminate All Forms of Racial Discrimination;
—support the Establishment of a U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights.

6. Supporting universality of membership in the United Nations to enable the United States to have better inter-communication and as a result better international understanding both with and by other nations.

7. Assisting the Second Development Decade by introducing and approving plans for economic and social development—now generally approached as one program.

8. Rendering economic aid through the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies rather than on a bi-lateral basis. Note recommendations in the reports of Lester Pearson, Sir Robert Jackson and Rudolph Peterson.

The opinion of many U.S. citizens is reflected in the statement that "Development is peace-making—the widening gap between rich and poor is an invitation to disaster." We urge the United States to continue and to increase the aid given through the U.N.; to help finance the International Volunteer Corps; to establish new forms of private-public partnership in overseas investment and technical assistance, and to provide legislation to encourage and support more and better trained U.S. leadership within the U.N. system and especially in the economic and social side, enabling more comparable professional conditions to those inside U.S. government and private professions.

Respectfully submitted.

EDWARD L. ERICSON,
President.
ROBERT E. JONES,
Executive Director, Joint Washington Office for Social Concern.
MRS. WALTER M. WEIS,
U.N. Representative.

Letter From People First Central Committee, U.S.A.

People First Central Committee U.S.A.,
Chicago, Ill.

Congressman Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Frelinghuysen: I enjoyed trying to field the questions and criticism you directed to me on Tuesday at the hearings of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements. I only regret that my testimony annoyed you so much.

It is hard to put such complex matters in a nutshell. I would like to order my thoughts with a bit more reflection in this letter, in the hope that what I am trying to say will make more sense to you in this form. Perhaps you or Congressman Gallagher may wish to add this amplification of our discussion to the record of the hearings.

It does not "denigrate" President Nixon to state that he repeatedly omits mention of the United Nations from his speeches on foreign affairs. It is simply a fact. It is true that he sometimes does pay attention to the U.N. and it is more importantly true that President Johnson didn't do much for the U.N. either. Johnson usually mentioned the U.N. in a speech, Nixon usually does not; the criticism of neglect is nonpartisan.

As I mentioned to the Subcommittee after your departure on Tuesday, for several years there has been not even a single employee of the United States government, either in the Department of State or in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, primarily engaged in the planning of a political structure of peace. Maybe this is scandalous; but it is true. My argument cites some examples to urge a much more searching examination of our policy toward the United Nations than we have given it heretofore.

If there is even a reasonable possibility that some of our customary assumptions are wrong, such an examination is imperative. We have just learned that the assumption of "Third Force" opposition to United Nations reform was quite wrong. I am suggesting to you that we should much more carefully examine the assumptions that American public opinion would accept the vesting of decisive peace-keeping powers in the United Nations without representational reforms, and that less powerful nations would refuse such reforms.

On these points we are guessing, both you and I and everyone else, and I submit that guesswork isn't good enough: the issue is so pivotal that we need a more penetrating analysis, and enough logic and facts are available that we should be able to make one. What logic and facts I have at my disposal suggest the following chain of reasoning:

Peace won't keep itself. We will get peace only when we erect a structure of peace sufficient to replace war as a means of decision. This will constitute giving an international authority the power to keep peace. This is an ultimate step, not an interim step: it will transfer the final power of decision in international affairs to an international body. And I think a lot of Americans are going to be very careful to sanction such a transfer only to the most capable and representative international body which we, in concert with other nations, can devise.

On the other side, it is possible to make a pretty good case that the less powerful nations would welcome some degree of representational reform in the United Nations if such a step would make the United States more willing to give the international body real power in a crucial area like peacekeeping. One possible scheme of representation, accompanied by supporting argument, appears on page 61 of the report of our Conference Upon Research and Education in world government, *Freedom in a Federal World*, a copy of which I am sending you separately.

You will note that this formula assigns only 15% of the seats in an elective house of the General Assembly to the four largest nations, and preserves the essential virtues of "Third Force" mediation, which all of us regard as valuable.

My own observations among citizens both of the less powerful nations and of this country suggest strongly that the foregoing chain of reasoning has substantial elements of realism, certainly enough to merit more careful research by our government, as the Resolution by Congressman Gallagher, H.J.R. 1078, proposes.

