

SENATE RESOLUTION 183

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER 24 (legislative day, OCTOBER 22), 1945

Mr. TAYLOR submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the
Committee on Foreign Relations

RESOLUTION

Whereas the atomic bomb and other new and terrible instruments of warfare make it possible that most of mankind and civilization itself may be destroyed should the world become involved in another war; and

Whereas even before the soldiers of this war have returned to their homes another race between nations is already under way to train ever greater armies and to produce more scientifically diabolical weapons in the largest possible numbers; and

Whereas we believe that not only the people of the United States but an overwhelming majority of all people in all countries are sickened by wars, senseless slaughter, and the burdens of great military establishments and crave only peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby calls upon the delegates of the United States of America to the United Nations Organization prayerfully and earnestly to redouble their efforts to secure world-wide agreement to—

Limit and reduce immediately and eventually to abolish armaments, outlaw military training and conscription except for such police forces as the Security Council of the United Nations Organization may deem necessary to preserve the peace of the world; outlaw the manufacture of weapons and instruments of war of every kind and nature, including atomic bombs and all other atomic weapons, except for such weapons as the Security Council of the United Nations Organization may deem necessary to preserve the peace of the world; provide for an international police force capable of enforcing these agreements; be it further

Resolved. That because the creation of an international police force requires adequate international civil authority for its control and mindful of the long and continued peaceful relations between the forty-eight States of our own Republic and being hopeful that similar principles of government if applied to all men will secure to the world the greatest possible opportunity for everlasting peace, we therefore urge that every possible effort of our delegates to the United Nations Organization be directed toward the ultimate goal of establishing a world republic based upon democratic principles and universal suffrage regardless of race, color, or creed; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to use the great powers and influence of his high office toward achieving the purposes of this resolution by instructing the delegates of the United States to the United Nations Organization to propose at the First Assembly of that Organization the creation of a commission to prepare the drafts of the requisite international conventions, agreements, and treaties for the establishment of the world republic proposed by this resolution.

WHY A WORLD REPUBLIC?

by

GLEN H. TAYLOR

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM IDAHO

Idaho's junior senator, Glen Taylor, climbed the political ladder luring listeners with banjo and song—then urging his plans for peace through world cooperation. His audiences liked his ideas so well that they pushed him up through local government to Congress where he fought for the Bretton Woods Agreements and the ratification of the UNC. In October he introduced Senate Resolution 183, calling for a "World Republic"—the first time in history such an idea has been officially presented to the legislature of a major nation. Below he tells why he did it.

MY reasons for submitting to the Senate of the United States the resolution calling for the creation of a World Republic are extremely personal. I have two small sons. Like parents the world over, Mrs. Taylor and I did not bring them into this world only to have them die in World War III.

Having been elected to the Senate by the people of Idaho, I have a direct responsibility toward the parents of the children in that state whose names may well be on the casualty lists of another war. I promised the men and women who sent me to represent them in Washington that my every effort would be devoted to a world organization for a lasting peace. The teachings I received from my own mother and father would have been futile if I did not live up to those promises!

When the Charter of the United Nations Organization was presented to the United States Senate for ratification, I was among the eighty-nine members who voted "Yea" when the roll was called. The United Nations Organization came into being officially on October 24, 1945—the day on which I introduced my resolution into the Senate. It is my sincere belief that the World Republic envisaged in that resolution can be created only through the medium of the United Nations Organization. There was no intention on my part in introducing the resolution to weaken or destroy the months of hard work that went into the preparation of the United Nations Charter or to call for the abolishment of the United Nations Organization. Instead, my only wish is to strengthen that association of nations—to extend it into its logical, final form, a World Republic.

To employ an oft-used historical comparison, I consider the United Nations Charter in its present form as the present-day counterpart of our own Articles of Confederation. The original thirteen colonies on this continent faced precisely the same situation that the nations on the six continents of the globe face today. They had a loose organization, a league of friendship, among the colonies, and it was inadequate. They argued and squabbled among themselves. They made no progress toward economic well-being. They fought among themselves.

