

John Foster Dulles - Long Range Peace Objectives - 18 September 1941

[Atlantic Charter
dated August 14, 1941]

LONG RANGE PEACE OBJECTIVES

Including an Analysis of the
Roosevelt-Churchill Eight Point Declaration (= Atlantic Charter)

* * *

A statement submitted to the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace, by its Chairman, Mr. John Foster Dulles; together with comments on the paper and suggestions for its use by study groups.

* * *

This document has been authorized for publication by the Commission, and commended to the Churches for their study. The views herein expressed have not been acted upon by the Commission or by the Federal Council of Churches, which instituted the Commission.

* * *

September 18, 1941.

To the Members of the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace:

Your Committee of Direction, in their Memorandum submitted to you last spring, expressed the view that we should already now be seeking to define and realize a new and better world order. In that connection we said:

"Increased unity and strength at home and increased power and influence abroad, are sure to result from concrete evidence that we have diagnosed the problem of peace and that we have the will and capacity to proceed practically about the business of securing a different and better world order."

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have now expressed, in a Joint Declaration, their conception of that better future for the world which they aim to realize.

The Declaration may seem inadequate. To that I shall allude later. But, first, appreciation should be expressed of the wisdom and courage of these leaders in attempting, in the midst of a desperate and precarious struggle, to make any concrete formulation of their conception of a new world order. It is a significant tribute to the democratic system that its peoples demand, and its leaders accept, that there be publicly expounded the long term objectives of the struggle to which men are asked to dedicate their lives.

The fact that Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill have publicly recognized that peace aims are properly a subject of present consideration is thus of the utmost importance. This is more important than the precise formulation they agreed upon. For we must recognize that any "joint" statement loses vitality through the necessity of composing different viewpoints, and that any statement at all, issued at the present time, cannot but be tentative and exploratory and influenced by military and other practical considerations.

Among such practical considerations is doubtless the desire to ascertain what are the long range objectives which will enlist the whole-hearted support of Christian groups such as those of which we are representative. It is, I am sure, responsive to the wishes of our government if we express ourselves upon this matter. In that spirit I submit to you my own reflections on the eight points of the Roosevelt-Churchill Declaration.

Point 1

It is first declared that England and the United States "seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise".

This statement is doubtless designed to allay apprehension abroad as to the use to which we may put the vast military establishment we are creating and the far flung naval bases we have recently acquired.

It is well that we should disavow "aggrandizement" with its implied disregard of the welfare of others. We must remember, however, that growth, in itself, is not something inherently evil. It is, indeed, the peculiar genius of the Constitution of the United States that it could and did operate as an open end instrument, bringing more territory and more

peoples into federal union. That conception should not now be renounced.

If we should renounce growth that would be evidence, not of morality, but of satiety.

I mention this because of the tendency of all national groups to attribute self-righteousness to the particular mood in which they find themselves. This tendency, which violates Christ's precepts, creates much ill-will and is itself a major contributing cause of war. We should, in a spirit of humility, avoid even the appearance of thanking God that we are not as other men.

Point 2

It is secondly affirmed that territorial changes should be made dependent upon "the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned".

This is a sound generalization. Like most generalizations it is, of course, subject to qualification. The statement might be understood as meaning that there will be no change in the status of Germany. But if Europe is to be reorganized as a federated commonwealth, of which I speak later, then it might be that the present greater Germany should be disintegrated into several states of the new Union. This result should not necessarily be dependent upon "the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned" who might prefer, through maintaining themselves as a single state, to dominate the Union.

Point 3

It is in the third place affirmed that all peoples should have the right to "choose the form of government under which they will live".

This generalization, like the preceding one, is subject to important qualifications. Under the Constitution of our Federal Union, the States are not permitted to have other than a "republican" form of government. Free choice of government is withheld from many peoples. Mr. Churchill has, indeed, stated that Point 3 was not intended to alter present British policies in relation to "India, Burma or any other parts of the British Empire".

Point 3 states, in conclusion, that "sovereign rights" should be "restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them". This seems to envisage a restoration in Europe of

the old system of many sovereign states, a system which in Europe has constantly and inevitably bred war and which must continue to do so. Doubtless there should be much self-government along ethnic lines. But as said by Mr. Atlee, on behalf of the British Labor Party, "Europe must federate or perish", and as resolved by the Malvern Conference, "our aim must be the unification of Europe as a cooperative commonwealth".