I think you and I might agree that we need less guesswork and more real study. There is an important corollary. If we have not really applied our best brains to such problems, we cannot claim that we are conscientiously striving

for peace. Our effort to plead justification in Viet-Nam and the inadequacy of the United Nations is correspondingly superficial. The accusation that our Presidents have been guilty of criminal neglect in their failure to plan peace, accordingly and to that extent, gains substance; and the desperation and revolt of young people clearly has its roots in their belief that we have not come to grips.

Like the warmakers, the peacemakers must think some unthinkables. A Presidential Commission will be a beginning, late but positive.

Sincerely yours,

EVERETT L. MILLARD,
Executive Secretary.

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE ON THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Twenty-five years ago, while World War II was still an agonizing reality, representatives of 51 nations gathered in San Francisco. In the name of "the Peoples of the United Nations," they pledged to unite their strength within a comprehensive new juridical and political world organization "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" in accordance with principles of justice and international law.

The American Bishops declared a few months later that our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. Concerned that the great powers were placed in a position "above the law" in matters relating to the maintenance of peace and security, they expressed the hope that a sound institution would develop from the recognition of the rights and duties of international society.

As the American Bishops meet now in 1970 in San Francisco, a city which bears the name of the patron of peace, we deem it appropriate to welcome the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the United Nations. Even more important, however, this is a fitting occasion for an examination of conscience and a renewed resolve to unite, as both the Gospel and the times demand, to banish war and to make of the earth a peaceable kingdom.

We call upon American Catholics to join with us in appreciation of the noble purposes of the United Nations and of its innovative efforts and achievements in behalf of human solidarity, human development and peace, and we urge them to increase their knowledge and understanding of these efforts and achievements. At the same time we recognize, as the United Nations itself is doing, how far it still is from meeting contemporary threats to and demands for that peace, justice and true human progress which are the theme of the anniversary year.

ACHIEVEMENTS

Common endeavors of the Member States of the United Nations, in harmonizing their national interests, have indeed deepened and broadened awareness of the reciprocal rights and obligations of states in international life. Some conflicts have been averted, contained or halted by its efforts. The horrendous character of nuclear, chemical and biological warfare has been universally acknowledged, and treaties to limit or abolish the respective weapons have been concluded or initiated. Numerous new states, formerly under colonial rule, have been assisted in the transition to independence and the new responsibilities thereof, and they have been welcomed to United Nations membership on terms of juridical equality. The dignity and fundamental equality of all members of the human family, without regard to sex, race, color, religion or any other distinction, have been repeatedly affirmed and enhanced through formal declarations and treaties, through various educational campaigns and through positive action of a social nature. Worldwide technical cooperation and other forms of mutual assistance are feeding the hungry, healing the sick, instructing the ignorant and sheltering the homeless. A body of international law to cover existing and expanding relations in international life, which otherwise might lead to conflict, is being progressively developed. Agreements to preserve outer space, the ocean bed and an uncontaminated environment as the peaceful patrimony of all mankind have been concluded or are in the making.

POSSIBILITIES

There can be no doubt that the United Nations could move to that higher dimension of community and authority demanded by the contemporary crises of peoples, which are, in fact, world crises, if men and states would take seriously the injunction of Pope Paul to the United Nations: "We must get used to thinking of man in a new way, of men's life in common in a new way, in a new way, too, of the paths of history and the destiny of the world." In a world made one by the evolution of communications and transportation, this new way requires States to emerge from the anachronistic structures which enshrine old concepts of unlimited national sovereignty.

As Christians and as American citizens, we have a special responsibility to cherish and protect the life of men in community and to assist the United Nations to help us do so. As Americans we must acknowledge the reality of our massive power and take the lead in sharing it through strengthening the world organization. This calls for acceleration in the delicate exchange in which the United States and other nations experience a limitation of the power to act unilaterally and an expansion of the obligation to share the responsibility of global peace and development.

This limitation of unilateral power is required notably in the area of arms control to effectively curb the power of any State to make war and the concomitant establishment of a U.N. peacekeeping system capable of speedy action to guarantee security and facilitate peaceful solutions. The success of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks between the United States and the USSR is a first and necessary step.

As to possibilities of peacekeeping, without which there will be no real or lasting arms control, the words of Charles Yost, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, are worthy of note: "We have only to glance at some of the key provisions of the Charter to see how far we have fallen short of making them living realities, how substantially we have failed to develop the institution and the sort of international society which the authors of the Charter had in mind . . . The United Nations is still waiting for its members to give it the authority to settle disputes and to live up to its promise of peace."