At that time it was said that the thirteen colonies were too vast to be encompassed in one government. It was suggested that they should be divided into spheres of influence, so to speak, even as has been suggested for the nations of the world at the present time. It was suggested that a certain group of colonies should be in one confederation, another group in another confederation and a third group in still another confederation because the colonies were too big to be united in one republic. But our founding fathers thought better of that and so created the United States of America.

It is contended today that the world is too large for one republic, that there should be spheres of influence and confederations of nations in various sections of the world. I do not believe in that theory—I am unalterably opposed to that theory because spheres of influence have always been the prime ingredients of the witch's brew of suspicion between peoples, of international political and economic rivalry and of oppression of the dominated peoples within those spheres—all of which have invariably led to war in the past.

DECEMBER, 1945

27

There are some who claim that to establish a world-wide republic is impracticable and impossible because of the many races and religions and varying standards of living in the world. Here in America we also have many races and religions, and we also have greatly varying standards of living—not only between different classes but between the several sections of our country. Even in Canada, different languages are spoken in various regions of that democracy. It is claimed by many that we cannot even hope to get along peacefully with Russia—let alone join with her in a World Republic—because she has an economic system different from ours. We should bear in mind that Canada has a socialist government in the Province of Saskatchewan, but to date, it has not brought violence or revolution or even serious misunderstanding with the remainder of the Dominion.

MANY people who shudder at the idea of a World Republic fear that their country would lose control of its domestic affairs. That same fear was present in the minds of the citizens of the thirteen colonies who opposed the Federal Union by the Constitution. Let us examine for a moment what principal powers would have to be granted to the government of the World Republic by those of the present nations. The thirteen colonies, jealous of their rights, granted to the federal government their greatest single right—that of raising armies. What was the most important result of that grant? The peaceful solution of all disputes between the states! Aside from any will of the disputing states to avoid armed conflict, they were powerless to resort to arms to settle their differences because they did not possess military establishments! This, to my mind, is the all-encompassing reason for creating a World Republic.

The forty-eight states of the federal union still have their own legislatures, still have complete control over their own domestic affairs except in those matters which they themselves have decided could best be controlled by the federal government. Obviously, for example, a single monetary system has worked to the advantage of the individual states. The absence of tariff barriers between the states has made of the United States the greatest market the world has ever known. The institution of the Federal Reserve Banking System has been of great aid in developing the more economically backward areas of the country: we

look to the same progress for the world under the international banking system envisaged by the Bretton Woods Agreements. But the states still have control of the banks within their borders.

And over even those powers which the states granted to the federal government, the people of the states still exercise control through their representatives in Congress. The federal government is, therefore, not a limitation of the sovereignty of the individual states but instead an extension of that sovereignty. True, the individual state cannot do exactly as it pleases—but neither can the individual citizen! I question whether any state—or nation—has today complete control over its sovereignty. Under the provisions of the Constitution, only the Congress of the United States has the right to declare war. But how much control did the United States have over its entry into World War II? The decision as to whether or not this nation would go to war with the Axis Powers did not rest with us—the decision was made for us by the war lords in Tokyo, Berlin and Rome. The only decision left to us was whether we would fight to retain our democratic way of life or submit to complete domination by the military criminals Hirohito, Hitler and Mussolini!

BUT all this, I sincerely believe, is nothing more than abstract theorizing. The atomic bomb and the other incredibly horrible weapons which have been developed, and which are still being developed, leave us but few alternatives, give us but little time to decide whether or not we shall live together peacefully or die together in a world at war. The thirteen colonies, had they failed to form that “more perfect Union,” could have fought each other only with inadequate flint-locks and ineffective muzzle-loading cannon. But the fifty-odd countries of the present world, if they fail to form a World Republic, will fight each other with atomic bombs! That is what we face in this world: nations armed with atomic rocket bombs aimed at the vital centers of other nations, with a technician sitting at a button on a control-board, ready to press it and spread destruction to an entire nation—and all the nations of the world living in dread and fear. We know now that atomic bombs of tremendous explosive power can be produced in such small size as could be hidden inside an ordinary loaf of bread. Such bombs secretly planted in cities can be exploded ten years later by radio



Senator Taylor with the very personal reasons for his resolution.

impulse from a plane flying at forty or fifty thousand feet overhead at night!