Vague and sweeping promises of self-rule and of sovereignty may attract support from the many who are discontented and who desire no rule but self-rule. But such promises may become a serious obstacle to durable peace. At the Paris Peace Conference we were plagued by the demands formulated in reliance on Mr. Wilson's promises of "self-determination". We faced the alternative of multiplying the independent sovereignties of Europe or seeming to repudiate promises that had been made. The former course was chosen, to the ultimate confusion of all concerned. But the alternative course, involving widespread disillusionment and apparent bad faith, would also not have laid a sound basis for peace. It is important that we do not repeat that mistake and recreate for ourselves the dilemma of 1919.

Point 4

By Point 4 the joint declarants pledge themselves to "endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity".

The liberal and constructive feature of this point is its announced intention not to discriminate economically against the vanquished. This is admirable. The Declaration falls short, however, of assuring to the nations of the world effective access to the raw materials they need. The emphasis appears to be on treaty equality and to suggest a return to the "most favored nation" system of the last century. But that system did not assure, nor does the present Declaration assure, that we or the British Empire will buy from or exchange with other people. But unless we do so they cannot actually get the raw materials which they need.

It is essential to any just and durable peace that nations like the United States, which disproportionately control the natural resources of the world, should develop the will and find the effective way, to permit these resources to serve the basic economic needs of others. This may involve bilateral agreements which will differ among themselves because the needs

to be served are different. Whether or not this be the case, we can at least know that the ends we seek will not be achieved by an offer to sell to all comers on a basis of equality if, through other restrictions, potential buyers are deprived of the means of acquisition.

The United States has in the past been a principal violator of good international practice. We have treated our foreign trade as though it were of no legitimate concern to anyone but ourselves. Any American endeavor to give substance to the fourth point should, therefore, in the first instance involve securing a change of attitude by the Congress of the United States. Unless this occurs the Declaration will be received with grave and warranted skepticism.

As indicated by the Memorandum of your Committee of Direction, we are prepared strongly to support such domestic efforts as are prerequisite to giving substance to Point 4 and we believe this should be done now.

The whole of Point 4 is qualified by a reference to "existing obligations". This refers presumably to the British Empire system of trade preferences. It would be regrettable if this or some undisclosed arrangements should nullify the opportunity of peoples generally to have effective access to the trade and raw materials of the world.

Point 5

Point 5 advocates "the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security".

This is a proposal which we can all support. Such support to be effective must seek the establishment of some international mechanisms for collaboration. As said by the conference held at Geneva in 1939, under the auspices of the World Council of Churches:

"It must be made clear to the people of our respective states that if Christian principles of national conduct are to be made effective there must be some form of international organization which will provide the machinery of conference and cooperation. The experience of national life makes it clear that the mere affirmation of principles of conduct is not sufficient to put them into practical operation."

Point 6

Point 6 expresses the hope that peace "will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries".

This hope we all share. But we recognize that such hope cannot be realized merely by seeking to make sacrosanct, for all times, the boundary advantages which now enure to some. The extent to which boundaries will be free from physical inroads depends upon the nature of the restraints which the boundaries create. As frequently pointed out by Secretary of State Hull, if boundaries are unnatural barriers to the movement of men, trade and investment, their maintenance inevitably becomes subject to attack.

The hope that men in all lands "may live out their lives with freedom from fear and want" is, of course, one we all entertain. But it can never be achieved except relatively, and there are positive dangers in holding out such an expectation to desperate and destitute masses.

It is regrettable that the hope expressed was primarily in reference to the material aspects of men's lives. Intellectual and spiritual freedoms are surely of at least equal importance. This was recognized by Mr. Roosevelt in his subsequent message to the Congress of the United States.

Point 7

The seventh Point proposes that in time of peace men may "traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance".

This has been the case ever since piracy was suppressed. The real issue which confronts the world relates to the right to close the seas in time of war, a right upon which the great naval powers have always insisted and whereby they obtain the potential power to coerce other nations which are dependent on imports from overseas. The present statement may be contrasted with President Wilson's Point that the seas should be free "alike in peace as in war".