The United States should not only take the lead in the new efforts to institutionalize a standby U.N. peacekeeping force and to help set up fact finding, arbitration, mediation and conciliation mechanisms for settling political disputes, it should also take bold steps in the effort to substitute for the rule of force a rule of law. In the light of changed world conditions we encourage and shall promote wide public discussion of greater use by the United States of the long established but practically unemployed International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes.

The compelling needs of mankind no less than the growing dangers to peace are a strong indictment of the untrammeled pursuit of national self-interest. There is evidence that our great country and its generous people hold not the first but the eleventh place among the nations in percentage of our gross national product allotted to help in the development of poorer nations and peoples. We encourage careful study of the new directions outlined in the report of the President's Task Force on International Development, which call for the reversal of the downward trend of such contributions and for greater use of international rather than national channels in distributing such aid. In this way we can share effectively in the promotion of global solidarity and increase the common stake of all nations in a strengthened United Nations. Sympathetic exploration in the United Nations of an International Volunteer Service for technical assistance and development should be given every encouragement.

The patterns and practices of international trade in which we are engaged also call for a serious reassessment in light of the present needs and the future well-being of the world. Our country should provide a far more adequate response to the needs of those nations which suffer from the injustices of the present system in which we play a powerful role; the structures which support these injustices must be examined with a view to change.

All of our strivings for true human progress will be frustrated if we cannot honestly regard each of our brothers as another self, whose true vocation, like ours, is to love and to seek and embrace the good and the true, and thus attain that higher level of life which is his destiny. This regard must be expressed also in laws and institutions. Of the many Conventions drafted since 1945 by the United Nations with the object of securing reciprocal commitment by all nations to protect and promote particular human rights, the United States has

ratified but one. We urge again, as we did in 1968, U.S. ratification of the Convention on Genocide and pledge ourselves to assist in the promotion of wide public dialogue, not only on those Conventions which have already been submitted to Congress, e.g., on forced labor and women's political rights, but also on others which should be so submitted, including those on racial discrimination and discrimination in education.

In any global approach to the problems of peace and human welfare, the real and potential magnitude of the People's Republic of China cannot be ignored. We commend the present Administration for continuing the efforts to develop workable relationships with the people of mainland China and urge wide public discussion of this subject.

Informed and conscientious participation in forming national policies is the surest way to promote change looking to greater international cooperation. The exercise of this right and duty should be ensured by continuing education. We must ask ourselves whether our schools, organizations and institutions are ministering to the formation of a global mentality or whether they are reinforcing outmoded nationalistic, and even chauvinistic, attitudes of the past.

In the development of a world public opinion, we would commend study of the possibilities inherent in the common interests and actions of the many international non-governmental organizations. Their experience is a contribution to the growth of world community and is so recognized in the consultative status granted to many of them by the U.N. Economic and Social Council.

In conclusion, we remind all of the words of Pope Paul VI to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1965: "This organization represents the obligatory path of modern civilization and of world peace . . . Go forward." The path is obligatory because the world can no longer afford the luxury of completely autonomous and self-sustaining nation states. In the United Nations, therefore, we see the beginnings of a new international order to replace the jealous sovereignty of States and the fragmenting forces of nationalism—a new international order in which mutual cooperation and respect for rights and duties will lead to that human solidarity which may be said to reflect the plan of the Creator who made mankind one that they might seek and find Him.

Letter From National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association of the United States of America

National Council of the Young Men's Christian Association
of the United States of America,
New York, N. Y., June 10, 1970.

Hon. Cornelius E. Gallagher,
Chairman, Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, Committee on Foreign Affairs, 2170 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: As a non-governmental representative of the National Board of YMCAs to the United Nations, I am very pleased, on behalf of my colleagues on the National Board staff, to respond to your request to all NGO representatives to participate in hearings on the future role of the United Nations and U.S. policy in the U.N. sponsored by the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements in the near future.

Enclosed you will find a copy of "Some Examples of Positions Taken By the National Council on Public Issues (1942–1968)" and copy of a resolution which represents action of the National Council of YMCAs taken at its meeting in Pittsburgh on May 24, 1970 in regard to the 25th anniversary of the U.N. From these documents you and your colleagues will see that the YMCA has, from the very beginning, endorsed the U.N., its agencies and its work very vigorously.

As a movement, we are operating at the present time in nearly 85 countries of the world, and I am sure that my colleagues and I would be very glad to testify before the sub-committee in any possible way which would help improve understanding.

