

The American Mercury

13922-

THE FAILURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

BY

CHRISTOPHER NORBORG

HAVING fought the Axis dictatorships to a finish under a vow of "unconditional surrender," the democratic states proceeded to surrender the peace of the world unconditionally to another dictatorship "as absolute as any in the world," to quote the words of Franklin Roosevelt.

The United Nations represents the final fruitage of the democratic victories. But the fruits of a lasting victory do not go to the democracies. They have been handed over without reservation to the USSR, which openly professes its implacable enmity to the free institutions and free enterprise of Western democracy.

The UN was instituted as an ex-

pression of the united will of the peace-abiding states of the world. It was their declared purpose to suppress future aggressors by a standing military force representing the armed contingents of the great powers. Peaceful means of settling international disputes were to be provided so that there should never again be a global war.

But the admission of the Soviet Union, an anti-democratic power, to the Security Council has voided the possibility of effectual unanimity and joint action for the preservation of world peace. Military sanctions can be used only against states that are obviously too weak to attack any one of

CHRISTOPHER NORBORG is a philosopher and scholar who worked for UNRRA and OSS during the war. He is the author of several books, including *From Plato to Hitler*. This article is taken from a new book, *Operation Moscow*, to be published in August.

the great powers or to invade their known spheres of influence. Hence, the only preventable conflicts are those between small states, and on the face of it, great powers are not likely to intervene with force in such conflicts since they do not involve their vital interests.

'The Big Five powers, which have the strength to wage global war, alone or in combination, have been given the privilege of vetoing enforcement against themselves. This is of no harmful consequence insofar as four of these states are concerned. Britain and the United States have already outgrown the phase of territorial expansion and are now engaged in voluntarily relinquishing sovereignty over previously held territories and colonies. They have established firm policies of neighborliness and tolerance for foreign states. France is too weak to do more than cling to what she has. The foreign policies of the present Chinese government are peaceful.

Only the Soviet Union has an intolerant political philosophy and a recent record of territorial expansion and aggression against foreign states as in the case of the unprovoked war against Finland, the armed usurpation in the Baltic states, and the intimidation practiced in other foreign states where mass deportation, liquidation of political opposition and concentration camps have established the postwar rule of Stalinism.

In the light of these historic facts, it needs only common sense to perceive that the only source of danger to

world peace is the one remaining totalitarian power of major dimensions. The granting to the Kremlin of an unqualified veto of military sanctions means that the only possible source of disturbance to world peace can commit any future act of aggression or provocation with complete immunity from authorized hindrance or interference by the UN forces. The Soviet Union or any one of its numerous dependencies can launch an unprovoked war upon any state, large or small, with impunity so far as these armed forces are concerned. In order to breach the peace and at the same time to forestall armed intervention by the Security Council, the Generalissimo of the USSR has only to say "Yes" to his field commanders and to the Security Council the little word "No"!

The Soviet triumph over Hitlerism has proved to be an empty victory for the Russian people. Their patriotic loyalty to a government which for a whole generation has given them nothing but broken promises of freedom and prosperity has been rewarded by fresh purges and a new series of Five Year Plans in which adequate consumer goods for the masses have no place. The peace has ended in a triumph only for the autocrats of the Kremlin.

II

A successful operation in behalf of world peace and the liberation of the Russian working classes must provide, first of all, for military restraint of the

expansionist policies of the Politburo. The enlightened and peace-loving peoples of every continent, now joined in the United Nations, have surely seen and suffered more than enough from aggressive tyrannies to be willing to unite their strength and statesmanship for the purpose of putting would-be aggressors in quarantine until they become civilized or are overthrown by pressure from within.

Since any aggressive nation relies upon force, it becomes imperative that the operational plan of the free world recognize the primacy of military restraint. Such restraint cannot itself reform a dictatorship. But the preventive use of force is essential because it gains time for the operation of other civilizing factors — diplomatic, economic, ideological, moral, and, above all, spiritual — which can work most effectively only under conditions of peaceful evolution.

The quarantining of potentially dangerous dictatorships was the original policy of the late President Roosevelt. It was the program he advocated for a pernicious and intolerant tyranny at a time when he was not under the psychological and physical pressure of actual war. It was his policy before he had to purchase the cooperation of the Kremlin in fighting the madman of Berchtesgaden. Had his wise advocacy of a preventive quarantine by peace-loving powers been heeded, the dreadful sufferings of a second global war might perhaps have been avoided.