Point 8

The abandonment by "all the nations *** of the use of force" is, in Point 8, stated as an ultimate ideal. The immediate practical application of this is, however, to be limited to the disarmament of those nations "which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers".

Point 8 thus adopts the result of the Versailles Treaty which, while expressing the intention of general disarmament, actually effected disarmament only of the defeated nations.

The future thus envisaged is unsatisfactory. It may be that armament is largely a symptom of international distrust and that the best we can do is to strive to create such confidence in methods other than force as will gradually lead all nations voluntarily to forego armament. But we must realize that unilateral disarmament gives rise to acute moral resentment. Also peace can never be assured merely by seeking to reserve armament exclusively for those nations which are so satisfied that they seek only to maintain the status quo. This was the great illusion of Versailles.

The world is a living, and thus a changing, organism. As the nations are now organized, force, actual or potential, is the accepted method for determining whether and when and to what extent changes may occur between them. There is no reliable alternative. This is said, not with approbation, but in the interest of realism. In consequence there will be no acquiescence in unilateral disarmament, and no permanent renunciation of efforts to develop national power, until the world is made organically flexible, with mechanisms to assure a peaceful political response to the constant fluctuations of underlying conditions.

Those who sincerely and intelligently seek the renunciation of force and the abolition of armament will concentrate upon the development of some international mechanism for effecting peaceful change. It is regrettable that the Joint Declaration fails to make any proposal to this end.

* * *

Taken as a whole, the Joint Declaration must be regarded as a tentative and incomplete statement. Doubtless its authors so regarded it. This is to be hoped. For, in its present form, the Declaration seems to reflect primarily the conceptions of the old sovereignty system. It follows too closely the pattern of Versailles, without, however, any of the liberalizing international institutions which that treaty sought to bring into existence. In the absence of mechanisms creating rights on a basis of equality, there would probably result an Anglo-Saxon military and economic hegemony whose self-interest would be bound to the maintenance of the status quo.

Certainly the collaboration of the United States and the British Commonwealth of nations is a precious thing and the unity of our peoples is something to be fostered. But this in itself will not assure a just and durable peace. The danger is that we should think so.

The close of the last World War found five great nations among the victors - Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the United States. The end of the present war, if it is fought through to military victory, will find an overwhelming concentration of power in one or two nations. That power, of course, will be a reality, the implications of which we cannot avoid. Our task will be to make it a beneficent reality. This requires that we use our power, not to perpetuate itself, but to create, support and eventually give way to international institutions drawing their vitality from the whole family of nations.

The easy way will be for the victors to assume that the power they possess is so concentrated that peace can be assured by informal processes, not requiring permanent international machinery. The hard way will be for the victors to create international organs having the power to make decisions in which others will participate as a matter of right. Yet only this latter course can be expected to produce a durable peace.

Unless the leaders of the British Commonwealth and the United States start promptly to educate their people along such lines, they will find themselves the prisoners of a public opinion such as, following 1919, frustrated all efforts to place peace upon a stable foundation. We will have begun again the cycle which leads inevitably to new war.

I believe that Christians in this country have a duty to make it clear that while they applaud the making of the statement of peace aims and approve of many of its features, yet they regard that statement only as a beginning. In its present form, it falls far short of the conceptions of President Wilson and short even of their expression in the Treaty of Versailles. It falls far short of the conceptions expressed by the great ecumenical conferences of recent years.

President Roosevelt has dealt boldly and dramatically with domestic problems. Recognizing the failure of our society, as organized, to adapt itself to new conditions and to meet the imperative needs of human beings, he has effectively grappled with the problem and has not hesitated to break with tradition and to alter fundamentally the entire structure of our economic order. As to much that he has done there is disagreement. But few would seek to undo the great social reforms he has effected.

We are entitled to expect a like approach to the problem of peace. It has been demonstrated, beyond doubt, that the old system of many disconnected sovereignties, each a law unto itself, inevitably breeds war. We must not keep humanity chained to such a wheel. Laying aside timidity, adding practicality to sentimentality, we must fearlessly plan a new world order.