Sincerely yours,

Nicholas T. Goncharoff,
Director, International Education and Cultural Affairs.

ACTION OF NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, PITTSBURGH, MAY 27, 1970

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Resolved, That the National Council, as an expression of its continuing concern for developing a world community where peace and justice prevail:

(1) urges local YMCAs to join with other groups in the community in using the 25th Anniversay of the United Nations in 1970 as an occasion for effective education and action directed toward strengthening the United Nations and its related Specialized Agencies for more effective leadership in peace-keeping and for economic and social justice and progress; and

(2) requests the National Board to furnish guiding suggestions for local efforts as promptly as possible.

SOME EXAMPLES OF POSITIONS TAKEN BY NATIONAL COUNCIL ON PUBLIC ISSUES

1942: The National Council welcomed "as socially desirable and in harmony with American democracy" the War Relocation Authority's announced policy to permit *resettlement of Japanese evacuees* in inland communities. (Reaffirmed in 1943, with proposals to help with resettlement.)

1943: The National Council recorded general approval of the *Interfaith Declaration on World Order* and urged member Associations "to exert themselves to the end that the policies of our government may be increasingly animated by the spirit and principles of this Declaration." (The Declaration included seven propositions on world order from official pronouncements of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish bodies, and was signed by Frank S. Bayley, president of the National Council of YMCAs, acting in his individual capacity.)

The National Council recorded its support for action by Congress committing the United States to cooperation with other nations in developing some form of *inclusive world organization*.

The Council also favored action by Congress to repeal the *Chinese Exclusion legislation* and to place China on the same immigration quota basis as other nations.

1944: The National Council looked with approval on the progress toward *world organization* that appears to have been made at Dumbarton Oaks; the Council urged the shaping of the world organization to function in keeping with the Atlantic Charter.

The Council commended to local Associations *The International Petition* (for the formation of a Supreme Council of the United Nations) as material for study and a project for action by individual members.

The Council registered its continuing concern for the *civil rights of the evacuees of Japanese ancestry* and recommended that Area Councils, local boards and members assure the Western Defense Command that, when exclusion orders are revoked or relaxed, they will exert themselves to foster community cooperation with the action and will extend assistance and fair play to returning evacuees.

1946: The Council recognized the right and responsibility of its authorized national assemblies and its constituent boards and committees to formulate statements and direct educational programs on public questions, provided such judgments are expressed after thorough study and provided a group makes clear that it is speaking for itself alone, as one of seven principles for National Council leadership in public affairs.

The Council gave approval to a statement "*The Churches and World Order*," adopted by the Federal Council of Churches, and recommended it to the Associations for study and support.

The National Council recorded its *approval of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization* and urged Congress to accept promptly its constitution, give it full support, and encourage and facilitate active cooperation by the American people.

The Council urged support for Congressional legislation to assure "unchallengeable control by civilian authorities of all matters involving national policy concerning *the use of atomic energy*," except those that pertain directly to military weapons.

1947: The Council reaffirmed its faith in the *United Nations* and urged the full use of its machinery by the government of the United States in dealing with world affairs, including the needs of other nations for relief and development. . . .

The Council recorded support for *amendment of immigration laws* to permit entry of displaced persons, and urged legislation for participation by the United States in the U.N.'s International Refugee Organization.

1948: The National Council endorsed and supported "*A Positive Program for Peace*," a seven point proposal made by the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches, urged Association leaders to give the statement supporting action, and directed that the President, Secretary of State, and chairmen of appropriate Congressional Committees be notified of the action taken.

1949: The Council urged Associations and conferences to give high priority to study of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* and the problems of drafting a relevant world covenant.

The Council urged Associations to cooperate fully with the churches in making it possible for the maximum number of men and women and young people, properly approved by the *Displaced Persons Commission*, to find homes, work and friends in American communities.

The Council reaffirmed previous actions on displaced persons and urged action by the Senate in support of action taken by the House "to increase the number of eligibles and to simplify administrative procedures."

1961: The National Council approved a statement of policy to guide YMCA relations with the *Peace Corps*.

1963: The National Council of YMCAs enunciated its official position in interracial matters in a policy statement as follows: "It is the policy of the National Council of YMCAs that (1) membership in and use of facilities of every YMCA and (2) composition of YMCA boards and staffs should be without discrimination by reason of race or color and (3) that the staff and lay leadership of the Movement should work toward the accomplishment of this result."