But that wisdom was greeted by a political charge of warmongering. The appeasers and pacifists were strongly entrenched and blind to the future aims of Germany — willfully blind because the head of the German state had submitted a blueprint of his mischievous designs in *Mein Kampf*. Today, once more, every suggestion of precautionary steps against the future aggression of the Soviet dictatorship is greeted in some quarters with charges of warmongering. But fortunately, it is no longer so easy to be willfully blind. One might still discount, if he chose, the published and detailed utterances in which the head of the Soviet Union has announced a program of worldwide and relentless hostility toward all democratic states whether they be capitalist or social-democratic. But honest people cannot fail to see the significance of the mountainous and ever-mounting evidence of underhanded violation by the Soviet Union of the basic wartime compacts with the Allies.

Obviously, the first step toward organizing a united military front for the prevention of Soviet expansion is to sweep away the last vestige of the delusion that the United Nations, as that international organization is now arranged, offers the slightest possibility for positive prevention of aggression. So long as this wishful notion is held, the democracies are actually inviting an outbreak of war by their adherence to an organization that can only serve to immobilize the defensive forces of democracy. Such immo-

bilization in turn would give the aggressor the priceless advantage of the initiative, and thereafter compel a desperate, all-out and prolonged global war for the survival of free men.

The time has come to face the truth that, incredible as it sounds, the United Nations is actually serviceable solely for the protection of the Kremlin and its sphere of influence. When the Soviet Union or any of its protégés is attacked by another state (as may well happen in view of the underhanded and pestiferous activities continually directed against foreign governments by Moscow's agents), the Kremlin can call for help from its "fellow democracies." On the other hand, when the Soviet Union or any of its satellites, or all of them together, launch an attack upon a fellow-member or members of the United Nations, that body then becomes itself the tool by which the Kremlin's veto power can nullify or divide the defensive forces of the peace-loving states of the whole world.

The United Nations cannot conceivably be used for the active protection of any state outside of the sphere of the USSR simply because the Communist Party, which controls the USSR, is only interested in the overthrow of any government that represents capitalism, socialism, labor unionism, or New Dealism, which are all characterized by Moscow as "rotten liberalism." In fact not one of the states now composing the United Nations, other than those that are purely Communistic or Communist-

dominated, has a form of government which is not abhorrent to militant and dogmatic Stalinism. Far from being willing to sacrifice their own hard-pressed people for the defense of any one of such states, it is the publicly declared policy of the Soviet state party to do everything possible to weaken and destroy all non-Communist states.

It is not enough to point out that the Kremlin swears no loyalty to the United Nations as an agency for the protection of democracies. The Soviets have their own alternative for world peace, namely, a worldwide Soviet. Times without number, Stalin and his associates have declared that wars spring from the economic crises that affect all capitalistic states. The Kremlin believes, therefore, that only the downfall of the democracies and their conformation to the Soviet pattern can guarantee a lasting world peace. Such a peace program cannot possibly be harmonized with that of the United Nations.

III

Rudimentary analysis thus suffices to prove that the Soviet Union will not cooperate to protect any kind of non-Soviet state under any future circumstances. The future defensive cooperation of the Soviet Union and its former allies is out of the question because the defeat of Germany and Japan has destroyed the only aggressive states strong enough to seek world domination and thus to make temporary comrades-in-arms of the Soviets and the democracies. Sec-

ondly, as has been noted, there would be no point in lending an armed contingent to defend a small democracy if the peace of the world were not involved. Moreover, the fact is that the self-centered and intolerant principles governing the Kremlin forbid its offer of troops for the protection and benefit of any weak democracy.

The Soviet Union in its treatment of its smaller neighbors has proved conclusively that, far from being willing to defend their independence and their property, it will itself strip them of these attributes of sovereignty in order to safeguard itself from the hazard of war. To go to battle for a small democracy would expose the Soviet Union to all the unpredictable losses and risks of war. And even Henry Wallace, the one-time spokesman for the rights of the "little fellow" and the small nation, has said: "You cannot expect a large nation to take any risks for the sake of a small nation, can you?" (*the Nation*, June 11, 1945).

