



To the Class of '48

NO ONE has to tell you that much of the ground has slipped away on which the world had hoped only three years ago to build a sound and enduring peace. No one has to tell you that the small and very precious ground yet remaining will be used up completely if present world tensions continue to mount and multiply as they have in recent months.

And so, we ask ourselves: How did all this come about? What about the United Nations? Why should we now be faced with the very emergencies that the United Nations was designed to prevent?

Today, after having traveled for almost three years on the road from San Francisco, it is not too soon to measure our progress, to see where we are, and, more importantly, to see where we are going. The time has come to take a good, long, hard look at the United Nations as it stands today.

The time has come to take a general inventory of accomplishments and failures, strength and weakness.

The time has come to face up to whatever that inventory reveals and requires.

The time has come to make it possible for all peoples — all peoples everywhere — to rekindle their faith in the promise of the United Nations.

The time has come to justify that faith.

* * *

If we wonder why it is that the United Nations has so far been unable to carry out its original purposes, we have only to consider these three obstacles:

(1) The United Nations lacked the necessary authority to deal so early

in its development with major emergencies.

(2) The United Nations lacked the machinery of enforcement to carry out its decisions.

(3) The Unanimity Principle of the Security Council blocked effective action by the very agency set up to enforce the peace.

Under the circumstances, the United States found itself forced into the role of an emergency fire department, rushing here and there around the world to do what it could to stamp out early flames before they became a general conflagration.

There is no point in fooling ourselves. No one nation can be expected to prevent or put out all the fires indefinitely. Nor can one nation be expected to minister to the world's ills indefinitely, or act as a policeman indefinitely.

In the long run, the health and well-being of the world will best be served by common action—by a pooling not only of material resources but of the much deeper and richer spiritual resources. Such common action can and must be developed within a revitalized United Nations. For three years we have protected and sheltered the organization through its infancy and growing pains. We have kept from it many of the burdensome issues under whose weight the organization might have collapsed.

But we can postpone the coming-of-age no longer. If we want the United Nations to do a man-sized job of keeping the peace, we shall have to give it more than boy-sized authority. The United Nations must become the heart, soul, and body of world law, with legs and arms to carry it where it has to go to protect the peace and enforce the peace. That is why it is imperative that the United States propose a review conference of the United Nations under Article 109 of the Charter.

Nations today, large and small, are insecure. In the absence of a world organization with sufficient powers to insure their safety, they find it necessary to embark understandably on vast military programs. And since almost every portion of the globe is strategically important for military reasons, the nations are inevitably competing with each other to control—militarily or politically or both—as much of the surface of the earth as possible.

Therefore, the initial job of such a review conference would be to find out what type of strengthening of the United Nations would be essential before member nations would feel secure enough both to call a moratorium on militarism and to relinquish control of external areas.

As part of such a discussion, it is to be hoped that the United States would emphasize that a strengthened United Nations means adequate powers to make, enforce, and maintain world law. It is to be hoped that we would make clear our willingness to be part of such a strengthened UN. For only if the United Nations has these adequate powers should we ourselves be willing to modify or halt our program of military preparedness. We want to be certain that any disarmament program will not be a one-way street traveled by most of the nations in the thought that it is the true road to peace while other nations are speeding down a secret highway to surprise aggression.

The problem, then, is twofold:

(1) Provide for a police force with adequate powers to stop aggressions or violation of world law anywhere in the world.

(2) Draw up a time-table for the creation and building-up of the police force in such a way that no nation will be without means of insuring its safety until the United Nations forces are adequate.

The new warfare, with its many new weapons of mass destruction, must be brought under control. We are referring not only to atomic weapons but to all the fantastic new killers that have been or can be developed in the world's laboratories.

BUT control requires power. This power must be carefully defined and screened so that it will be responsible at all times. The United States should be opposed to any attempt to invest the United Nations with a large police force unless that force is made responsible by operating out of the institutions of law. World law must be enacted with the utmost care, and all questions of possible violations brought before a world court.

Against such a background, the police force could more properly be called a "peace force."

Another point America might submit to a review conference is that the peace of the world is too important to be removed from the individual. At Nuremberg, the United Nations established the principle of individual guilt. For nations are only aggregations of individuals. Nations do not make war. Only individuals can make war. But the United States should be opposed to any extension of world law bearing upon the individual except for those cases clearly affecting the common security. The secret manufacture of outlawed weapons, for example, would constitute a threat to the common security of the peoples of the world. No nation

(Continued on page 29)

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

"Appointment on the Hill"

SIR: Lilian T. Mowrer, an intriguing woman, reviewed "Appointment on the Hill," by Dorothy Detzer, a "gallant woman" [SRL May 8]. I am seldom inclined to write letters disagreeing with a critic but in this case I feel that the controversy should not rest between two women, the issue on which the review went off. I certainly don't want anybody to infer from this letter that I am against women or that I agree thoroughly either with Mowrer or Detzer. I want to make clear that even women have a right to differ but I want to record that I think "Appointment on the Hill" is an interesting and honest document of material value and entertainment.