1967: The National Council adopted (by a vote of 294 to 11) a constitutional amendment requiring that member Associations "annually certify that their policies and practices provide that eligibility for membership or participation in program shall be without any discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin."

1968: The National Council recommended that each unit of the YMCA "in order to relate maximally to the human disruptions of our time, be prepared to share in the development of public opinion and policy by *taking positions on the issues* that have deep bearing on the lives of persons."

Statement of the National Board of the YWCA of the U.S.A. for the Record of the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, June 23, 1970

The YWCA of the U.S.A., a women's organization of 2½ million members and participants and a member of the World YWCA, at work in 78 countries, has for more than 50 years placed major emphasis on international cooperation to solve world problems. Even before the technological revolution which has so dramatically shrunk this planet, our close working relationship with YWCA women around the world made us aware that few human problems are contained within national boundaries. We recognize that international consultation and mutual assistance are essential in making headway against war, oppression, poverty and pollution. Nor do we believe agreements between super-powers alone can avert the catastrophes inherent in these potential threats to man's survival.

Representatives of the YWCA and other non-governmental organizations are in a strategic position to see at first hand the day-to-day operations of the United Nations and to watch the participation of the United States in its councils. Directives by YWCA National Conventions for the past 25 years have made U.N. affairs a major emphasis of our national and local educational programs. Members of the National Board and its committees give full time consideration to United Nations' commissions and committees which are particularly relevant to the YWCA program.

On numerous occasions the YWCA observer, or an observer of some other non-governmental organization, sitting alone in a U.N. gallery, is the only other American who hears a statement by a U.S. representative to a U.N. body. YWCA volunteers and at times staff members also attend briefings held at the U.S.

Mission to the U.N. where they find the Mission most cooperative in answering questions and providing interpretation of U.S. policy. After years of such regular attendance, these volunteers have developed a professional understanding of the opportunities available to the U.S. in the United Nations. This insight guides us in our belief that the U.S. should pursue its foreign policy objectives through the United Nations to the greatest extent possible.

President Nixon has referred to the United Nations as "that symbol of international partnership." We see it rather as a practical instrumentality for improving the quality of life for every American. But as the past has shown, successful United Nations action requires the full participation of the United States. Notable examples of such U.N. action now benefitting all of us are the treaty which banned nuclear testing in the atmosphere, the treaty banning weapons of mass destruction from outer space and the treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. The hearings of this Subcommittee have taken note of numerous others.

Because the April 13–18 YWCA Triennial National Convention this spring took a position on a number of matters now before the United Nations, this statement emphasizes those issues on which 2500 delegates voted to express their views. They adopted a major program thrust for the next three years—a Program of Action to work toward the elimination of racism. As priorities under this emphasis they supported a number of positions on human rights, including ratification by the United States of the International Convention Against All Forms of Racial Discrimination. We support the view of a number of legal authorities that U.S. constitutional guarantees can be protected and that ratification is both feasible and desirable. We hope the President will see fit to send this treaty to the Senate as part of U.S. observance of the U.N.'s 25th Anniversary.

As a step toward compliance with one United Nations resolution calling for racial justice in southern Africa, we welcome the Administration action, announced by U.N. Ambassador Charles W. Yost May 20th, to discourage American, and other investment in the former League of Nations mandate, Nambia, on which South Africa has imposed her racial policies.

Racism cannot be eliminated at home or abroad, we believe, without outside assistance to people who are working against great odds for social and economic development. United Nations development programs, reorganized and strengthened in accordance with recent proposals, we believe, should be a major channel for U.S. assistance to world development. Our experience with the Mutual Service Program of the World YWCA, where an international committee similar to the Governing Council of the United Nations Development Program sets priorities and fixes allocations for projects requested by national YWCAs, has made us sensitive to the advantages of the multilateral approach to development assistance.

We were pleased that the Peterson Commission's recommendations to the President on U.S. aid policies included strong support for the use of multilateral channels. The YWCA Convention endorsed "the contribution by industrialized nations of at least 1% of their gross national product to world social and economic development preferably through multilateral channels." These are views shared by a number of large national organizations. We hope the Congress will respond to the Peterson Commission's conclusion that "The United States has a profound national interest in cooperating with developing countries in their efforts to improve conditions of life in their societies," and that "The downward trend in United States development assistance appropriations should be reversed."

