Dr. Jay Orear, Capt. John H. Morse, Jr., and Rep. Charles O. Porter enjoying a moment of relaxation at the World Affairs Institute.

World Police? Another Approach

(*Charlotte Observer*—July 25, 1959)

Many students of warfare are convinced that development of the nuclear bomb and intercontinental missiles has virtually nullified the prospect of future conflict on a global scale.

The destructive potential of such weapons and the certainty that an enemy would retaliate in kind argue, they reason, against their use in anger.

If that be true, the theory goes, the most effective instrument for lasting peace would be an international police force, within the structure of the United Nations, that could be dispatched to any part of the world where "brush wars" threaten.

It makes a persuasive premise. But foes of the "one world" concept, and nations unwilling to yield any part of their national sovereignty to U.N. control, make it unlikely that such a combined policing agency will come into being any time soon.

Recognizing the difficulties, Liberal Leader Lester B. Pearson, of Canada, has advanced an alternate proposal.

Pearson would have half-a-dozen or more of the lesser powers—countries such as Canada, for example—equip and train their own contingents for international service. These units would be made available for international service, as a coordinated force, if the United Nations called for their assistance.

This is no plan of a crackpot. Pearson, by reason of his U.N. activity, is one of the more influential world statesmen. He won the Nobel Prize for his leadership in stopping the British-French-Israeli-Egyptian fighting during the Suez crisis.

The proposal, moreover, has a good deal of merit. Such a force need not be heavily armed. Even with small arms, a couple of thousand men dropped into a trouble spot when danger threatens, might be able to contain the flareup.

It could be more effective than the hastily-organized "emergency units" that the U.N. has called upon in the Middle East, and more impressive, in any case, than "moral suasion."

New York City Tour Planned For Fall

A new chartered bus trip to New York City for the winners of the High School World Peace Study and Speaking Program and their teachers has been planned for this Fall. The dates have been set for November 1-5.

This new tour has been designed for those who would prefer to spend an extra day in New York, eliminating the usual day spent in Washington, D. C. The United Nations is in full swing during the Fall months, whereas this is not the case during the Spring when the trip is usually held. The extra time in New York will be divided between special sessions at United Nations Headquarters and interviews and visits to such places as Quaker House. Detailed information regarding this itinerary will appear in the next BULLETIN.

The chartered bus trip scheduled for April will not be changed by the addition of a Fall trip. The Spring tour will be basically the same, including Washington, D. C. and interviews with the North Carolina Senators. Consequently, the students and teachers will be able to choose the tour which best suits their interests.

In order to insure the success of both the Fall and Spring tours, the high schools must register for the Speaking Program just as soon as school is in session in September. Contact the principal of your local high school as soon as you receive the Speaking Program materials.

★ ★ ★

U. N. Urged To Sift 'Genocide' In Tibet

The International Commission of Jurist Friday urged the United Nations to investigate reported attempts by the Chinese Communists to obliterate the national life of the people of Tibet.

"What at the moment appears to be attempted genocide may become the full act of genocide unless prompt and adequate action is taken," the commission said in a preliminary report on Tibet. The total of slain Tibetans has been put at 65,000.

The nonpolitical organization, representing 30,000 judges, lawyers and professors of law, said the evidence collected so far points "at least to a prima-facie case of genocide against the People's Republic of China."

Number One On The Agenda

Editorial by NORMAN COUSINS

Saturday Review, 15 Aug. '59

No single event since the end of the Second World War is more promising or imaginative than the forthcoming exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Chairman Khrushchev. This exchange represents in a very real sense the culmination of the reciprocal visits of officials, scholars, scientists, educators, doctors, authors. The President and the Chairman will be able for the first time to have unobstructed access not only to basic viewpoints but to the thinking behind those viewpoints. They can consider not only the desirability of a relaxation of tensions. They can consider specific structural problems involved in the building of durable peace. Most of all, they will be able to work with fresh facts. For the world situation is not what it was only a few years ago. The change is represented not only by the increase in the destructive power of new weapons. It is represented by a basic change in the nature of the contest between the United States and the Soviet Union.

What was primarily once an ideological struggle is now primarily a balance-of-power struggle. Every point outside the two nations becomes an area of actual or potential contention. Whether the balance of power is measured by influence in the administration of another nation, or indirect control, or military bases, or arms supremacy makes little difference. Each side will attempt to bolster its security with all the means at its disposal.

The ideological factors are important, of course. They accelerate the present danger but they no longer totally define the present danger. The danger is that both sides—and indeed the world—will try to get by without a structured peace.

What is meant by a structured peace? First, that the individual nations be deprived of the means and opportunity for carrying out the mass murder of other peoples and nations. Second, that the legitimate needs of national security be underwritten by a world authority with adequate and workable machinery. Third, that this authority be empowered to enforce its decisions in matters of common security based on clearly defined law. Fourth, that a world legislative body, a world executive body, and a world judicial body be combined into a single functioning whole for carrying out world law.

Is there any likelihood that the Russians would be willing to work for this kind of structured peace? Wherever I went in the Soviet Union, I pressed as hard as I could for an answer. The answers I received were almost identical with the ones I had heard in the United States. World law was too idealistic. It couldn't possibly be achieved in time to do any good. It interfered with national sovereignty. It represented a danger to a nation's political or economic system. It ignored the political and cultural differences that separated the peoples of the world. Finally, it was said that if the Soviet Union and the United States could agree on the day-to-day questions, then no world authority was necessary. And if they couldn't agree on the day-to-day questions, then no world authority could make them agree.

As I say, the answers were the same as those one meets in the United States. What is not sufficiently realized, either there or here, is that day-to-day agreements must depend on enforceable arrangements for either side to be secure. And enforceable arrangements require in the very nature of the case an objective authority with adequate power in which all members have confidence. The very absence of such an enforceable authority intensifies the insecurity and the consequent dangers.

Lee Hall—Blue Ridge Assembly, Inc., Black Mountain, North Carolina.

Though American public opinion still has far to go before we have a national censensus in favor of world law, it is important and encouraging that both the President and Vice-President have spoken eloquently of the need for world law and are making this issue increasingly central in their public discussions. If this subject can become number one on the American agenda, then we may be justified in carrying it over into our conversations with the Russians. And, in the happy event that the head of each government will be given access to public opinion in the other's country, there is the prospect that the President may be able to speak directly to the Russian people about the problems of a structured peace.

That a structured peace is more difficult to bring into being than space ships or atomic-powered submarines there can be no doubt. Survival requires much more than advanced gadgetry; it requires historical knowledge, insight, inspiration, patience, a genius for persuasion, and an overpowering respect for human life and the rights of the next generation. But difficulty of this sort is the proper business of leadership. And the role of the individual in helping to fashion such leadership continues to be the key one.

In any event, the main question is not whether the Americans know how to make better color television sets than the Russians, or whether the Russians know how to make better Sputniks than the Americans. The question is whether the Americans and the Russians, in combination, know how to make peace.

For it is not what the Americans can do by themselves, or what the Russians can do by themselves, that kill determine the shape or the splendor of their societies. Their destinies will be determined by their mutual ability to create and sustain a *structured* peace. If they should fail in this enterprise, then all their other enterprises—the giant turbines, hydroelectric power installations, mass-assembly belts, housing projects, jet planes, rockets, supermarkets, superhighways, or ballet theatres—all these will serve only as monuments to the scientific genius and political imbecility of a race of extinct warriors.—N. C.