In this connection, let me quote a few of the men who really know the destructive power of atomic bombs:

Dr. Harold Ulrey, one of the scientists who helped develop the bombs:

"Unless we can devise some plan to prevent the manufacture of atomic bombs we shall live in constant fear of sudden and violent death. A world of vast fear and apprehension will be our lot and that of our children.

"We must understand that the most devastating weapon of all times is now in our hands and will soon be in the hands of other industrialized countries."

Dr. Robert R. Wilson, who foresees atomic bombs thousands of times more powerful than the ones dropped on Hiroshima, said on behalf of the Los Alamos scientists:

"Efforts to keep it from other nations will lead to an unending war more savage than the last."

Counter-measures would be extremely difficult and uncertain because of the concentrated form of destructive energy and the large number of possible methods of delivery. Advantage would lie with the aggressor. A single heavy attack, lasting a matter of minutes, might destroy the ability of a nation to defend itself further. The bomb is a deadly challenge to civilization itself.

Dr. Shapley of Harvard University stated:

"The future, if it is to be made safe for civilization, is one in which narrowly national interests diminish and world-wide responsibilities increase."

And President Truman had this to say to

his neighbors in Kansas City, before the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima:

"It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for us to get along in the Republic of the United States."

I know that he spoke from his heart, but I think that since that time he has had too many "practical" advisers tell him that it is absolutely impossible even to think of a World Republic and, therefore, we should arm to fight instead of seeking peace through such a world government.

I know how that is: I went through a similar experience with my resolution. Every layman with whom I discussed the World Republic favored the idea but my political friends advised against introducing the resolution—not on the grounds that the World Republic was an unworkable idea but rather that it was politically impractical. I decided that discussing the World Republic idea with those friends was a poor course to pursue, because if I kept on I would be in the sad position of submitting my resolution over the good advice of every politician I knew. So I ceased and desisted and presented the resolution on my own initiative because in my heart I am convinced that a World Republic through the United Nations Organization is the only possible solution to the problem of attaining permanent world peace.

THE idea of a World Republic is not something that I thought of on the spur of the moment. I have studied the problem for a good many years. But, of course, when the atomic bomb fell on Hiroshima, the effect upon me was something like that of a man turning around and seeing a grizzly bear on his tracks! It hurried me up a little—I thought more intensely on the subject and did considerably more research and study. Then, the apparent failure of the first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers in London to achieve anything concrete and the obvious trend of the thoughts of many world leaders toward the necessity of great national military establishments both spurred my thoughts. The growing wave of pessimism which is sweeping the world and the fear of ordinary men and women that World War III is not too far away decided my course of action.

Recently I asked my friends and chance ac-

quaintances what they thought of the idea of a World Republic as the most sensible and practical way of maintaining peace in the world. I was rather astonished at the response which I received. Invariably the answer was, "Taylor, you have something there! I am for it, but I do not believe anyone else will be for it." When I spoke to the next person, I asked him the same question. I tried to put it in such a way that he would not think that I was sponsoring the idea. I wanted to get his honest reaction. Again I would receive the answer, "That is the right idea. It is our only hope of maintaining peace in the world, but I do not think anyone else will agree to it."

Everyone thought that I had something, but that he was the only one with enough vision to see the problem in its true light, and that no one else would agree with me. I talked with a former Senator. I talked with a man from India who has attended Harvard University and who is now lecturing at a college here. I talked with farmers from my own State of Idaho. The other day I talked with one of them and suggested the idea of a World Republic. He said, "I am for it. That is the only thing that will maintain peace in the world." Knowing that he was a farmer, a grower of sugar beets and probably a strong advocate of high tariffs and opposed to reciprocal trade, I said to him, "You understand that possibly in the World Republic the government might abolish all tariffs between nations." I thought that would stop him if anything would. He said, "That's all right. I still say, we must have a world government if we are to hope to have peace and avert the destruction of humanity."