But what of the defense of a small democracy in a conflict that might lead to a world war? Such a defense would necessarily involve the defense of the major democracies also. The USSR would be called upon to take risks in behalf of the United States and Great Britain in particular, because these states are vitally interested in the preservation of world peace. Would Moscow go to the aid of these states? Molotov has already given the answer when he said before the Assembly of the United Nations in

October 1946: "... We must take into account the possibility of an increased influence in certain countries of such aggressive, imperialist circles (as in defeated Germany and Japan) who for the sake of achieving world domination can embark upon a reckless aggression and the most hazardous military adventures." He then named England and the United States as the countries infected with this imperialistic trend.

The United States was especially singled out by Molotov as being dominated by "an irresistible trend toward expansion and unchallenged domination of the world." Such an obviously untrue statement may be a shocking insult to American citizens, but the fallacious dogma of the Marxist faith insists that imperialist expansion is the unavoidable fate of all capitalistic countries. All alike, therefore, are feared by the Soviet Union as potential enemies; and naturally the larger democracies are the most feared. They have been continually accused of forming a bloc against the USSR. Nothing could be more absurd, therefore, than to suppose that the Soviet Union would voluntarily bleed for the support, whether direct or indirect, of such declared enemies.

Since, upon analysis, it is clear that neither the small democracies nor the large ones are possible candidates for Soviet support in the Security Council, what other conclusion can be drawn but that the United Nations in its present setup is a total illusion as a protective agency for the peoples

who enjoy self-government and desire to live in peace with their neighbors?

The Kremlin under the veto provisions could prevent even publication of the invasion by its own troops of a peaceful country such as Greece, Turkey, Iran or Palestine. The Soviet delegate can deny to the so-called Security Council the privilege of even advising what shall be done if Yugoslavia should march through Trieste into Italy. A Soviet-inspired Polish invasion of Germany backed by Red troops could neither be stopped nor reprimanded! The Soviet vote, in short, paralyzes the entire United Nations, its military staff, military contingents nominally devoted to the halting of invasion by an enemy power, and all the other agencies set up by these bodies to prevent war. It is the deepest irony of the postwar era that the only practical significance of the United Nations is that of a protector of an anti-democratic dictatorship and a blanket license for the expansion of Stalinist militarism at the expense of weaker states.

In any event, it is beyond question or dispute that the decision as to whether or not there shall be another global war has been transferred from the fifty-five United Nations to the political bureau of a single state.

Stalin joined the United Nations reluctantly and has adhered to that organization only because it has given him everything he wanted and cost him nothing in return. From his vantage-point in the Security Council he is now enabled to set at naught the

joint will of the world for an assured peace based upon justice for all nations. So long as the present organization of the United Nations stands as the arbiter, peace must be forfeited or bought by unending appeasement of a Stalinist Moscow. This is the unconditional surrender of the United Nations.

Truth may be crushed to earth but it cannot be destroyed. Already the profound error that engendered the United Nations "writhes in pain," as Wordsworth wrote in another connection, "and dies among its worshippers." Nowhere more clearly than in the Council and Assembly of the United Nations is it realized that this organization is totally incapable of fulfilling the pledge of Yalta.

The veto provision cannot be amended without the concurrence of the one state that benefits from the retention of the veto. And the Soviet Union has served notice that the abolition of the veto would mean the "liquidation" of the United Nations. As Carl Berendsen, the New Zealand delegate to the United Nations, well said, "This infant organization has been brought into the world with its hands manacled and its feet fettered." Finally, the Soviet Union cannot be expelled from the United Nations, no matter how faithless its future conduct may prove.

IV

The Soviets plead incessantly for the preservation of the rule of "unanimity" among the great powers. But

there never was the slightest unanimity — one-mindedness — as between the Soviet Union and its allies. There was only the involuntary unity of objective and compulsory circumstances, namely, their simultaneous subjection to the attacks of a power-mad Nazi dictator intent upon overriding all non-Teutonic states. Those circumstances cannot be repeated in our generation. And, apart from such an adventitious cause of joint action, there can never again be any ground for even the appearance of unanimity or true like-mindedness between Moscow and the West.

No democratic state can claim to belong wholly to the category of "the good, the true and the beautiful." In spite of all the Atlantic Charters, this sad world is still far removed from such a Platonic ideal. But the democracies at least have their faces turned toward realization of the ideals of the dignity of man and of the spirit of fraternity that transcends social classes and national boundaries. The democracies enjoy the chastening benefit of the self-imposed criticism of free speech and a free press. They are, therefore, progressively constrained by the concepts of liberty under law and a peace based upon justice. The Soviet autocracy, to the contrary, has turned its back upon all these fundamental values of an advanced social order, sacrificing every truly human value for the expediencies of its own security and power. Bringing the spokesmen of these two opposing conceptions of

statehood into a single Security Council has only served to accentuate their irreconcilable differences.