MORRIS L. ERNST.

New York, N. Y.

Before Kinsey—Lies!

SIR: Your discussion of Dr. Alfred Kinsey's "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male" [SRL May 8] is intelligent and constructive. Until Dr. Kinsey's book became available I had never heard a single word of truth spoken or being written.

You will please all who think by encouraging the perusal of Dr. Kinsey's book and by all means Dr. Kinsey should be persuaded to continue his labors.

SCOTLAND G. HIGHLAND.

Clarksburg, W. Va.

Edman on Trial

SIR: I have never seen from the pen of a man of such alleged erudition as Irwin Edman such a revelation of bigotry and abysmal ignorance as in his review of "Civilization on Trial" [SRL May 1]. One would think that a man could not be both a scholar and a Christian. He seems to assume that a man could only be an enthusiastic Christian if he had no knowledge of other religions and that any investigation into such fields would reduce him to a very mild enthusiasm for his own faith; very mild indeed. The professor, poor man, has never heard of the learned and frightening Orientalists in the Roman Catholic Communion?

Certainly the Christian religion has a primacy among religions to its own believers. Any person who can read and write would concede that, were its lofty precepts and stern moral code adhered to, it would have long since accomplished the conversion of even such fancy pagans as Professor Edman. I have read Spinoza, John Dewey, and Santayana and they all seem to be about as full of balderdash as Edman. Fugitives from a system of thought to which they owe much and which, forswearing, they cannot concede any virtue to.

Who ever heard of speaking of moral values and not including the supernatural? Moral values are supernatural; the very word spiritual, of the spirit, connotes the supernatural, for who can see the spirit? We can but perceive it.

For sweet charity's sake, someone



THROUGH HISTORY

WITH J. WESLEY SMITH

"I declare that this land is now part of the United States, and that the time is one hour later—I mean one hour earlier—I mean, well, if it's seven o'clock here, then it's . . ."

should buy the professor a year's subscription to Fordham's *Thought*. Among those pages he might find some example of the tolerance characteristic of the true scholar. At one time I numbered some of his devotees among my acquaintance; wherever they are, they should be hanging their heads.

ELIZABETH G. LAMB.

New York, N. Y.

SIR: The level of criticism to which Mrs. Lamb rises is exemplified by her opening sentence. In apparent confusion as to who is bigoted and ignorant, she says, "I have read Spinoza, John Dewey, and Santayana, and they all seem to be about as full of balderdash as Edman." I should almost be tempted to settle for that!

But full of fury as is Mrs. Lamb's letter (and fury is not a substitute for analysis), it makes precisely the assumptions which Mr. Toynbee seemed to me to be making in his conclusions about history and civilization. "Who ever heard of speaking of moral values and not including the supernatural?" I did, and I constantly do, and so do the readers of Aristotle's "Ethics" (a book, I believe, greatly admired at Fordham), and of Spinoza, Dewey, Mill, and Santayana. "Moral values," says Miss Lamb, "are supernatural." That is precisely the question which cannot be, "for sweet charity's sake"—not to add for sweet logic's and for sweet truth's sake—so smugly assumed. Matter generates spiritual values as the soil nourishes and sustains trees and flowers, as the candle burns into flame. Spiritual values are those ends to which life tends and in which too fitfully it culminates. To insist that spirit exists in the way in which matter exists is simply to assume a second-story material world.

I cannot undertake to argue the whole issue of the secular versus the religious in this brief space. But I can reiterate that there is a serious case, argued by very serious and competent thinkers, like Spinoza, Dewey,

and Santayana, that moral values are possible on a secular basis, may even spiritual values, and that there are other and more plausible ways of reading the meaning of history than in the narrow, recent terms of the Christian story or the Christian metaphysics. I was questioning what seemed to me Mr. Toynbee's imposition of Christian assumptions on his analysis of the meaning of history. I still do.

I am glad my "devotees" have scampered out of Mrs. Lamb's orbit. They wouldn't be safe or happy in it.

IRWIN EDMAN.

New York, N. Y.

SIR: Religion is not a matter of demonstrable proof any more than the tenets of naturalism, dialectical materialism, or humanism. They are accepted by the believer. They never are the product of experiment. Any system of philosophy, religious or otherwise, is only logical within its own framework. Comparison between systems should be made only in reference to tenets accepted or conclusions justified by its own dogmas. Professor Edman was right in his analysis of Toynbee, but the criticism could have been just as destructive if made from the traditional Christian position. The same thing happened several months ago in connection with the review of C. S. Lewis's book on "Miracles" [SRL Jan. 31].

(FATHER) WILLIAM JOHN SHANE.
Delhi, N. Y.

Coleridge Letters

SIR: With the kind consent and cooperation of the Coleridge family in England, I am preparing an edition of the complete correspondence of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. I shall be grateful for any information concerning the whereabouts of Coleridge letters.

EARL LESLIE GRIGGS.

Department of English,
University of California,
Los Angeles 24, Calif.

JUNE 12, 1948

21