ALTHOUGH the state of the world so demands, I do not expect that my resolution or the concurrent ones that have been introduced into the House of Representatives by Congresswoman Helen Gahagan Douglas and Congressman Charles La Follette will receive immediate favorable legislative action in the Congress of the United States. My best hope is that developing events and the pressure of public opinion may eventually bring action before we have traveled too far down the road of military might to bring the monster of armed force under control. The resolutions are before the two Houses of Congress. They have been submitted. It is up to the people of America to make known their wishes in the matter. It is up to the other peoples of the world to make their wishes known to their own national legis-

latures. I call upon my colleagues—my fellow legislators throughout the world regardless of party—to bring forth similar resolutions.

Preservation of world peace cannot be left to the whims of sovereign states or to conferences of foreign ministers or to security councils. These inadequate agents may suffice for a time, they can even be valuable as architects of a more permanent structure. The United Nations Organization may have been adequate at San Francisco but agreements between sovereign nations will not suffice in the atomic age which has come into being since the San Francisco Conference.

General Marshall has said:

"If Man does find the solution for world peace it will be the most revolutionary reversal of his record we have ever known."

I agree with General Marshall. It will be a revolutionary reversal but I believe that if we have the courage, the resolute purpose and the magnificent imagination which was displayed

by the framers of the American Constitution, this can be accomplished. Those men did not wait for the masses to force them to act. They were leaders. They had been called upon only to revise the Article of Confederation, but they recognized the futility of confederations and leagues of friendship and agreements between sovereign powers. So they took the responsibility upon their own shoulders and drafted our Constitution. When some objected that they were going too far, George Washington said:

"It is too probable that no plan we propose will be adopted. Perhaps another dreadful conflict is to be sustained. If, to please the people, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work? Let us raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair; the event is in the hand of God."

How well might those words of President Washington apply to circumstances at this very grave moment in the history of the world!



The Taylor family minus the youngest, who at the time of this campaign photo, starred only on the diaper circuit. Taylor has proved he can think and fight as well as sing.

DECEMBER, 1945

31

tojo doesn't live here any more



by Major BEN Z. KAPLAN

Major Kaplan has been communing with his diary every day since the age of 13. The entries from which these selections were made are Kaplan's numbers 4093-4099. A graduate of Texas U. (B.J. '41) he did radio work in the brief interim between college and the army which has taken him to Africa, Italy and now Japan. Major Kaplan's home is in Waco, Texas.

ATSUGI AIRFIELD, JAPAN, 30 August '45
(Thursday) Entry 4093

Japan. Two or three years ahead of schedule, according to my own timetable, to say nothing of the Army and Navy, judging from the flying and floating arsenals we left behind at various Pacific stops. But, because being here represents what I hope will be the last hitch between me and civilian clothes, I must say that I am awfully glad to see the Land of the Rising Sun (which only shines 21 full days out of the year, we're told).

The landings came off without incident today. We were in the vanguard of some 200,000 troops which will land in the Atsugi, Tokyo, Yokohama, Tateyama and Yokosuka area. Only 150 engineers preceded us on the

28th—to prepare Atsugi for the heavy traffic which began today. Last night we watched the transports being loaded on Okinawa. It was an impressive sight. Files of shadows of airborne infantrymen silently awaiting the hours before take-off outside and beside the huge greyhound-nosed C-54's. Have never seen such activity around a field. An estimated 300 four-motored transports were being loaded. There were men and planes and trucks as far as the eye could see in all directions. And, as it grew darker the lights, collectively, gave the appearance of a county fair, or carnival, seen from a distance.

Take-off at 2:30 this morning. Slept just about all of the way, if not too comfortably.

We landed at about 0800 hours. Each C-54 had five minutes in which to get down, disgorge,