The rank and file of the common people of the democracies performed magnificently in battle, in the underground forces, on the high seas, and in the mills of industry. They left to their statesmen and diplomats the comparatively easy task of keeping the peace they had won in "blood and toil and tears and sweat."

It needed no miracle to achieve that lasting peace. It needed only an extension of the same spirit and the same technique by which every state preserves the peace within its own borders. But the political leaders of democracy have lacked the vision and the courage of their own peoples.

In conclusion, these simple truths emerge as self-evident. The present widespread fear of World War III could not exist if the United Nations were capable of fulfilling the Yalta pledge of peace maintenance. The existence of that fear advertises both the total failure of the United Nations and the immediate necessity of adopting new measures to redeem that pledge. It is a pledge made sacred by the shed blood of millions of free men. Its present violation is an affront to the dead and to the living. That affront must cease. The world demands an end to war, and the means to that end is at hand.

For the Charter of the United Nations itself provides for the independent action of its members to insure the peace of the world under the

present circumstances. Pending the coming into force of the agreements of the several states to supply specific armed contingents to the Security Council, Chapter XVII provides for "transitional security arrangements." The Big Five are authorized to consult with one another and, as occasion requires, with other members of the United Nations, with a view to whatever joint action may be needed "for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security." Of course, such "joint action" need not involve the active cooperation of all the Big Five if such cooperation is not needed or would not be in the best interests of "international peace and security." The democratic states are free to enter into arrangements for joint action to that end.

It seems to have been overlooked, moreover, that the above provision is not permissive but mandatory. The verb is "shall." Since the police contingents of the Security Council have not been apportioned and ratified to date, and since the fear of war persists, it is the duty of the permanent members of the Council, together with such other states as they wish to consult, to take steps to set up a temporary or "transitional" peace enforcement agency. More to the point, *no right of veto obtains over decisions arising from such present consultation of the Big Five.* A majority opinion can prevail.

The elimination of the veto arises from the fact that the obligation of consultation and joint action is de-

rived from the Four-Nation Declaration of October 30, 1943, to which the name of France was added. The inclusion of "other members" of the United Nations in such consultation is not limited to members of the Security Council, and hence eliminates any possibility of the veto right. Any arrangement thus made for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security must be terminated when "in the opinion of the Security Council" that body is enabled to begin the exercise of its responsibilities as a police enforcement agency. But such an opinion obviously requires an affirmative vote. And here the Kremlin is hoist by its own petard. Its affirmative vote for the termination of the existing plan of "joint action" cannot override the negative vote of even one democratic member of the Big Five who holds that the Security Council is not qualified to maintain the peace of the world.

Thus, the truly peace-loving democracies are not merely free to proceed at once to institute a genuine peace enforcement agency; they are duty bound to do so. Nor need they later surrender such an agency in favor of the fictitious police force of the present Security Council, unless and until they have received satisfactory assurances and factual guarantees of the pacific intentions of the armed forces of the Soviet Union, its secret police, its satellite states and its worldwide network of political agents.

But the right and sovereign obligation of the democratic states to look

beyond the Security Council for a means of policing world peace at the present time does not rest solely upon the expediency of the Four-Nation Declaration and the foregoing technicalities. It is affirmed as an inherent prerogative, and without any qualifications whatever, by Article 51 of the Charter, as follows:

Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

The Security Council has not taken such measures at this writing, and will not have done so until it has (a) secured an adequate police force and (b) removed the present threat that the Kremlin will veto the use of such a force for the protection of democratic states against its own aggression or that of other anti-democratic powers. The securing of an adequate police force will require an amendment of the UN Charter for reasons to which attention will be directed in due course. The removal of the second handicap of the Security Council will require a radical amendment in the government of the Soviet Union.

Needless to say, the "inherent right" of the members of the United Nations to repel an attack by means of "collective self-defense" includes also the inherent right to foresee and forestall such an attack by setting up in advance the means of collective self-defense. No defense against modern

weapons would be effective without adequate collective planning and collective arming against every possible source of aggressive attack, including an attack by the USSR. Therefore, in the absence of fully and finally effective provisions for the preservation of the peace by the Security Council, the members of the United Nations are clearly permitted by the Charter of that organization to institute collective measures for self-defense, and to maintain them until the day and hour when, in their sole judgment and in the exercise of their inherent, inalienable and sovereign right to national security, the Security Council is ready to take over the duty of their collective defense.

