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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The history of the world has been a history of wars and rumors of wars. Regardless of the area in which the wars occurred and regardless of the cause, human relationships have been vitally bound up in the conflict. Men, for various reasons, have found themselves unable to get along in peace with their neighbors and have resorted to armed conflict to settle the differences. As long as the struggle has been confined to small areas the results have not been so disastrous and mankind has survived the ordeals. World War I and World War II, however, have been fought on a world scale, and new and deadly weapons have been invented. The climax of the world's wars occurred when the United States dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima in 1945. Mankind at last had succeeded in creating a deadly weapon with which he could not only destroy his enemy, but the whole world as well. This bomb made it evident that man is going to have to learn to get along with his fellow man without recourse to war if the human race is to continue to live upon the earth.
The purpose of this study is to make a survey of the efforts that have been made to secure world peace and to present some basic elements necessary in any workable world peace organization. Stress will be placed not on military power or economic difficulties but on the fundamental human relationships of mankind.

Limitations of the Study

The study is limited to the examination of fundamental elements of peace. There will be no attempt to formulate a detailed plan for peace—the limits of the study preclude that, even if the author felt qualified for such a task. Some of the greatest minds of the present era have given undivided time and attention to such proposals; the effort here will be to try to call attention to some hitherto neglected fundamentals which underlie the entire structure of world peace.

Source of Data

Both documentary and human sources have been used in the study. Documentary sources were professional books, histories, and periodicals. Human sources were teachers of history, social science, and other classes of government, writers, speakers, and national authorities on the economic condition of the world.

Method of Procedure

The study has been divided into three main parts. After the introductory chapter, a survey is made of the various
efforts to obtain and establish world peace by government efforts. In this connection, attention is given to the Fourteen Points as outlined by Woodrow Wilson, the League of Nations, the Atlantic Charter, the Bretton Woods Conference, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and the San Francisco Conference. The essential elements, not the details, of these undertakings are studied.

The second phase of the study deals with the plans for world peace advanced by eminent writers, teachers, statesmen, economists, and the man in the street. The universal desire of man for world peace is stressed.

In the third and concluding phase of the study, consideration is given to the basic elements that underlie any attempt to form a world peace organization. Human relationships are studied as the real cause of all wars, and an attempt is made to present some basic ideas which would be helpful in establishing world peace.
CHAPTER II

HISTORY AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

"For I dipt into the future,
far as human eye could see,
Saw the Vision of the world,
and all the wonders that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce,
argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilights,
dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting,
and there rained a ghastly dew
From the nation's airy navies
grappling in the central blue;
Far along the world wide whisper
of the south wind rushing warm,
With the standards of the peoples
plunging thru the thunder storm;
Till the war-drum throbbed no longer,
and the battle-flags were felled
In the Parliament of man,
the Federation of the World.
There the common sense of most shall
uphold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber,
apt in universal law."  

The above written idealistic prophecies of Lord Tennyson
have long been the desires of mankind. Since the earliest
periods of written records, endorsement of peace has been
the problem of civilizations.  

The first organized society which had for its primary
purpose the promotion of world peace was formed in New York

---

1 Alfred Tennyson, "Locksley Hall", Poems, p. 110.
2 Edward P. Cheney, Shorter History of England and
   Greater Britain, p. 11.
City in 1815. An international peace movement resulted in the congress that was held in London in 1843, and at the outbreak of the first World War there were 160 peace societies in the world.

In 1899, at the suggestion of the Czar of Russia, the first Peace Conference was held at The Hague in Holland for the purpose of promoting peace and diminishing the great expense of maintaining navies and armies. There were twenty-seven nations represented at the Conference, the United States being prominent among the number. The Conference agreed to submit disputes wherever possible to an international court of arbitration as a step toward bringing about universal peace. The first case submitted to this court was the "Pious Fund" case in 1902. This was a fund established for missionary work in California in the seventeenth century. After California was ceded to the United States, Mexico ceased to pay the income due the California missions. The Court decided in favor of California. In 1904 President Theodore Roosevelt proposed a second Peace Conference. Delegates from forty-four nations assembled at the Hague in 1907 and their deliberations further aided the cause of world peace. This Conference drew up a code of international rules, called the Hague Conventions, for

---

4 Ibid.
5 Edward P. Cheney, op. cit., p. 812.
regulating the conduct of war. The nations represented pledged themselves to observe these Conventions. 6

The weakness of the plan was that it was no stronger than the pledged word of the different nations. There was no force back of the agreement; if a nation wished to observe the "Conventions", well and good; if it did not, there was nothing to prevent ignoring them if the nation so willed.

Other conferences and plans have met with varying degrees of success and failure. Perhaps the most far reaching plan on the road to world peace was included in the Fourteen Points which Woodrow Wilson presented to the German Imperial Government as the terms for the armistice which ended World War I.

When Germany gave evidence that she desired peace, in the fall of 1917, President Woodrow Wilson replied as spokesman for the allies. He presented the Fourteen Points that he and his trusted friend and advisor, Colonel E.M. House, had drawn up as aims for the termination of the war. These points were the terms upon which we would accept peace.7 Freedom of the seas, self determination of peoples, the greatest measure of free trade, and a league of all nations organized to prevent wars, seemed to point to world peace

6Ibid.

7Samuel Flagg Emis, A Diplomatic History of the United States, p. 618.
when they were accepted by Germany at the signing of the armistice on November 11, 1918.  

The Fourteen Points are given in their entirety below.

The Fourteen Points

I. -- Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

II. -- Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas, outside territorial waters, alike in peace and war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

III. -- The removal, as far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

IV. -- Adequate guarantees given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest points consistent with domestic safety.

V. -- Free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the government whose title is to be determined.

VI. -- The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy, and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good-will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

VII. -- Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored, without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which

---

3Josephus Daniels, The Life of Woodrow Wilson, p. 200.
they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

VIII.—All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly fifty years, should be righted, in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

IX.—A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

X.—The people of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

XI.—Russia, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan States determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guarantees of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States should be entered into.

XII.—The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantees.

XIII.—An independent Polish State should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

XIV.—A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike.\(^9\)

If President Wilson had been able to influence the American public and the Congress through his personal wit and his brilliant interchange of words as he was able to influence his intimate friends, his political profile and his influence

\(^9\)Ibid., pp. 291-293.
with his powerful Fourteen Points would have been notably changed.\textsuperscript{10} These Fourteen Points because of their sincere patriotism, their great humanitarian appeal, and their elemental eloquence will certainly be considered a permanent literary contribution from the United States as well as a great historical document to the world. In fact, the author of this initial world peace proposal, Woodrow Wilson, has been "hailed throughout the world not only as the spokesman of America but as the foremost statesman of the age."\textsuperscript{11}

Perhaps the focal point of the failure of President Wilson's peace program was due to the peculiar arrangement of the government of the United States. The President of the United States may negotiate a treaty with a foreign power, but his treaty must be ratified by the Senate. There must be cooperation between the President and the Senate if anything is accomplished. President Wilson was the type of man who liked to work alone; he was a great intellectual, and he lived somewhat aloof from the average people. His relations with Congress were not very close. When he went to Paris to negotiate a treaty of peace after World War I, he did not solicit the support of the Congress in his undertaking. Consequently, the President incurred the enmity of powerful members of the Senate who succeeded in blocking the

\textsuperscript{10}Charles Merriam, \textit{Four American Party Leaders}, p. 87.

\textsuperscript{11}Leonidas Warren Payne, Jr., \textit{History of American Literature}, p. 144.
entrance of the United States into the League of Nations at a time when many informed observers were of the opinion that the great majority of the American people favored our joining the League. 12 The recent negotiations of the United States with foreign powers have been conducted on a bi-partisan basis and with influential members of the Senate participating in the discussions. World peace, it may be seen, has been furthered by a trial-and-error slow climb up the ladder of world understanding.

In a succinct manner Daniels tells us how the ideals of Wilson and the vigorous prosecution of the war by the allies caused Germany's allies to withdraw from the struggle. This statement also sheds light upon the value of the Fourteen Points as an instrument for world peace:

"Our war aims stated in terms so plain and so just that they were approved by the people of all nations, were the weapons of peaceful penetration. The neutral countries were won to friendship by Wilson's broad and humane declarations; the allied forces saw in them a new era. Sent by cable and wireless and translated into every tongue, they became hope to those who sat in darkness. More than that; translated into the German language, they were broadcast all over the German Empire. As the people read Wilson's program of peace, his freedom from passion, his plea for world fellowship, many hearts turned toward his ideals." 13

Following the armistice came the banding together of the victorious nations for writing the peace. Stuart Chase


13 Daniels, pp. 290-291.
thus describes what happened to the Fourteen Points:

"President Wilson, armed with his Fourteen Points and a great fund of idealism, crossed the ocean to help write the peace of Versailles. If the League of Nations will not work by itself, he said, we must make it work. Hopes ran high.