Your Committee of Direction, in its earlier Memorandum said:

"In a world which is torn asunder by dynamic ideologies, our greatest deficit is spiritual not material. Too much do we appear to be purely on the defensive and to be supporting the status quo of a world system which has become generally condemned as defective and incompatible with peace. Even though by weight of material, unaccompanied by the impetus of new ideas, we can repress the present outbreaks of violence, we would not have eradicated the causes of their recurrence. Because this is generally sensed, we have failed to achieve a spiritual leadership of the multitudes who everywhere demand that a way be found to save them and their children and their children's children from the misery, the starvation of body and soul, the violent death which economic disorder and recurrent war now wreak upon man."

We have a duty to urge upon our President that he dedicate to this great task his outstanding qualities of leadership.

* * *

It is right that critics should seek to be constructive and not merely negative. I will, therefore, make certain affirmative suggestions. They will be incomplete and inadequate, but indicative of the kind of world order which we could reasonably expect our political leaders to seek for us. They assume, as did the Joint Declaration, that Nazi tyranny will not dominate the peace.

My suggestions fall under five heads. One is a transition measure designed to prevent social chaos following the cessation of hostilities; the next three relate to immediate territorial and political settlements in relation to the three major areas of admitted maladjustment: Europe, Asia and colonies; the fifth, and most important, relates to the establishment of permanent mechanisms of universal scope designed to help the nations of the world to live the way of peace.

I.

Upon the cessation of formal hostilities there will be chaos and anarchy throughout much of the world. For that the British Commonwealth and the United States will have a certain responsibility for we, along with Germany, have deliberately chosen blockade as an instrument of our national policy. As a result starvation, disease and destitution will be rife. Civil government will have been undermined by such conditions and also by the fact that the British and American governments are fomenting violence and unrest within German occupied territory. As a stimulant for present disaffection, we are holding out great hopes of personal freedoms and material plenty if only men will rebel against Germany's "new order". Certain passages of the Joint Declaration are obviously framed with this objective in view.

The hopes thus aroused can never be fully realized and certainly they cannot to any appreciable extent be quickly realized. It will fall upon us to repress much of the violent unrest and unreasonable hope which we will have excited. At that juncture we should at least be prepared to furnish largely and on a charitable basis, and on condition that social order is maintained, medicine, food and clothing. This should at once be publicly promised and steps taken to insure that such promises can and will be made good. To create large visible stocks dedicated to this purpose would be a measure both of expediency and of mercy.

II.

Europe

We should seek the political reorganization of continental Europe as a federated commonwealth of some type. As stated above, there must be a large measure of local self-government along ethnic lines. This can be assured through federal principles which in this respect are very flexible. But the reestablishment of some twenty-five wholly independent sovereign states in Europe would be political folly. Alexander Hamilton stated in The Federalist:

"To look for a continuation of harmony between a number of independent, unconnected sovereignties in the same neighborhood, would be to disregard the uniform course of human events, and to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages."

Events since that time have abundantly verified what Hamilton then said and what the American people then accepted and acted upon. It is time for Europe to apply this political wisdom.

Twice within the last twenty-five years the United States has become deeply involved in the wars originating between the independent, unconnected sovereignties of Europe. It has been demonstrated that the world has so shrunk that European wars can no longer, as during the last century, be confined to Europe. Therefore, it is not merely of self-interest to Europe, but of vital concern to us, that there be not restored in Europe the conditions which inherently give rise to such wars. From a purely selfish standpoint any American program for peace must include a federated continental Europe. From the standpoint of the peoples concerned, their economic interdependence calls for political mechanisms to assure that their resources and markets be coordinated for maximum peaceful utility.

The Far East

There should be adjustments which will assure to Japan effective access to markets and raw materials, so that she may raise the standard of living of her people. But China must be preserved from political domination by Japan or any other alien power. With respect to details, I refer to the admirable "Outline of Proposals Looking Toward a Settlement in East Asia", formulated by the National Study Conference at Philadelphia in February, 1940.

Colonies

All non-self-governing colonies, with the possible exception of those where self-government is already advanced, should be placed under international mandate. This was the original conception of President Wilson, perverted by the Treaty of Versailles. The purpose of the mandate should be, first, to assure the moral, social and material development of the native inhabitants and their ultimate self-government, and in the meantime to assure that other peoples shall have access to their resources and trade on equal terms.

Such mandating, if carried out in a genuine international spirit, would prevent colonial areas being used as pawns to advance national policies of imperialism, strategy or prestige.