Economic and social development in the future may benefit from President Nixon's recent proposal for a treaty under which the nations of the world would regard the resources of the seabed beyond the depth of 200 meters as the common heritage of mankind. It is this kind of long range policy development with which the United Nations has had great success. While adopting the view that "ecological balance" should be a prime consideration in development, the YWCA Convention supported such an international effort, with emphasis on *protecting* the resources of the seabed for the benefit of mankind.

As social and economic forces in our own country so clearly demonstrate, progress in these areas is threatened or brought to a standstill when national resources, human and financial, must go to meet non-productive military requirements. The Convention therefore gave priority to support for United States and United Nations efforts for disarmament and peacekeeping. We welcomed the U.N. action which led to the present SALT talks, but believe the super-powers

should recognize the interest of other nations, as was brought out in U.N. debate on the non-proliferation treaty. The YWCA Convention expressed the view that the U.S. should "de-emphasize bilateral military alliances and spheres of influence in favor of strengthening the international peacekeeping role of the U.N."

We therefore welcomed the Administration's determination, as announced April 29th by then Under Secretary Elliott L. Richardson, to initiate efforts toward more effective United Nations peacekeeping arrangements.

Peaceful settlement is another area in which YWCA Conventions have recorded a sustained interest. U.S. neglect of the World Court and the crippling effect on U.S. participation of the Connally reservation have long been of great concern to us. Secretary of State William P. Rogers' recent statement pledging a U.S. effort to use the Court more fully encourages us to hope that the U.S. is, as President Nixon suggested in his Report to the Congress on Foreign Affairs, entering into a new kind of international partnership.

The U.S. initiatives proposed in this 25th Anniversary year lead us to hope that the United Nations is becoming more than a symbol of international partnership. To make international partnership a reality, as our National Convention proposed, the U.S. should stand for universal membership in the United Nations. Without the participation of all of China we believe the problems noted above defy solution.

In addition to our conviction that the U.S. should strengthen the United Nations by using it more fully, we believe the Congress should do what is necessary to keep its headquarters in New York. Practically, this means the appropriation of a modest share of the sum required to build additional desperately needed office space to service a membership which has doubled since present facilities were constructed. U.N. activities are based all over the world, but the present operations should stay together in New York and we urge you to recommend the expenditure of 20 million dollars to keep in the United States the headquarters of the United Nations. The U.N., we believe is our best hope for the security of all.

Statement of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc. of the United States of America

Mr. Chairman, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., is proud and honored to submit to you our statement of wholehearted support for the United Nations organization on the 25th anniversary year.

Our organization grew out of wartime needs and the special interests and abilities of American women who worked during World War I. Soon after that major conflict had ended, our organization, in national convention, went on record in support of international cooperation and United States participation in the Permanent Court of International Justice. In 1925 the National Convention issued a broad statement on international relations which read:

"In order to abolish aggressive war we must cease to sanction this institution of war: be it Resolved that we must establish law not war. By outlawing the use of aggressive war in the settlement of international disputes through declaring its use a crime under the law of nations . . . we request Congress to take early action toward establishing such a world tribunal as can substitute international adjudication for the arbitrament of arms."

We had to wait another 20 years before that dream would be realized with the founding of the United Nations, a multigovernment body clearly designed to prevent and hopefully eliminate aggressive war, to establish a world body that could bring peace of potential conflagrations.

Our organization proudly remembers that BPW was one of the five organizations invited on a consultative basis by the Department of State for the initial meeting when 50 nations assembled to sign the Charter, June 1945. This invitation was a fitting tribute to the Federation's perennial interest in world peace through international cooperation, an interest maintained today with a permanent observer at the United Nations in New York.

We are proud of the history of success and progress that the United Nations has achieved. We look forward to continued international prestige and victory through peace in the future.

On the part of our own Government, we would earnestly recommend United States ratification of a very important United Nations Convention which our organization has supported and continues to foster. Part of our current Legislative Platform for 1969–70 is adherence of the United States to the United Nations Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

We cannot understand the delay in ratification. We have heard the arguments in opposition, concerning the constitutionality of such action, and the counter-arguments. We know that the U.N. Convention on the Political Rights of Women commits our Nation to nothing new or original, since it only provides that women shall be entitled to vote and hold office without discrimination.

Among the 64 countries which have ratified the Convention, 26 are affiliates of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women to which our National Federation belongs. We believe that it is long past time for this Nation to reaffirm the basic dignity, human and political rights of women as persons and citizens, by ratifying this Convention. We recommend ratification to the United States Government, most particularly to the United States Senate which must pass on this measure.