The peace was signed—though it was not quite the peace which Mr. Wilson had hoped for. With considerable relief the victors scrapped their new political, military, and economic institutions and tried to turn back to the nineteenth century. Clemenceau, the Tiger, had been born in 1841. In military matters, the progress ceased as abruptly as it had begun. In political matters, the principles of the French Revolution of 1793 were good enough. In economic matters, laissez faire and the world free market were to be restored without delay.

A curious thing happened. Most of the victors became static and soft: the vanquished became dynamic and destructive. Russia, in effect, a defeated nation, also seemed to gain strength from her defeat. Later the Japanese joined the dissatisfied powers.

The outstanding fact to grasp about the 1920's was that all right-thinking men directed their minds, and where possible, their actions, to the pre-war era. But stubborn as were their beliefs, and hard as they tried, they could not get back. The external situation was too much for them."

An international program of cooperation which was intended to prevent military aggression, protect racial minorities, and secure peace, was the outgrowth of the Fourteenth Point and became known as the League of Nations--so stated Wendell L. Wilkie, as he traced its presentation and death in the following paragraphs:

"We cannot state positively just how effective it might have proved had the United States extended to its support, influence and active participation.

But we do know that we tried the opposite course and found it altogether futile.... I was a believer in the League. Without, at this time however, arguing

14Stuart Chase, Tomorrow's Trade, pp. 46-47.
either for or against the provisions of the League plans, I should like to point out the steps leading to its defeat here in the United States.... President Wilson negotiated the peace proposals at Versailles, including the covenant of the League, without consultation with or the participation of the Republican leadership in the Senate. He monopolized the issue for the Democratic party and thereby caused many Republicans—even International-minded Republicans—to take the opposite position. Upon his return the treaty and the covenant were submitted to the United States Senate for ratification. And there arose one of the most dramatic episodes of American history.

First, as to the Senate group, the so-called 'battalion of death,' the irreconcilables, or the 'bitter enders.' Here was a group that had no party complexion. In its leadership the name of the Democratic orator, James A. Reed, occupies as conspicuous a position as that of the Republican, Borah. At the other extreme was the uncompromising war President, Woodrow Wilson, who insisted that every i be dotted and every t be crossed. Between them were the reservationists, of various complexions and opinions, and of both Republican and Democratic affiliation.

We do not know today and perhaps we never shall know whether the man who was then Republican leader of the Senate, Henry Cabot Lodge, whose name we now associate with the defeat of the League, truly wanted the League adopted with safeguarding reservations or whether he employed the reservations to kill the League. Even his close friends and members of his family have reported contrary opinions on the subject.

But we do know that when this question passed from the Senate to the two great political conventions of 1920, neither of them stood altogether for or against the treaty as it had been brought home by the President. The Democratic Convention in its platform did not oppose reservations. The Republican platform adopted a compromise plank which was broad enough to accommodate the firm supporters of the League in the Republican ranks. The anti-League supporters found safe footing there too.

Both platforms were ambiguous: the parties had no consistent historical position about the cooperation of the United States with other nations. The confusion was doubled by the attitude of the Republican candidate, Warren G. Harding, because no one was certain whether Harding was merely pulling his punches against the League, or whether he intended to support it upon election, in a modified form. All that was clear was that he felt that he had to make some opposition to the League since it had been a political issue
by the Democrats. In private conversation, he gave each man the answer he wanted. It was not until later, after the election returns were in, that Harding spoke frankly of the League as "Now deceased." 15

The "Death" of the League was an improper manner for Harding to refer to the fate of the embodiment of President Wilson's Fourteen Points. Mr. Lippmann emphasizes the fact that the League was a first attempt, without experience, in American diplomatic relations with a seasoned European school of diplomacy. Defending the position of the American public in repudiating the League, Mr. Lippmann further states:

"The insight was true, the execution greatly defective. The conduct of a foreign policy of a great power requires experienced men. That experience cannot be gotten in a few moments, months, or even in a few years." 16

A resurgence of the value of this immortal document has been revealed by Ely Culbertson, in these words:

"The toil and sacrifice contributed to the cause of the League of Nations by the men and women of good will has not been in vain. Wilson and his co-workers for the League have awakened a world consciousness that will never die. For the first time humanity has beheld a world center around which the civilized forces of peace and freedom might crystallize against the primeval forces of war. But the solution of the world's problems does not lie in futile attempts to resurrect the League of Nations, whose bullet-riddled covenant lies buried with military honors. It lies in trying to build a new house of nations on the imperishable foundations of Wilson's ideals." 17

15 Wendell L. Wilkie, One World, pp. 197-201.


17 Ely Culbertson, Total Peace, p. 34.
From the Wilson point of view no League of Nations could function without the support of an international army or navy in possible contingencies. He refused to accept any reservation destroying this sanction.\textsuperscript{18}

These years since establishment of the League of Nations have seen much written about both the success and the failure of this organization.\textsuperscript{19} Into the modern world Ely Culbertson brings the League of Nations and compares the past needs of it with the present ones. Here are his words on this subject:

"During the last generation a new principle appeared, side by side with power politics, in the foreign policy of states—the principle of collective security based on some kind of world organization. This was the ideal of Wilson.... Collective security was impossible in the past.... New and unique circumstances have arisen in the last few years which could make an adequate system of collective security not only possible but certain. But—this is the important point—any future system for collective security must fulfill the double requisites of effectiveness and acceptability. This is the double yardstick for any political system. A system such as the League of Nations was acceptable but wholly ineffective. Some other system, based in the drastic limitation of the sovereignty of states might be as effective in insuring lasting peace, but would be wholly unacceptable. What is needed is a system which will insure the maximum effectiveness and the needed acceptability."\textsuperscript{20}

The Fourteen Points are thus revealed as a basic element for a lasting world peace.

The Atlantic Charter

The expected peace of Woodrow Wilson was overshadowed

\textsuperscript{18}Bemis, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 648.

\textsuperscript{19}Herbert Hoover and Hugh Gibson, "An Approach to Lasting Peace", \textit{Reader's Digest}, June, 1943, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{20}Culbertson, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 14.
by the gathering war clouds of Europe and gave rise to a meeting aboard ship in the Atlantic of the President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill in August of 1941. This meeting was called for the purpose of discussing peace aims and the establishment of foreign policy. The contributions to a permanent peace for the world may be noted in the following clauses which provide:

"...for the disarmament of any nations "which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers": for freedom of the seas; for "access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world" but all nations, victors and vanquished; and for full collaboration among all in the economic field."\(^2\)

The two nations, the United States and Great Britain, thus accept the responsibility for keeping possible aggressor nations in a state of limited armament; and they also accept the responsibility for a world police force both on land and on sea. Wages, employment, production and prices in the two countries would be greatly affected under such a plan. Inflation would be inevitable and the existing international trade laws would have to be revised. The money of the world would have to be stabilized and the impoverished nations fed and clothed after the war.\(^3\) The humanitarian and broad reaching implications of the Atlantic Charter are


\(^{22}\)Ibid., p. 8.

\(^{23}\)Ibid., p. 9-10.
a challenge to constructive thought. Their value as a basis for the establishment of world peace is emphasized by Secretary Knox:

"To put it bluntly, we must join our force, our power to that of Great Britain, another great peace-loving nation, to stop aggression which might lead to a world disturbance, at its beginnings....We must, for an interregnum of "a hundred years", instruct the world in the fundamentals of international law. ....the only kind of peace that is available is the kind of peace that can and will be enforced through the superior power of those nations that love justice and seek after peace."24

Culbertson reflects the hopes of the people of the United States and their confidence in the Atlantic Charter as the nucleus of the newer organization of the League of Nations which has become popularly known as the United Nations--"not only for winning the war, but as a foundation on which to build the vast architecture of the post-war world."25 Culbertson further emphasizes that the Atlantic Charter is more than a treaty. He calls it a moral commitment and states:

"It so happens that the purely selfish interests of American balance politics coincide with the broader interests of the nations of the world. And since the reality back of any treaty is the desire and the power to support its provisions, the United States can securely anchor the Atlantic Charter in the abundance of her economic power, military strength, and the confidence of the world."26

24 Ibid., p. 13.
25 Culbertson, op. cit., p. 58.
26 Ibid., p. 128.
People all over the world were hoping for a new deal for the individual human being and they saw hopes in the Atlantic Charter. Hopes that force and conquest would fade away and that a state of international interdependence should prevail rose from all parts of the world after the announcement of the eight points of the Atlantic Charter.\textsuperscript{27} Thus there was a broader scope included in the Atlantic Charter because it took into account the peoples of the world and not just a few sovereign states, as all other previous agreements had done. Social justice, as it applies to the common man, is reflected in the charter and this too is the first time that such recognition has been given in any other agreement or treaty. The "little people" would be left free to choose their type of government, and be given to understand the respect due to the votes of the majority of its people. The broad views of the charter overlook a world in which

\"...human intelligence will organize and distribute the ample resources of nature so that all can live abundantly; a world in which intelligence will be devoted to human progress rather than destruction; a world in which a man's labor may be directed toward his own advancement.\"\textsuperscript{28}

The coalition of the United States and Great Britain in an effective peace measure such as a trade treaty suggested by the Atlantic Charter would go far toward promoting international understanding, especially among the English speaking

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Johnson, op. cit.}, p. 47.