The conference held at Geneva in 1939 under the auspices of the World Council of Churches produced an excellent statement of the essential characteristics of mandates such as those I envisage.

III.

Peace in all social units is basically dependent upon the attitude of men toward each other. It requires that the seeking of advantage for self, or for that with which self is identified (family, nation, class, etc.) should be moderated by a decent regard for the material, intellectual and spiritual needs and desires of others. These are constantly varying and peace is never achieved by fixing a status, even originally acceptable, and then seeking to perpetuate that status.

In a small community peace can usually be achieved without much political mechanism. Decent and sensible people, who constitute the great majority everywhere, avoid a use of their power, which, visibly, creates human misery with which they will be in direct contact and the reactions of which will obviously disturb their peace of mind or body. However, as we pass into larger areas of social and economic interconnection, the effects of one's acts are not visible. Also, the human needs that lay the seeds of conflict are often unperceived until they attain such threatening proportions and come under such violent leadership that any attempt at appeasement then defeats its own purpose. Thus international peace requires not merely an initial status conducive to peace. It requires even more that there be an international organization charged with the responsibility of guiding the nations along the ways of peace.

Under Secretary of State Welles, on July 22, 1941, referred to the splendid vision for which President Wilson gave his life. He pointed out that the League of Nations had failed

"chiefly because of the fact that it was forced to operate, by those who dominated its councils, as a means of maintaining the status quo. It was never enabled to operate as its chief spokesman had intended, as an elastic and impartial instrument in bringing about peaceful and equitable adjustments between nations as time and circumstance proved necessary."

He concluded:

"Some adequate instrumentality must unquestionably be found to achieve such adjustments when the nations of

the earth again undertake the task of restoring law and order to a disastrously shaken world."

With the views thus expressed by Mr. Welles I am wholly in accord. In elaboration thereof I would suggest:

As a beginning of world government, there should be organized an international federation for peace. Of this federation all the nations would be members.

The charter of the federation would recognize, and bind all members to accept, the principle that national interdependence now replaces independence and that action by any nation, notably in the economic field, which materially and adversely affects other people, is not purely a matter of domestic policy but is coupled with an international responsibility. Members would accordingly be bound to take no such action without first obtaining the judgment of the federation as to the effect thereof upon the peace of the world.

The federation would function through an executive organ made up of outstanding personalities who would be solemnly pledged to place the peace and welfare of humanity as a whole above the advantage of any particular nation, race or class.

The executive organ would keep the international situation constantly under review in order to detect, at their incipency, any conditions the continuance of which might endanger the peace of the world. It would report to the members on any such conditions and would propose measures which in its judgment would be calculated to prevent such conditions ripening into international violence. The nature of such measures would be determined by the executive organ. They might call for a revision of international conditions designed to ameliorate the economic or political lot of certain peoples. They might call for measures to repress sporadic threats of violence.

Each member state would undertake to accept the judgments and proposals of the executive organ as of high moral authority, recognizing that the failure of any member to follow them would place upon it a clear responsibility before the world.

In order further to implement the principle of interdependence and international responsibility, each member state would undertake to create internally an administrative unit having the duty to study economic relations with others and to collaborate with the executive organ of the federation. Members would further undertake to establish domestic legislative procedures to assure that national action, which might involve international economic repercussions, would not be

taken without first obtaining a report from such administrative unit as to the effect of the contemplated action upon peoples elsewhere.

Member states would undertake to publicize the reports of the executive organ of the federation for peace, as well as the reports of the domestic administrative unit referred to above, with a view to promoting public education as to how the acts of one nation affect others and how each nation may, through courtesy to and consideration of others, live the way of peace.

The federation for peace should, in so far as practicable, utilize the existing machinery of the League of Nations, particularly such technical organizations as the International Labor Office, Health Organization, etc.

Through acceptance of the principles and practices above outlined, the member nations would have renounced that irresponsibility which above all makes absolute sovereignty incompatible with peace.

* * *

The measures I have outlined obviously fall short of a complete program for peace. The omission of disarmament and sanctions - other than moral - will be noted as well as the failure to endow the proposed world federation for peace with direct legislative power. I recognize the importance of these matters and that in due course they must come about. But they are at the present time highly disputable and I do not consider them essential to inaugurating an era of peace.