In the execution of this responsibility for self-preservation and for the avoidance of World War III, the democracies are under no obligation to consult with the Soviet Union if they do not deem such consultation essential to their safety. Article 51 requires no such consultation, and no Kremlin veto bars effective security arrangements.

v

The fact that it is necessary to go outside of the present conventions of the United Nations in order to safeguard the peace has now become a generally accepted tenet. The Atomic Development Authority proposed by the United States was originally designed to operate independently of the United Nations, if necessary. Other proposals relating to the regulation of

armaments would require independently negotiated conventions and a separate treaty or treaties.

Fortunately, the independent means by which the democracies can create immediate world security are already in partial existence and can be easily and quickly perfected. These means, moreover, can be developed not only without prejudice to the United Nations, but rather as the most effective instrumentality for the eventual empowerment of the Security Council. Indeed, the means in question are given preferential treatment in the UN Charter itself, as we shall presently point out. While they are designed to operate independently, they can be and should be placed at the disposal of the Security Council whenever it is disposed to take affirmative action for the preservation of the peace. In such case the democracies will be prepared to cooperate fully and heartily with the forces of the Soviet Union. This fact and the fact that the proposed instrumentality is authorized both generally and particularly by the Charter signify that a new and effective enforcement agency can be instituted without the slightest affront to the dignity or security of the Soviet Union.

Second only to the obligation every government owes to its own people for their national security is the obligation to preserve and defend the United Nations as the forum of the peace-loving peoples of the world. But it is the General Assembly and not the Security Council that embod-

ies and voices the hopes and aspirations of the common people. It is in the Assembly that the world becomes for the first time a single neighborhood. The founders of the United Nations wisely drew a sharp line of demarcation between the functions of the Assembly and the Council. The former forms policies. The latter is merely an executor and is undemocratic in its very composition. The fact that it has failed to perform its principal office of guaranteeing the peace of the world does not justify pessimism with respect to the beneficent rôle of the General Assembly.

But the Assembly itself cannot hope to survive unless the abortive Security Council is replaced by another organization of unquestioned competency to enforce a peace based upon justice. That the Assembly will welcome such a substitute for the present misnamed and incurably hamstrung Council cannot be doubted. By a smashing majority the Assembly has already rebuked the Soviet Union for its abuse of the veto privilege. Other proposals by which the Kremlin sought to obtain one-sided military information of vital value to the democracies were voted down by equally emphatic majorities. Were the members of the United Nations to be assured of the protection of an agency controlled by genuinely peaceful powers, they would find renewed inspiration in the councils of the Assembly, and the United Nations would begin to fulfill the dreams of the millions who fought to make democracy safe.

But, before setting forth the formula for a new and valid peace enforcement agency, we must first take note of the latest and most sinister of the ruses by which Moscow has perverted the United Nations to her own exclusive benefit. Not content with having intrigued the democracies into surrendering the whole decision of international war or peace into the hands of the Soviet dictatorship, that self-confessed foe of political democracy has now ensnared the short-memored diplomats of Washington, London and Paris into the very same disarmament lure that paved the way for Hitler's easy victories over France and England, and the Japanese triumphs of Pearl Harbor and the Philippines. This scheme was railroaded through

the Assembly at the close of its December 1946 meeting when the hall was half empty, and before the delegates had grasped its real implications.

It is not enough that the Kremlin stands squarely in the doorway of the Security Council where it can bar the democracies from receiving the protection of the prospective international police force. The next move is to strip these all too trusting states of their own weapons of individual self-defense and their only means of developing their own collective security. Such a strategy would remove the last hindrance to that world conquest of Communism to which Stalin publicly, solemnly and irrevocably dedicated himself, his associates and his successors at the death of Lenin.

JUNE NIGHTS

BY G. E. HUNTER

Two spires of yucca bloom beside the door
Of her neat bungalow; a well-pruned vine
Makes frugal shadow all along the floor.
In her prim garden in the morning shine
She takes a walk with steps precise and slow.
When she could have a child, she had no child.
And she was widowed a long time ago;
No wonder she is virginal and mild,
And cannot understand the gaiety
Of laughing girls when every joyous air
That titillates the dainty poplar tree
Is fingering their warm breasts and lips and hair.
June nights what can she know of youth's queer craze
When yucca flowers pale by dark doorways.