\textsuperscript{28}\textit{Ibid.}
peoples of the world. "Understanding on trade, money, and credit will serve as certain weapons against treaty breakers."

The thought of every man everywhere agrees with the "Four Freedoms" of the Atlantic Charter: Freedom from Want; Freedom from Fear; Freedom of Religion; and Freedom of Speech. These are the basic needs of mankind; every struggle for liberty that has occurred has embraced them in one or more ways. Perhaps they represent an elusive Utopia, but man has never climbed upward without visioning the goal at the top. The Four Freedoms are, indeed, worthy aims whether the country be Tibet or the United States.

The Bretton Woods Conference

Representatives from 44 nations met in the summer of 1944 at a White Mountain resort, Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, to promote a better financial relationship among the nations represented and to provide a smoother method of understanding the currencies of the world. International loans to war-torn nations and loans to be used in reconstruction of devastated countries were a second purpose of the meeting.

The conference met to gain a composite knowledge of the basic currencies of the world and from this knowledge to


30 Carlyle Morgan, *Bretton Woods*, p. 3.
establish a stabilized international currency or system of international exchange. The gold standard has long been an international yardstick for the trade exchanges; but there has been no stabilization of the relation between currency and gold among all the nations of the world. Economic conditions within a country may cause a variance from the gold standard and, as has been the case with both England and the United States, an establishment of the gold standard as a basic medium of exchange has been abandoned. 31

"What is wanted, of course, is not so much a gold, or silver, or platinum, or even a commodity standard, but an international standard. Gold served as such in one period of the world's history. It does not seem likely to function in quite the same way again—at least not in the period immediately ahead." 32

As world governments become more and more dependent upon each other in economic relationships, the mediums of exchange must of necessity be more and more dependable in the world markets. In world trade nations need commodities from other nations but they do not need the currencies peculiar to that country, nor do they have banking systems capable of supplying currencies of the individual nations. For this purpose the representatives at Bretton Woods faced the problem of trying to reach a system that would not require the use of the selling nation's currency in the interior of the buying nation. 33

31 Ibid., p. 16.
32 Ibid.
33 Ibid., p. 24.
Morgan explains how the relationship between two countries might be readjusted when the values of the currencies of the two countries might be greater than the cost of the gold, which was standard at time of comparison.

"Since dollars at the moment would have a higher value in international markets than the pound had, British operators would ship gold out of Britain and buy (American) dollars with it. The courses and results of such shipments were varied and sometimes highly technical. Perhaps it is enough to say here that between the volume of currency and credit which existed in any nation and the amount of gold held in that country, there was a relationship, and this relationship affected prices, and wages, which in turn affected production and trade."\(^{34}\)

Since the very life of Britain depends upon her trade with other nations, and in turn affects her economic welfare, it is of vital importance to Britain that some medium of exchange be set up that will be of benefit to her and that will not, at the same time, cause any loss to her in the exchange of money, or currencies. So it is with most every other nation of the world, especially in peace times. Vital economic trade should be a basic element of peace.\(^{35}\)

Canada became the levelling force in the measurement of one force against another at the currency conference. The Canadian plan follows the usual procedure of American banking. Deposits of stable money or gold must be made in the world bank before any withdrawals may be made. Nations in need apply to the International Fund for the currency of the foreign government with which it wishes to trade. The applying nation must have on deposit in the international

\(^{34}\textit{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 25. \) \quad \(^{35}\textit{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 38. \)
fund sufficient gold or currency of its own nation to cover
the amount which it wishes to buy in the gold or currency
of the foreign nation with which it deals. Therefore, no
nation actually borrows money from the international fund,
but rather the nations deposit their own security.36

The International Monetary Fund, as proposed at Bretton
Woods, had for its purpose the keeping of a steady relation-
ship between the nations of the world in the matter of cur-
rencies or money. The International Bank for Reconstruction
and Development had for its purpose the drawing of funds
from the 44 member nations on a pro-rata basis to form a .

"...pool into which any member country may dip
when it finds itself short of a foreign currency
that it particularly needs. There are limits as
to how much the needy country can take out. These
limits depend on how much it puts into the Fund
in the first place. And there are rules of good
behavior which it must observe if it is to use the
Fund. The real point of the Fund is that it pro-
vides quick access to needed currencies. Thus it
should be able to help a country over a tight spot
in its currency relations before its difficulties
become chronic and before they cause difficulties
for other nations."37

The Bretton Woods Conference could not attempt to cure
all the ills pertinent to International Banking, but its
value lies in the fact that much progress was made in an
attempt to settle monetary problems of the world in a peace-
ful manner. In a state of World Peace the Bretton Woods

36Ibid., p. 40–41.
37Ibid., p. 46–47.
Conference would serve as a bond of international interest, related to economic and political interests of each nation in the Conference. 38

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference

The Dumbarton Oaks Conference was just what the title implies; a conference: all of the proposals are "expressly presented as tentative and incomplete." 39 No government is bound by these proposals, and their submission is for further study by all the nations. These studies which lead to a definite United Nations Conference for insuring peace throughout the world should have untold value in the broad plan for World Peace. The editor of the New York Times thinks that the United States can play a large part in the insurance of World Peace by taking an active part in the leadership of such an organization as the Dumbarton Oaks Conference:

"The United States can restore a will for peace in the world and reestablish its lost leadership in international affairs. By such means the ravishers of weak neighbors and the enemies of democracy will discover that the United States has not become so timorous and so stupid as to abandon its responsibilities and imperil its greatness and its freedom. It will be wiser to put them on notice at once." 40

---

38Ibid., p. 70.


40Reader's Digest, op. cit., p. 39.
Leland M. Goodrich, who is Executive Secretary of the Universities Committee which prepared a digest of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference for use by teachers and interested economists and politicians, states the twofold tasks of the conference in the following:

"There is, first, the task of preventing war by providing means for the peaceful settlement of disputes and by suppressing threats to the peace or actual acts of aggression. There is, in the second place, the equally vital need of achieving economic and social cooperation with a view to creating basic conditions favorable to continued peace."

The purposes of the conference of the proposed international organization, continues Goodrich, are found in different sections of the proposals. One purpose is meant "to achieve international cooperation in the solution of international economic, social, and other humanitarian problems." Again the statement is found that "with a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the organization should facilitate solutions of economic, social, and other humanitarian problems and promote respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Thus the organization tends to smooth out the differences which would arise from the social and economic conditions.

---


42 ibid.

43 ibid., p. 2.
and also the humanitarian problems that are certain to arise in the international relationship. It appears also that this conference tends to act as an adjustor of these same differences in each individual nation. A mediator and an adjustor conference along these lines would serve to smooth a war-like action within a nation or among nations.

The organization such as was proposed by the representatives at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference would be composed of a General Assembly, Economic and Social Council, Secretariat, and Specialized Organizations and Agencies.

In the General Assembly each nation represented would have equal voting strength and representation, and all decisions brought before the assembly should be decided by a two-thirds majority vote of the ones present at the assembly. The Economic and Social Council could act upon those matters referred to it from the General Assembly. The members of the Council should be taken from the representatives of eighteen members which the General Assembly had chosen for three-year terms. The various responsibilities of the Council have been described in this manner:

"To make recommendations, on its own initiative, with respect to international economic, social and other humanitarian matters; to reach agreement with the appropriate authorities of specialized organizations and agencies, subject to approval by the General Assembly, on the terms of the relationships to be established between the organization and such specialized organizations and agencies; to receive reports from "the economic, social, and other organizations or agencies brought into relationship with the organization"; "to coordinate their activities through consultations with, and recommendations to, such organizations or agencies"; "to examine the
administrative budgets of such specialized organizations or agencies with a view to making recommendations to the organizations or agencies concerned"; to assist the Secretary-General to provide information to the Security Council directly upon its request; and to perform such other functions "within the general scope of its competence" as may be assigned to it by the General Assembly.44

The Secretariat would be drawn from the General Assembly and would operate and function as its name implies, with the Secretary-General operating as the chief administrative officer of the Organization.45

Specialized Organizations and Agencies would have, as Goodrich explains:

"...responsibilities in their respective fields as defined in their statutes. Not to be overlooked, also, is the possibility that the close economic collaboration among certain, at least, of the United Nations in the pooling of productive capacities and the allocation and transportation of war materials which the war has necessitated will be continued into the post-war period for meeting the urgent economic problems which will then exist."46

Among the specialized organizations and agencies which the report of Goodrich mentions are the following: Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, International Monetary Fund, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Food and Agriculture Organization, Organization for Cultural and Educational Reconstruction, Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, and an International Labor Organization. These agencies were designed to have flexible

44Ibid., p. 3.
45Ibid.
46Ibid., p. 4.
provisions, so that they could provide the greatest good for the common defense of all. Ample leeway for the provision of new agencies as they might rise was provided for.