There are, of course, those who feel that peace depends primarily upon political mechanisms and that, unless these are perfect and complete peace, will fail. I believe that peace is essentially a way of life and that the function of political mechanisms is not to impose peace but to establish channels of contact and collaboration without which - because the world is so big - people cannot know how to live the way of peace. If we eradicate from our system that immoral principle of national irresponsibility which the sovereignty system now sanctifies, and if we establish mechanisms which will enlighten people as to their interdependence and how mutual consideration may be evidenced, we will have achieved the fundamentals of a peaceful world order. If the political mechanisms we establish include a permanent world organization capable of growth and continuing initiative, then initial omissions can gradually be supplied.

The thoughts expressed in this report to you are largely drawn from the thinking and pronouncements of Christian statesmen at such important conferences as Oxford (1937), Geneva (1939), Philadelphia (1940), Atlantic City (1940) and Malvern (1941). We now face the issue of whether such pronouncements can become vital or whether they will stand as monuments to the present incapacity of Christian thinking to influence practical affairs. We enter the decisive period. For our President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain have, by their Joint Declaration, inaugurated the formative thinking which will determine the ultimate event.

Your Committee of Direction, in its Memorandum above referred to, pointed out that while no single event could of itself bring peace, nevertheless "through struggle and sacrifice men can bring into being moments which, if wisely and resolutely availed of, may be made to promote greatly the cause of peace." We approach such a moment. Let us, as Christian citizens, dedicate ourselves to assuring that it will be wisely and resolutely availed of. This requires, above all, that the United States will not shirk its international responsibilities.

John Foster Dulles,
Chairman.

* * *

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TOPICS

When first presented to the Commission, the foregoing paper raised extensive discussion and a variety of questions. In the main, the questions revolved around the second half of Mr. Dulles' paper in which he outlines his idea of "the shape of things to come". There seemed to be general agreement that the first half of the paper, embodying an analysis of the Eight Point Declaration, was both timely and thoroughgoing. The following summary of the discussion, containing points of view expressed by members of the Commission as well as direct questions raised, is presented here in the hope of stimulating further discussion of the paper by study groups in the churches.

Sanctions

The first question which emerged and one to which the group returned frequently had to do with the matter of sanctions. It will be noted that Mr. Dulles deliberately omits a proposal for legal sanctions. Certain members of the Commission challenged him at this point. As one member states, "How can you give authority to this organization (referring to Mr. Dulles' plan for an international federation for peace) without sanctions? Are not sanctions absolutely necessary in order to carry out the very admirable position taken in the paper throughout?"

On the other hand, some members agreed with Mr. Dulles in his feeling that the question of sanctions is secondary to the establishment of justice as between nations. One pastor indicated his feeling that sanctions, or even the threat of sanctions, military or economic, might not be necessary under such a plan as Mr. Dulles envisaged. Said he, "I believe that if the nations do justice, real justice, even such relative justice as can be done and of the sort that this paper recommends, there will then be no need of sanctions, military or economic. If the nations refuse this, sanctions will be of no avail."

Some of the group felt that the paper was unrealistic at this point in that any organized society of nations must have the power to enforce its decisions and to restrain nations when they resort to unwarranted aggression.

The Commission found itself somewhat at variance as to whether sanctions were permissible from the point of view of the Christian ethic, although many of them would feel that the use of force under certain conditions, and with necessary safeguards, was entirely justified. This might imply the existence of a genuinely international military force made up of representatives of all nations whose allegiance would be not to their particular national group but to the society of nations.

The possible creation of some such international police force raised the question as to what the United States would be prepared to do in such a case. Would it be realistic for the United States to talk about an orderly world community unless it is prepared to participate in the functioning of some form of international police? Is the United States ready at this time or at any time in the near future for such an abridgment of its national sovereignty as this would entail?

World Organization

The second major area of discussion centered around the question of world organization. Did Mr. Dulles' concept of an "international federation for peace" go far enough? Many members of the Commission felt it did not. Commenting on Mr. Dulles' observation that the Eight Points "fall far short of the conceptions of President Wilson and short even of their expression in the Treaty of Versailles", a university professor said, "The proposals which are made in this paper are also inadequate because in my opinion they too fall short of the proposals of Wilson. They also disregard the experience of the past. They take us back from the League of Nations rather than forward. . . It is necessary to have strong international government, one in which the use of force is taken for granted."