The San Francisco Conference adopted the plan of the United Nations as outlined by the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in most of its important details, and the organization as set up provides for a General Assembly, and Economic and Social Council, Secretariat, and Specialized Organizations and Agencies. Two of the most important of these are the International Trade Organization and the UNESCO.

These are the main movements for international peace as initiated and carried on by the different governments. In the next chapter attention will be given to various plans for peace advanced by individuals and organizations in the United States and over the world.
CHAPTER III

VIEWPOINTS OF DIFFERENT INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS
ON WORLD PEACE AND HOW TO ACHIEVE IT

The purpose of this chapter is to present the views of different individuals and organizations on world peace and how to achieve it. Selections have been taken from eminent writers and statesmen and from current newspaper comment. Through the use of such a variety of opinion it is hoped to present a cross-section of what the people as a whole think and believe about the question.

Henry M. Wriston writing in *Strategy of Peace* states that the Atlantic Charter, the Four Freedoms, and the Declaration by the United Nations, the Moscow Declaration, and the statements at Cairo and Teheran are all helpful, but that they express general principles without definite measures for their realization. He is inclined to believe that the peace conference in 1919 concentrated too heavily upon political considerations and that the trend in discussions for peace following World War II is for too great an emphasis on social and economic questions. Wriston maintains that there must be careful planning in all fields.

---

He does not feel that it is necessary to take time to define every boundary and settle all political controversies in every part of the world, but he does feel that it is necessary "to make concrete what was first expressed only in principle."\(^2\) He further states:

An outline of the basic terms of peace should approximate the definiteness of the Agreement for Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the draft proposals on currency stabilization. Public discussions would lead to improvements; opinion could begin to crystallize.

The suggested outline of a basic treaty does not pretend to offer a solution to all political problems. It merely explores and illustrates a possible mode of procedure in the belief that thinking will be clarified by approaching the problem completely.\(^3\)

Aristotle then discussed four of the factors which determine the form and structure of such a treaty. They are, first, the size of the problem; second, the nature of a coalition; third, the variety of American opinion; and fourth, our constitutional peculiarity arising from the special relationship of the Senate to foreign relations.\(^4\)

All affect both the temper and the method of the proposals.

The size of the problem makes it necessary for the peace treaty to be limited in scope. The treaty of 1919 according to Aristotle attempted far too much. In a limited treaty the overall pattern can be set, and different phases may be negotiated at other times and other places.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 129

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Ibid., p. 130.
The second limiting factor which shapes the suggested proposals arises out of the fact of coalition. The United States has made no treaty of alliance since 1778. There has been a great deal of opposition to even the word "alliance." President Wilson spoke of the United States as an associated, not an allied power in the peace negotiations of 1919.

There was an unconscious, but no less real, connection between that attitude and the fact that the United States ultimately made a separate treaty-restoring friendly relations. . . . There can be no doubt that our repudiation of the tripartite treaty guaranty with Britain and France, our failure to join the League and later the Court, our absence from the Council of Ambassadors, and our disembodied presence in the capacity of unofficial observers at supplementary conferences all helped destroy the solidarity of the peace.\footnote{Ibid., p. 134.}

Even in the recent war we did not go the whole distance. We called ourselves the "allies" of Britain and Russia, but we had no treaty of alliance such as that between the Soviet Union and Great Britain. We chose to preserve a separatist attitude, and there has been no guarantee to other powers that we would do otherwise in the ultimate decisions reached about a world peace organization.

On the other hand, Russia, a strong world power, has also chosen to maintain a separatist attitude. She did not declare war against Japan until the last moment. She has a distinct ideology all her own just the same as we have democracy. She has her own ways of living. Wriston says that before any peace worth the name can be drafted it will have to be one which both Russia and the United States can
sign without reservations and which would minimize and mitigate the differences. Local issues should be largely excluded and, within the framework of general principles, left to local settlements. The smaller countries must have a vital part in any successful peace plan.

The third factor which Wriston considers in fashioning a treaty which will bring peace is that of the great variety of opinion prevalent in the United States. There are two strong political parties. Partisan feelings, Wriston declares, should not enter into a consideration of the peace.\(^6\)

The fourth factor is the special relationship of the United States Senate to foreign relations. Any treaty negotiated by the government must be ratified by the Senate. Historically, treaties of peace have had especially hard sledding in the Senate.\(^7\) There is no reason to believe that this would be changed.

Wriston then, after discussing limiting factors, states his formula for peace. This would be a treaty which could... . . . reveal the political implications of unconditional surrender. . . . makes separate treaties with each enemy as it is detached from the Axis. . . . removes the blockade and allows the prompt feeding of the people. . . . excludes the enemy from discussion of inter-allied problems. . . . and leaves to bilateral or group settlement problems of limited scope. It gives time for the slower, piecemeal solution of numerous problems.\(^8\)

Wriston, it is apparent, bases his hopes for peace on treaties constructively drawn which make allowances for

---

\(^6\)Ibid.

\(^7\)Ibid., p. 151

\(^8\)Ibid., p. 159.
differences in ideologies and calls for tolerance from all parties. No world-wide organization is sought.

Ely Culbertson, international bridge expert and writer, formulated a plan for "Total Peace" before the war was over with Japan and Germany. He said that the making of this total peace cannot be "unduly delayed, improvised, or left to the hazards of an indefinite future. A new total war will not wait for an installment-plan peace to evolve gradually from year to year and piece by piece." The main points which he advocated for a World Federation Plan are as follows:

First: To create appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace.

Second: To implement without undue delay the provisions of the Atlantic Charter dealing with the territorial, political, and economic settlement of the world, as well as the solemn promise to establish a wider and permanent system of general security.

Third: To establish without undue delay, and in accordance with the provisions of the Atlantic Charter, a territorial, political, and economic settlement just to all states, and to provide for the liberation of all peoples now oppressed.

Fourth: To establish without undue delay a workable international organization (the World Federation) separate from the governments of sovereign states, based on a higher law to which all states are subject, and supported by a World Police, so that all may be protected in collective defense and each may be protected even against all.

Fifth: To establish without undue delay just and adequate conditions of peace for the defeated states which, while making it impossible for evil militarism to rise again in defeated countries, will provide for their admission as equal members into the World Federation upon fulfillment of the Conditions of Peace.

9 Ely Culbertson, Total Peace, Preface.
Sixth: To provide through the World Federation an adequate framework, organs, and means for temporary postwar relief and reconstruction measures, and for permanent world-wide educational, scientific, and economic programs and institutions based on voluntary co-operation of sovereign states.

Seventh: To provide through the World Federation the necessary machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes between sovereign states as well as for gradual and peaceful change arising from new conditions in the relations between nations.

The fundamental goal of the World Federation is to prevent, by means of segregation of decisive heavy weapons and the establishment of a strong World Police, armed aggression by any state against any other, and thus to make possible lasting world peace. Elimination of the social cancer of war is also the innermost hope of the American nation and of the peoples of the world. 10

Culbertson, it is apparent, bases his plan for world peace on forcing peoples through agreements and restrictions to abandon war weapons and warring practices. In the framework of the plan the author provides a solution for some of the most ticklish vexing problems of modern times. The settlement of the Palestine question is one of these. 11 In this instance, he recommends that a sufficient part of the Mohammedan and Christian populations of Palestine be transferred to another territory so that a Jewish majority would be left in Palestine. The transfer, however, was to be effected only with the consent of the groups concerned. Current happenings in Palestine show the futility of any such plan being accomplished with the consent of either warring faction.

Stuart Chase, well known international writer, advances a plan for world peace in his book For This We Fought. His

10Ibid., p. 240  
11Ibid., p. 321.
plan is disarmingly simple and is not detailed or ambiguous by any means.

During the war, he states, scientists developed 2-4-D for the extermination of weeds, DDT for insects, 1080 for rats, and $E=MC^2$ for men. The latter was the atomic bomb. Chase's words are:

If enough of us can become aware of what has happened in this third great technical landmark in history, we may be able to force our leaders to accept a piece of international machinery adequate to contain Einstein's equation. Technical controls will be needed to protect us in the years it will take to devise trustworthy political controls. The physical scientists, who are showing the most gratifying terror of what they have done, can assist with such plans. The first political problem is to get the rest of us as intelligently terrified as the scientists. Then we will keep on pushing until an appropriate solution is found. Here is a goal to challenge all our energies.\footnote{12}

A committee which studied how to control the atomic bomb concluded that an agreement among nations to forego the use of atomic weapons would not provide security. An international inspection system would probably not work. The United States can not hope to maintain a monopoly on the "know-how" of producing and exploding the atomic bomb.\footnote{13} For these reasons the committee proposed to set up an international Atomic Development Authority which would:

1. Control and operate all uranium deposits and refineries located anywhere in the world.
2. Produce fissionable material therefrom.

\footnote{12}{Stuart Chase, \textit{For This We Fought}, p. 120.}

3. Leave "dead, dead, dead" materials to nations by permitting use, under license and reasonable terms of inspection.
4. Carry on further research in the field of atomic energy.\textsuperscript{14}

With such a plan of international control in operation each nation will know what the other nations are doing. Without such a plan they will fear what others are doing. This fear, then, is the basis of Chase's plan for world peace.

He says:

"In world's political and industrial leaders are not scientists; most of them have never gone beyond simple algebra. But it is of the utmost importance that they respect and understand in a great way what the scientists have done. Otherwise we are led by men who do not know the shape of the world they are trying to lead, or the forces they loose within it.

Not only must leaders exercise their brains to an untaxed degree, they must exercise their imagination. They have got to see the unearthly glare, feel the shattering shrapnel, as energy is released in these magnitudes. That mushroom of cumulus smoke in the stratosphere must be over before their eyes. They must see, feel, hear, and smell—almost taste—chain reaction; it should be stored forever in the nervous system.

If the bomb is considered just another element in power politics, just another military weapon, only stronger, the teleologic age surely omits us. Atomic fission is simply not that kind of event. Our leaders must come to see it in its true dimension, a blinding, shattering force, ranking with the discovery of fire, and the discovery of agriculture. In such perspective they may be able to deal with it.\textsuperscript{15}

Chase further recommends that the outstanding leaders of the world be exposed to direct chain reaction. He suggests that every Congressman, the heads of government departments, governors of states, university presidents, important tycoons, the executive committees of the great labor unions, the

\textsuperscript{14}\textsuperscript{Chase, op. cit., p. 121.}
Farm Bureau Federation, the veteran's organizations, and school teachers witness an atomic bomb explosion. He would add to this audience the British Parliament, the Cabinet, the Grand Mullah, Gandhi, a panel of bishops, the chiefs of state of all the nations, and all the admirals and generals who carry real weight. He states:

Let them stand there and watch: If a few get a little too near and are knocked over--like those extracurricular scientists in the New Mexico desert--that is all right too. Protect them from lethal rays but let them get knocked over. That is what they came for.¹⁶

Chase thought also that there should be a regular exhibit of an atom bomb explosion staged every six months by the United Nations. No person should be elected or appointed to high office anywhere without having witnessed at least one of these explosions. For those who are not leaders--the rank and file of literate humanity--the plan would be this:

All of us, children as well as adults, should see moving pictures or stills of Hiroshima and Nagasaki as are available, from either American or Japanese sources. We should see the dead, the wounded, the smashed hospitals, the agony. They should be run in every theatre in the world at regular intervals, without soft music, without announcers who coat their vocal chords with honey.¹⁷

In other words, Chase is in favor of shocking the people with the atomic bomb until they, in fear of ultimate destruction, subscribe to some kind of an organization to keep the peace of the world.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 116.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 120.
Another school of thought believes that some means of averting a war with Russia will ultimately result in world peace. John Foster Dulles, famous lawyer and expert on international affairs, states:

There can now be little doubt that such a clash is a possibility. Indeed, the more closely Soviet policies are studied, the greater does the danger appear.\textsuperscript{18}

Dulles further states that Soviet leaders assume that peace and security depend upon quickly achieving world-wide acceptance of Soviet political philosophy. We, on the other hand, subscribe to the ideals of democracy, we do not believe that governments everywhere should be fashioned like ours. Rather we favor a policy in which each nation would determine its own way of life but would not seek to impose it on other and weaker nations.\textsuperscript{19} This divergence of opinion concerning ideals, Dulles considers, is the fundamental differences between Russia and the United States. The first basic task of any peace move is to develop an international climate conducive to the settlement of particular problems.

In this respect, Dulles does not outline any specific plan, but he stresses basic understanding between the two nations and the cessation of activities tending toward the continued efforts of either government to impose its own ways of thought on the rest of the world.

\textsuperscript{18}John Foster Dulles, "Thoughts on Soviet Foreign Policy", \textit{The Reader's Digest}, August, 1948, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{19}Ibid., p. 21.
Once the Soviet leaders make it apparent that they accept a world in which the Soviet Union will be one of many nations, each representing a distinctive way of life, then accommodation becomes possible. We would each hope that our example would be so good that men everywhere would follow it. But we would each let the extension of our influence depend primarily on letting our light shine before men so that they may see our good works. The Soviet Union would abandon the methods it is now using within the Middle Zone and Outer Zone and we in turn would abandon methods which seem to us offensive, but which may seem to Soviet leaders to be offensive. Under those circumstances the tension between us would be eased and ways found to settle our particular differences just as we have found ways to settle like differences with Britain and France over the last 150 years. Then we could see probability of enduring peace.\footnote{Ibid., p. 22.}

There are few students of international questions who will disagree with the soundness of Dulles arguments for the development of an "international climate" conducive to the settlement of differences. However, there are many other nations in the world besides Russia today and many other peoples. Agreement between the two major world powers would not necessarily mean that world peace would result; history tends to refute any such statement or belief.

Henry Wallace, former vice-president of the United States and Secretary of Commerce, is another American who believes that an understanding between Russia and the United States will facilitate world peace. In his now famous letter to President Truman outlining his beliefs, Wallace stated that the predominance of force idea and the notion of defensive attack are both unworkable from the standpoint of world peace. He further stated that the only solution to the threat of
States and the Russians do not necessitate war. Such thinking destroys any hope for peace. Destroy the belief that countries of private capital and countries of public capital must fight and the way to end all war has been opened.

The way toward that end is to get all countries to cooperate, within and outside the United Nations organization, in their striving for the common good. It is only positive good that drives out evil.

Drew Pearson, noted columnist and commentator, proposes a five-year plan for friendship with Russia as one means of averting another world war and for establishment of world peace. The aim of this five year plan would be to cement good will between the Russian and American peoples and to build up good will. His specific points are:

1. Declare a five-year moratorium on all re-arrangement.
2. Teach the Russian language for at least one year in every American high school.
3. Bring the Moscow Ballet to the United States for a tour of our leading cities; also the Red Army chorus.
4. Establish one American newspaper in Moscow printed in the Russian language to explain the American viewpoint to the Russian people; with a similar Russian paper published in New York to explain Russia to the American people. No censorship.
5. Establish an American radio station in Moscow and a Russian station in New York to broadcast the respective viewpoints of the Russian and American peoples, together with cultural music and drama.
6. Exchange 25,000 students between the two countries the first year, 50,000 the second, 100,000 the third and so on. This would be difficult at first, but in the long run it would build up a guarantee of friendship, which no dictator could surmount with war.

24Ibid.

8. Send Henry Wallace as United States Ambassador to Moscow. Whether you agree with him or not, he is a sincere, idealistic seeker of peace who might convince the Kremlin that the American people really desire peace.25

Pearson feels that a friendly understanding spirit between Russia and the United States would help a great deal in establishing and maintaining world peace. Many other basic elements constituting would peace are ignored by the columnist.

Konnie Zillicus, an English member of Parliament, proposes control by the United Nations of strategic waterways as one way of establishing and maintaining world peace.26 He says that the United States should surrender control of the Panama Canal to the United Nations and that this body should have control of the Dardanelles, the Suez Canal, and the Straits of Gibraltar, and that Britain should invite the Soviet Union to help maintain order in Palestine.

The American Legion proposes that the United Nations form a world army, highly paid, highly trained, and truly international, recruited from the small nations of the world.27 This army will be ready to put down aggression anywhere in the world.

France has her own idea of what it will take to secure


26"Quit Panama Canal," The Denton Record-Chronicle, November 27, 1946.

27The Dallas Morning News, November 30, 1946.
world peace. Based on her experience with the German people, she says that the nature of the German peace treaty is the key to future world peace. The ultimate objective of any German treaty must be transformation of the German "master race," and their eventual entrance, as a democratic and peaceful people, into the United Nations. France demands permanent possession of the Saar, internationalization of the Ruhr, and a "decentralized" Germany organized as a federation of the individual German states.\(^\text{28}\) The British Labor government wants a strong and united Germany and German nationalization of the Ruhr's industries. The Soviet Union desires what is left of Germany to be unified under a strong central government. The United States favors economic unification of Germany and a centralized government.

General George C. Kenney, No. 2 man in the United States Army Air Forces, states that the eventual abolition of all national armies, navies and air corps in favor of an international force is the answer to world peace.\(^\text{29}\)

These are only a few of the plans being continually proposed for establishing and maintaining world peace. In the limits of this research, it would be impossible to give an adequate presentation of all the peace plans and formulas, but it is felt that a representative array of opinions has been presented.