Evidence was not lacking that some of the members of the Commission felt it unnecessary to search for an entirely new formula for world organization. In spite of the fact that the League of Nations has failed to live up to the hopes of its founders, has not a valuable foundation been laid, upon which a more perfect structure can be built? Says a university lecturer, "The weakness of this paper seems to be that it dismisses much that has gone before and starts us off in the search for new things when there is so much upon which we can build."

The omission of any proposal for a world government having direct legislative powers, with full American participation, was noted by the Commission. Is a federation of European states, such as Mr. Dulles contemplates, enough? "Are we once more," said a theological professor, "to tell Europe what she must do - federate - abridge sovereignty, while we ourselves maintain only a consultative relationship with some kind of vague world organization?" Many members of the Commission felt that some more real and tangible proposal for American abridgment of its own national sovereignty was in order. There was no expressed dissent from the view that some sort of federation of nations with full American participation, was an indispensable basis for a just and durable peace.

By way of elaborating his own position, Mr. Dulles reiterated his conviction that the United States should take immediate steps leading toward an abridgment of its own sovereignty. He suggested that a careful reading of the statement would reveal his intention of here suggesting what seemed to him the preliminary steps to be taken toward general limitation of sovereignty on the part of all nations.

To what extent is America willing to accept limitations on her sovereignty? What would be involved in such limitation? The discussion took note of economic as well as political and military implications. As one member pointed out, "At the end of this war we will be the only nation in the world able to finance reconstruction. We must lend gold and reserves and cooperate fully with impoverished nations. The only way these receiving nations can pay us back is to sell us their goods, and this can be accomplished only through a drastic downward revision of our tariff structure. Would America be willing to accept this very real limitation on her rights as a sovereign nation?"

Is a Discussion of Long Range Objectives Realistic
at the Present Time?

Since the Commission is divided with respect to America's relation to the war, it was natural, perhaps inevitable, that a question should be raised as to the unreality of the entire discussion of long range peace objectives. Said one layman, "It seems to me that everything said is based on the assumption that Hitler is going to lose the war. If the Church feels it has a moral responsibility to influence the peace, does it not have a prior moral responsibility to help win the war?"

Next Steps

The Commission was keenly aware of the value of just such a discussion as the reading of Mr. Dulles' paper had brought forth, and commended to the churches the setting up of local study groups, so that a much needed educational program might be gotten under way immediately. Whether carried on by a men's discussion group, a women's society, a young people's organization, a Sunday forum, a mid-week series or an informal gathering in the home, real progress can be made in the direction of increasing the awareness of the Christian forces of America that they are a part of the answer to the need for a better world order.

Studies might be conducted around the following themes:

I. The Roosevelt-Churchill Declaration

Following is the text of the Declaration:

The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national

policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

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

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

Franklin D. Roosevelt
Winston S. Churchill

The foregoing paper, by the Chairman of the Federal Council's Commission, represents one analysis of the Eight Points. Does your group agree with this analysis?

Does the group feel that the Joint Declaration is an adequate statement of peace aims? What would you add to it, or take from it?

Does the Christian religion offer us any standards by which we may judge the adequacy of the Declaration?

Does the Declaration advance or hinder the cause of an organized society of nations?

Is the omission of any reference to freedom of religion and freedom of speech significant?

II. Other Current Proposals

For use in study groups the Commission has prepared a handbook containing significant pronouncements of church leaders here and abroad, as well as a brief summary of proposals issuing from secular sources. Containing discussion questions and bibliography, this handbook, entitled "A Just and Durable Peace" will prove invaluable to local study groups. It may be obtained from the Commission to Study the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y. Price ten cents a single copy, including postage; five cents a copy on orders of 100 or more, plus postage.

III. The Use of This Document

Study groups may well explore further a number of specific problems suggested by a reading of Mr. Dulles' statement. Topics and questions indicated here are only intended as a guide.

A. Sanctions

1. What are sanctions?
2. In what instances, and with what effect have they been employed?
3. Could ample authority be exercised by an "international federation for peace", or by any sort of federation of nations without provision for sanctions?
4. Should we discriminate between "military" and "economic" sanctions?