CHAPTER IV

THE BASIC PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING ANY PROGRAM FOR WORLD PEACE

A resume of the different plans presented by statesmen, diplomats, military strategists, economists, and the man in the street reveal one common attribute — none of them take into consideration the intensely human element that enters into war or into the creation of world peace. War is the same general type of phenomena as any other cultural pattern. It has its origin in interactive living, and is intimately connected with all phases of living. It is a human invention — for certainly wars do not happen by themselves, and they are not something that cannot be avoided like storms, or other unpredictable disasters. It is much older than some of the other factors which are commonly used to explain war — capitalism, imperialism, or economic imbalances. War is a part of every phase of life.

War exists mainly because of the ideas of separateness that exist in the world — ideas that one race is superior to others, ideas that one nation should have more than its proportionate share of the world's goods; ideas that one religion is right and every other one wrong. One group of ideologists attempts to force their ways, or ways of living, upon
others and conflict results. If one could go back to the origin of war it would be found that its nature was determined by the factors that had already been produced in the social process and integrated into the interactive relationship between human nature and the social order.¹ War exists because it can interact with religions, educational, economic, political, and other social forms.

People have behavior reserves favorable to war just the same as they have reserve behavior potentialities. In all social forms there are reserve behavior potentialities in the direction of war—race superiority, the idea of a chosen people, ideologies. These are ready to appear with the right interactive crisis.

Science and warfare have always been very closely linked. The needs for war have called out most of the scientific inventions. Take the atom bomb, for example: the United States needed a colossal, powerful bomb to combat those made by Germany. In peacetime the necessary capital would never have been risked to develop and perfect the atom bomb. The military mind has joyfully accepted the inventions of science and called for more. War, by the means of science, has been brought to the point where an entire nation may be wiped out almost instantaneously by the release of a number of well-spaced atom bombs.

War and religion are also closely linked. War has been the favorite instrument of religion to spread or control its

¹John L. Gillin, Social Pathology, p. 429.
own particular brand of separateness. There have been more wars fought in the name of religion than for any other motive. The history of the Jews is a history of conflicts between them and religions. The persecution of the Jews was never more harsh than it has been in the recent World War II; in fact, Hitler blamed the Jews for the condition which brought on the conflict. The Jew has one kind of religion and his persecutors another.

Every type of economic nationalism has an interactive relationship with war. War has always manifested itself in society. It is not the economic structure that causes the war, but it does determine the kind of war that occurs. It has been charged that capitalism, because of the huge war profits, encourages and fosters war; capitalism only flourishes in a soil that is favorable for its growth. We have war potentialities, in our reserve life, that permit the establishment and growth of munition industries.

Even the home makes its contribution to war. The contribution is the development of attitudes of separateness about the family, or the nation, which makes it possible for the war spirit to enter in. For example, Mrs. Smith teaches her sons that they are better than the Japanese people; she also instills into them that the Japanese are treacherous, that they are trying to conquer the world, and that they hate the white people and want to secure it for the yellow race. A child growing up in such an atmosphere will not have to take too much prodding to enter war against Japan.

\[2\text{Ibid., p. 439.}\] \[3\text{Ibid., p. 442.}\]
Schools, too, instill the idea of war into young children. The "mother country" of the children is extolled and all its actions and wars are glorified. Schools are mediums for preserving and reviving old prejudices and hatreds. Hitler fashioned the German youth in the schools of the land before he called them to glorify Germany. Education is one of the most potent processes for keeping war a potentiality in every country in the world. There is no reason why it should not be a potentiality for preserving peace.

Public opinion aids also in building attitudes favorable to conflicts when crises occur. Propaganda, as it is sometimes called, can be utilized to build a war machine in a people and to weld them together. 4

Concepts of government are also strong in influential factors in the war potential. Totalitarianism is a complete mobilization of a nation's resources—social, economic, and political—for one thing. It contributes to war through being able to marshal all its own resources for war as well as for any other pattern of life. It is easy for a totalitarian nation to go to war because its orders are easily made and enforced.

Nationalism contributes to war through stress of love of country above all else. Germany's philosophers preached extreme nationalism "Deutschland uber alles." They built up this concept and put the rights of the state over those of the individual. Nationalism does not cause war of necessity, but it aids greatly in marshaling a people to conduct a patriotic war.

4Ibid., p. 441.
Isolationism is an idea of separateness, of superiority, on the part of one nation. It fosters undesirable attitudes which may easily become an interactive factor in a war situation.

Even a democracy may contribute to war in that one democracy may seek to impose its type of government on another. It also creates freedom of action, and such freedom does not brook efforts of others to subdue it. The man who lives in a democracy will fight to preserve the freedom that he enjoys.

Human nature, it is apparent, plays a large part in instigating wars. For a long while it was believed that people were born "bent" in certain ways and that it was useless to try to change them. Recent studies and psychological experiments have shown that people are "made what they are" not by predestination, heredity, or environment, acting as one factor, but through the interaction of many factors—heredity, environment, the common culture, and the life experiences of the individual. People are made, not born.

People make wars. There is no denying or gainsaying that fact. Since this is true, people can prevent wars if conditions which create war reserve potentialities in people can be changed. Such a possibility is the theme of this research. It is the thing that has been left out of the majority of the plans for achieving world peace. Perhaps this has been done because it is realized that changing human nature is a slow process. But history shows that people can be
changed if they wish to be changed. Many things point to the conclusion that the people of the world— the little people— want world peace.

Hal Boyle, internationally known foreign correspondent, covered the war in both the Eastern and Western theaters. Since the war has been over, he has traveled to many countries. In four years he traveled about 102,000 miles, visited fifty countries and six continents, and talked to several thousand people from General Eisenhower on down. He learned three fundamental things in these travels:

(1) Men and women in all lands—from a Brum taxicab driver to a lady hodcarrier in Bombay—ache for peace, freedom and security for their children in a world better than they themselves have known.

(2) All of them, deep in their hearts, are willing to accept any pattern that will lead them nearer that eternal goal.

(3) To gain world peace, there must be produced new heroes of compromise and tolerance in many countries to defeat fresh ambitious villains again piping the old Hitler tunes of distrust, prejudice, pride, and greed.5

Drew Pearson, in addressing an open letter to the Peace Conference while it was in session in Paris, states:

Every war is followed by proposals for international peace. These things have been tried and tried again. They have never been enough. . . . For peace is not to be found in the treaties alone. Peace must rest on a new spirit of cooperation, a new spirit of friendship, a new determination to build for peace. That determination is present in the hearts of men, but not always among their governments. . . .

Peace does not come from a union among nations. It comes from an understanding among peoples. There can be no understanding when people are separated one from the other.

In another instance Pearson says that if wars were left to the people that there would never be war. This is true not merely of the American people but all peoples. He believes that it is psychologically impossible for a war to be started by the people. War, he said, has to be made by kings or dictators or governments. The best guarantee that he saw for good government and for the prevention of war was a thinking public.

The desire of the people of the world for peace has been shown within recent weeks since the Truman declaration on United States aid to Greece and Turkey. Because the President chose to take the matter up immediately without referring it to the United Nations, many people have become fearful lest this organization fail. Thomas L. Stokes, newspaper correspondent, states:

"The people desperately want peace—people everywhere. That can hardly be contradicted. They saw, hopefully, the creation of a world organization in the UN to achieve that. They could not be fully aware of its imperfections, but they expected it to work.

What do they see now? They see the big powers striking out on their own...The international politicians operate over their heads....
The people are frightened.

That this attitude of the plain people everywhere is more than surmise has been indicated in the reaction in our own country to the threat to UN in our proposed Greek-Turkish policy...."
The people still have faith in a real world government. It is the only way. It is suggested that the people of the world are ready for it, ready to accept the necessity of yielding up part, at least, of national sovereignty to world sovereignty; ready to accept citizenship in the world; ready to accept a body of law that applies to every nation and every citizen, with its own police power. This, after all, they have been accustomed to all their lives in their own communities, states, and nations.

How long before the leaders and diplomats will catch up with their people?

War, then if it is to be outlawed, will have to be analyzed, its causes determined, and these causes removed in the hearts of all the people, not merely the governments of the world. It will take something more than the League of Nations, something more than the United Nations, something else besides economic stability, or universal education. It will have to be an integration of many factors, the chief of which will be the interactive human element.

It is in the light of these conclusions that the basic elements for a world peace plan have been worked out and are presented here. No attempt has been made to draw up a blueprint for peace; any such plan as that has the same drawback as a planned curriculum with all the details worked out. The world is constantly changing and growing; many problems must be solved at their base and by those most directly concerned. The effort here is to set out a guide which will chart the way and lay basic foundations. To this end, five basic ideas for permanent peace are presented. Each of these will be discussed along with pertinent comment from any sources available.

---

The first of these basic ideas is a World Federal Government, a World Federal Police, and a World Federal Court. So far as human judgment can determine and so far as human records show, we have got to have some kind of a machinery for maintaining peace. If nations are to be restrained from upsetting the peace of the world, there must be some authority somewhere which can "arrest" the offending nation in much the same way that the local policeman is called to quiet a disturbing influence in the neighborhood. There must be fairness and justice in the decisions of the world body, and public opinion must sanction any move. Each nation must surrender its sovereignty to a certain degree. Lynn Landrum says:

You can't simply assemble the sovereign powers of the globe and announce that you are going to superimpose upon them another and a higher sovereignty. If United Nations becomes sovereign, all the world powers as we know them will become subject states subordinate to the United Nations. 9

To be truly effective, any United Nations must have an adequate police force. This means that there is no need for governments to keep large standing armies. The states of the World Government would be analogous to the states of the United States. Each of these states, before the creation of the United States, had its own army and determined for itself its own laws. When national sovereignty was assumed, each state lost its right to maintain an army, coin money, levy tariffs, or make war on a neighboring state. If there

is ever an adequate World Government, the nations of the world must surrender their individual sovereignty. Then a world government based on justice must provide new and adequate machinery for administrating the affairs of the world. In all states of society, force is necessary in some degree. In the family life the parents exercise a controlling effect on the children; in cities the mayor and the police department and the City Council carry on the affairs of government and maintain order. The state likewise functions in its own sphere, and then the national government has its own field of administration. There are no audible objections to these forms of government from the people; they have become accustomed to them and public opinion upholds them. There is no reason why such a thing could not happen in world affairs once the people of the world clearly realize the need and benefits of a world federation. Landrum says:

The really important issue in the development of the United Nations is not disarmament, but the setting up of a United Nations which will be able to run a disarmed world. You simply cannot expect order to show up with nobody to administer it and nothing to enforce it. So far as human judgment can determine and so far as human records show, we've got to have a machinery for maintaining peace. Disarmament of Russia and the United States is not the problem—except in a transitory state. The real problem is arming the United Nations.10

The old League of Nations failed because the League was not composed of states that had surrendered their sovereignty

and which retained all their individual ambitions and quests for security. Such a condition also confronts the embryo United Nations now struggling to get established. Before there can be any union worthy of the name, there must be a feeling of trust and understanding on the part of all nations concerned. That is, there must be some basic feeling. The United States was beset with bickering and jealousies among the several states for a number of years before and after its final conception, but compromises and the force of public opinion gradually have welded together a mighty nation wherein each member state retains its essential individuality.

At the present time the great stumbling block to any progress in making the United Nations a reality is the attitude of the two major powers; Russia and the United States. Here two powerful ideologies clash. Speaking of the differences between the two countries, Stettinius says that the Soviet Union often sees every man's hand against it, even when that hand is extended in sincere friendship.11 This is a state of mind, he says. It is a case of human relationship. The Russian people look and talk like the people in the United States, and they have the same passion for efficiency and productivity. He then states:

Meanwhile, let us not exaggerate the consequences of ideological differences between ourselves and the Russians. Those differences

do not necessitate war. At the time of the Crusades it was thought that Moslem countries and Christian countries could not inhabit the same world in peace. At the time of the Religious Wars of the 17th century it was thought that Catholic countries and Protestant countries could not inhabit the same world in peace. Those thoughts were errors. Let us make it an error to think that countries of private capital and countries of public capital must fight. The way toward that end is to get all countries to cooperate, within and outside the United Nations organization in their striving for their common good. It is only good, positive good, that drives out evil.\textsuperscript{12}

It should be stated here that this recommendation for a United Nations (that would be one in physical nature as well as in spirit) does not mean that our government should release its sovereignty or responsibility all at once. The United Nations is yet in a tentative state of being. It is little more than a conference of disagreement among the nations of the earth. Not even remotely has United Nations any weapon at its disposal, any sanctions which it can apply, any force which it can bring to bear upon recalcitrant minorities. This is why the United States—and Russia and Britain, too, for that matter—are so slow to turn over to United Nations any great responsibility or pressing duty. That is the reason advanced for the United States by-passing the United Nations in its avowed intention to aid Greece and Turkey.

The basic element that is stressed is that there must be a World Federal Government capable of administering,

\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 114.
legislating, and deciding before there is any world peace worthy of the name. The people of the world must want and desire this kind of a Federation if it is to be organized and administered.

The second basic element in any adequate peace program is free trade all over the world, with a planning board to work out a system of "from each according to his ability to each according to his needs." The economic goods of the world are unevenly divided; some nations are rich in natural resources, while others have scanty supplies. Some nations have a surplus of land for development; others, notably Germany and Japan, have been forced to seek "living space" outside their own borders. The extent to which these conditions entered into the political ambitions of these countries can not be adequately evaluated, but there is no question that the "have not" nations sought, in many instances, the things which the "have nations" possessed in great abundance.

A committee which studied post-war international economic problems has concluded that in the past most countries, including the United States, have usually pursued economic policies aimed at their own immediate advantage (or that of some group or class in their population) without such regard to the effect of these policies on the economic welfare of particular nations or on the processes of international trade and finance in general.13

The conviction is now growing that, in the shaping of national policies on economic matters, more consideration must be given to their external effects. This does not mean that nations hereafter are to be actuated by altruistic motives in their trade relations but that they will be more aware of the interdependence of prosperity of nations. Concerning bi-lateral trade agreements the committee has the following statement. It, in itself, is a good description of the situation that existed in world trade prior to the war:

The trend towards exclusive bilateral trade arrangements, discriminating trade restrictions, and ruthless exploitation of special competitive advantages, must be reversed. Both defeated and victorious powers must contribute to this reversal. In the case of the vanquished, there must be no renewal on the part of Germany of her pre-war practice of exploiting her debtor position to impose disadvantageous terms of trade on other countries, particularly in Eastern Europe, and the present Japanese monopoly of trade in the Far East must be broken permanently. In the case of the victors, there must be no renewal on the part of Great Britain of her pre-war policy of exploiting the power given her by her large import market to secure discriminatory trade advantages in countries like Argentina and in the Sterling area; there must be no revival on the part of France of the highly exclusive trade arrangements between metropolitan France and the French empire. On the part of the United States, there must be no return to the policy of maintaining very high non-negotiable tariffs while demanding, under a most-favored nation clause in a general commercial treaty, an equal share in all trade concessions negotiated inter se by other countries; and the attempt must not be made, after a world shipping shortage no longer exists, to keep in operation the whole of our greatly enlarged merchant marine through government subsidies, in cut-throat competition with countries (Great Britain, Norway, Holland, Greece) whose prosperity is vitally dependent on their carrying trade.14

---

14 Ibid., p. 4.
It is now becoming more and more apparent that for any trading country, it is essential that its potential customers shall be prosperous enough to be able to absorb and pay for all the exports that it has to sell. It is to the long-run interests of all peoples that the maximum volume of useful and interchangeable goods be produced in the world as a whole and that these goods be produced in the countries where they can be produced most economically, provided that economy in producing costs is not obtained through a sub-normal standard of living. In the closely interwoven modern world economy, financial and other economic disturbances in one country tend to spread and involve the economies of all countries. For example, the world-wide suffering and lack of goods and foods in Europe will eventually affect the economy of all nations. At the present time it operates to make the cost of living extremely high in the United States, for so much of the nation's goods has to be divided with the world. Furthermore, it is being realized the unlimited exploitation of natural monopolistic advantages or existing industrial or financial superiority by one or a few countries restricts the purchasing power of other countries, causes disturbances in their economies, and arouses resentment which is one of the psychological factors making for war. Popular unrest arising from depressed economic conditions in a powerful nation may also have a tendency to create war. Its people will more readily follow a leader who promises to relieve the conditions through expansion or other means. Germany used the post-war depression to denounced
the terms of the Versailles Treaty and inflame the minds of the people to blindly follow Hitler who promised both relief and revenge.

President Truman, speaking at Waco, Texas, recently said:

Elsewhere on earth, nations are under economic pressure. Countries that were devastated by the war are seeking to reconstruct their industries. Their need to import, in the months that lie ahead, will exceed their capacity to export. . . .

If controls over trade are to be really tight, tariffs are not enough. Even more drastic measures can be used. Quotas can be imposed on imports, product by product, country by country, and month by month. This is regimentation. . . . and is precisely what we have been trying to get away from. The alternative is the international trade organization.15

This international trade organization is an effort to regulate tariffs between nations in the interests of all the nations with the United Nations.

Free trade would permit each country to grow and produce enough of what it could grow and produce best and cheapest in order to supply the world market with that particular good. This would meet the needs of the people of the world, and would eliminate depression and inflation, over-production and under-production, and periods of extreme wealth and acute depression.

Such things, however, do not happen by themselves, or before there has been a felt need for them. The current situation shows the need but there must be a world-wide organization to supervise and administer any such program. Free

15 "Truman Speech," The Denton Record-Chronicle, March 6, 1947.
trade is contingent upon a strong world Government with ample powers. There is no inclination here to minimize the difficulties of any such program, but the basic thesis is maintained: in order for world peace to be achieved and maintained, there should be free trade all over the world. Once such a practice could be achieved, there would be no question of the Dardanelles—who owned them—or the Suez Canal or the Panama Canal or Indo-China or the Malayan Archipelago. The Palestine question would fade away with the disposition of the oil trade of the East.

In other words, trade involves human relationships. It is within the power of man to distribute it fairly. Once we have a culture favorable to the growth of such ideas, it is possible to make progress along these lines. President Truman told his Waco audience that times had changed and that people are awake and have come to a realization of their responsibilities.

The third basic ideal or idea necessary for any world peace federation is universal education. This would include adult education as well as child education. It would mean an education in the social sciences—especially sociology—and in human relationships. There should be a study of the various cultures of the world. Each nation (state) should be required to study the culture (social background) of every other nation in the world. Each nation should promote an exchange of college students and professors with every other nation. In addition there should be inter-correspondence between the peoples of the world.
One phase of the United Nations deals with such a plan. An international organization known as UNESCO, short for United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, was established in 1946 in San Francisco as a part of the United Nations and the Congress of the United States voted approval of it. The purpose of this organization is:

...To create better understanding among peoples of different nations by international cooperation on things like education, exchange of scientific developments, and spreading of ideas and information.16

When it approved our joining UNESCO, Congress also authorized the creation in this country of a body to advise the government on what we should try to do in UNESCO.

This special commission is called the National Commission on Educational, Scientific and Cultural Cooperation. Its ninety members are top American scholars, educators, and intellectual leaders. At a recent four-day meeting it said:

An international conference should be called next year to lay down standards for revising school textbooks to rid them of prejudices and misunderstandings.

This would be a major job. Textbooks of a country traditionally have glorified that country's history at the expense of all other countries. UNESCO should make real use of the press, radio, and motion pictures to promote understanding among peoples and nations.

The United Nations should set up a worldwide radio network capable of bringing educational and cultural programs to all countries. UNESCO should work for the removal of blocks to free flow of information. A world-wide library (lending) for countries whose libraries were knocked out by war or which never had good libraries should be established.17


17Ibid.
J. Frank Dobie, southwestern writer and scholar, was one of the men appointed to serve on this commission. Writing on the meeting, Dobie had this to say:

Specifically, it is the function of the commission to advise American delegates to the forthcoming UNESCO conference in Paris as to how, in the words of Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, we may 'build the defenses of peace in the minds of men.' And certainly the defenses of peace lie in human attitudes, in the way peoples understand peoples, in breaking down the differences that separate peoples, and in strengthening the common interests that bind people together. The peoples of the earth already have these common interests. What they need to realize is how and wherein their interests are common. Their solidarity is not dependent alone on political and economic factors. It is based on the development of moral and intellectual attitudes.¹⁸

Dobie, it is seen, realizes that the element of human understanding is one of the most important factors in building a world peace organization. He says that peace and security never have been and never will be based on physical power alone, no matter how many victories in battle that power achieves.¹⁹ The purpose of this organization is to...

...employ science and education and the arts to make clear and articulate, the underlying agreements between the people of the earth—agreements which the events of the last few months have overlaid with a confusion of voices and an almost hysterical chattering of insecurity and fear.²⁰

Currently, there is a great deal of talk about the need for a closer understanding between the peoples of Russia and those of the United States. That, no doubt, is true, but

---

¹⁸Ibid.
¹⁹Ibid.
²⁰Ibid.
there is need for a better understanding between all the peoples of the earth. Right here on our own hemisphere and almost at our back door, there is heard the plea for a better understanding between the peoples of the United States and their next-door Latin-American neighbors. Dr. Torres-Rioseco, Chilean professor of Latin-American Literature at the University of California, told the National Association of University Women currently meeting in Dallas that the countries south of the border of the United States are afraid of this country because of its strong-arm policies and its economic imperialism. In turn, he says, most of the people of the United States feel a great disdain for Latin-America and measure its people in terms of religious fanaticism, political rioting, and the poorer classes of Mexican life in the southern United States.

The prospector, engineer, or banker from the United States, he says, considers Latin-America a country to exploit. He charged:

This nation and Latin America are still far from achieving an elementary understanding. Let us candidly confess that we know very little of each other, that we hold absurd views, and fatal prejudices...

When the United States Government is willing to develop basic Latin-American industries like the steel industry of Brazil, which will compete with American industries, the days of greedy exploitation will pass.

The words of this speaker show the great need existing

22 Ibid.
for a better understanding among the peoples of the world. There is no other factor which can offer more promise of achieving this understanding than education.

A step that is needed to make such education more effective is the teaching of a universal language. There should be one tongue which is understood by all people. This is the fourth basic need for a world peace organization that will function. This is easier said than done, however, for there are a number of tongues spoken in the world, and any effort to elevate one of these to the basis of a universal language would at once arouse opposition from many sources. At the present time, however, the English tongue is being used almost all over the world. There is no gainsaying the fact that a knowledge of the same tongue would enable people to understand each other better.

Another basic step needed in a world peace organization is a medium of exchange—world money, and a world bank. The meeting at Bretton Woods of representatives from forty-four nations in 1944 was made in recognition of such a need. Here a beginning was made on the establishment of a world bank which would have two purposes: stabilize the value of currency and act as a lending agent for loans to devastated countries. The fact that such an undertaking was consummated and has been put into action is a long step forward in a world peace organization. This is apparent in studying the outlined purposes of the International Monetary Fund:
Article I states the purposes of the Fund:
(1) to promote international monetary cooperation; (2) facilitate balanced growth of international trade; (3) to promote exchange stability, maintain orderly exchange arrangements among members, avoid competitive exchange depreciation; (4) to help establish a multilateral system of payments for current transactions and to aid in eliminating foreign exchange restrictions; (5) to give members confidence that they can correct maladjustments in their currency relations without resorting to internationally disruptive measures; (6) 'to shorten the duration and lessen the degree of disequilibrium' in international balances.23

The use of "world money" would facilitate commerce in the same manner that a world language would hasten world understanding. The example set by the thirteen original colonies of America is a good illustration of what is meant by the advantages of a "world money." At that time each colony had the authority and power to coin its own money. The results were confusion and a weird variety of monies or currencies. There were no stable values because each colony set its own valuation. The relinquishment of the right to coin and issue money to the Federal Government was a big step in the final unification of the different colonies under one government.

These five things—world governing body, free trade, universal education, world language, and a world bank and world money—are the essential elements in the organization and maintenance of world peace. Not any of them is indispensable in the whole scheme of international organization, but each has its own distinct place. The successful world peace organization will be an integration of them all.

23 Carlyle Morgan, Bretton Woods, p. 119.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has been an effort to look at the need for a world peace organization, review some steps already taken for the establishment of same, and present some basic elements essential for the establishment and maintenance of any such organization.

The plans for world peace that were studied were divided into two separate chapters. The first of these considered the plans advanced by the governments of the world and included the Fourteen Points, the League of Nations, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks and the San Francisco Conference. The second chapter gave attention to the plans of different individuals and organizations which also were actively seeking to aid in establishing world peace. In the fourth chapter five basic elements are outlined—a world government embracing legislative, executive and judicial powers, and policed by a world army, free trade, universal education, a world language, and a world bank and world money. Under these external appendages of peace, however, are the essential
human elements of people. These are the basic things that
must be taken into consideration.

When the history of wars is reviewed, the conclusion
is inevitable that human relationships are the cause of all
wars. War is the same general type of phenomena as any other
cultural pattern. It is deeply ingrained into the lives of
the people and the warp and woof of society. Creed, economic
security, selfishness, all enter into the picture. It is
becoming evident that man is going to have to learn how to
get along with other men if civilization is to endure. If
he does this, he is going to have to learn to subordinate
his personal desires and greed to the welfare of the group
as a whole.

The current rash of disputes and counter disputes over
the peace settlements and disposition of the war spoils at
first glance appear to be depressing and almost hopeless.
Even a cursory survey shows that the nations of the world
lack understanding of other peoples and other ways of life.
Within the borders of our own country are found intolerance,
racial animosity, bigotry, and selfishness. Yet an over-
all look at the development of the world peace movement shows,
that the world has been moving steadily towards some kind
of an organization for peace. The Fourteen Points by Wood-
row Wilson laid a firm foundation, and subsequent attempts to
build an organization have steadily been improved and a
wider application made of the values of human relationships.
Not too many years ago it would have amounted to heresy to
have spoken freely about free trade, abolition of the
sovereignty, and the elimination of race barriers. Due to the diversity of interests, the different ideologies, and the different natural resources, the idea of a world union has made slow progress, but progress has been made. The League of Nations failed, but a United Nations arose in its place. This organization comprises a far wider concept of peace than the original league. It may fail, but the growing awareness of the people of the needs and desires for peace will eventually bring about some kind of organization to prevent wars. This organization, however, must be rooted in human relationships, and the cultural pattern of the world must be changed so as to build peace instead of war in behavior reserve potentialities.
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