

PS
668
.B6

FOR RELEASE AT 1:00 P.M., EST
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 7, 1955

A LASTING PEACE UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW

ADDRESS

BY

HONORABLE HERBERT BROWNELL, JR.

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

Prepared For Delivery

before the

Canadian Club of Toronto

Royal York Hotel

Toronto, Canada

Monday, November 7, 1955

The whole world has been inspired by President Eisenhower's talks at the Summit which look to a new era of lasting peace for all mankind. As an initial step in this direction, the President has proposed to the heads of the Soviet Union that there be a mutual exchange of military blueprints and reciprocal aerial inspection.

The free peoples of the world quickly grasped the effective workability of the plan, its obvious practicality and its utter simplicity. Understandably, hopes have been raised, and the results of pending and future conferences are awaited with high expectation. For in the scales of justice as applied to all mankind, there are no differences between nations, however deepseated, that outweigh the cause of peace.

The people know that no effort is too great for attaining this primary objective of any civilization that is worthy of the name. They are aware that no opening wedge is too small from which to start the end of distrust, suspicion and tensions that explode so easily into total war. No nation, no government, no people can afford to let this bright prospect slip away.

It is in this context that I would like to speak today of the consistent pattern of peace and friendship that has always existed between Canada and the United States. For in this unique relationship between two great neighboring countries, we may discover and project the ideal and secret for global peace as well.

It was providence that placed us together on this favorably situated continent. Now what was it that has made us firm friends?

First, our way of life is one of tolerance for each other's ideas, standards, customs, philosophy and common heritage. We recognize the differences among our peoples and respect them. We have not sought to impose our political views on each other or interfere with each other's internal affairs. We have assumed the right of our people to choose the form of government of their own liking and which best suits their way of life. Thus we have each observed our rights of privacy in the highest sense of international law.

Second, our way of life is one of trust in each other and in the judgment of the courts; of protecting the weak against the strong; of reducing inequalities and eradicating injustice; of regulating the course of public affairs to the needs of the people. Thus we have had common aims to uphold the dignity of man.

Third, for both the people of Canada and the United States the channels are kept open for unobstructed travel over borders and for the free communication of ideas through exchange of books, magazines, newspapers, movies and other media. There is no iron curtain between us which prevents transmission of the truth about each other and no censor to sift unfavorable from favorable news. Thus, through freedom of travel and communication, better understanding, trust and cooperation between our neighboring nations have been promoted.

Fourth, fair, sound and expanding trade relationships have helped cement our ties of friendship. Canada is a great industrial and economic power, a successful nation. There is an endless demand in the United States for Canada's lumber, woodpulp, uranium, iron ore, newsprint, nickel, lead, fish, beef, other products - and yes, even your famous beverages. In return, Canada purchases our coal, cotton, farm equipment, machinery, auto parts, chemicals, steel and many other products.

Our close trade relations are encouraged by many factors - non-inflated prices for goods - few if any, currency differences and exchange rules - financial stability and integrity - and these in turn contribute to a two-way flow of private investments which develop resources, enrich our economies and make for mutual prosperity of both countries.

In addition, our countries have constantly striven to eliminate conflicts in international economic policies and to encourage economic cooperation. This has been accomplished in large part by exercising restraint in imposing duties on imports. Our two countries are also members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly called GATT. This agreement provides an important international approach for reducing discrimination among nations in their tariff or trade policies. More flexible, friendlier and reciprocal trade relations are possible under the GATT since our representatives can sit down with yours when a problem arises and work out any differences. This was done only recently in connection with the use of import restrictions for balance-of-payments reasons.

Where there is a full and frank exchange of views on both sides, and a disposition to act fairly, matters tend to be resolved on a cordial note.

Symbolic of the close and friendly relations existing between both countries are the meetings of the United States-Canadian Committee on Trade and Economic Affairs. This Committee provides an opportunity for cabinet members of both countries concerned with economic and trade matters to meet together periodically and discuss developments of common interest. At the last meeting held on September 26, 1955 top level officials of both countries exchanged views on general commercial policies and prospects. This Committee was concerned with encouraging a growing volume of mutually beneficial trade between the two countries. It reviewed policies relating to freer trade, to payments and particularly to trade in, and accumulation of, agricultural products. It also considered other policies which might further the national well-being and security of the two countries. Here again is an outstanding example of how we may improve understanding and strengthen peaceful relations between two neighboring countries.

Although there have been many areas for potential conflict between Canada and the United States, these countries have repeatedly resorted to arbitration and other peaceful means for joint solutions.

In the past, the problem of proper boundaries has been a source of intense difference of opinion between our countries, just as it often is between neighboring farmers. The International Joint

Commission established in 1909 by the Boundary Waters Treaty has helped to resolve these vexing problems peacefully. As neighboring nations we have also had difficult issues raised respecting the use, flow and pollution of trans-boundary waters. These have been settled so amicably by the Joint United States-Canadian Commission that it has become a model of international administrative cooperation.

In addition, Canada and the United States are cooperating in many joint enterprises of mutual benefit. The great St. Lawrence River Seaway and Power Project which will advance economic and social progress, and the Joint Early Warning Radar System to protect against surprise attacks are merely a few of our many joint ventures of this kind.

Moreover, Canada and the United States are members of multilateral agreements with other nations, such as the North Atlantic Treaty and the United Nations. By these means our peace-loving countries have expressed their willingness to accept and discharge specific international obligations in exchange for more complete national security and the preservation of freedom against aggressors. Also, Canada and the United States together with other countries have recently entered into agreements for mutual cooperation in research leading to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. This is another project which holds promise for providing a more useful, happy life for our peoples and for the easing of international

tensions. And by engaging in treaties for reciprocal extradition of persons charged with crime, Canada and the United States have also joined hands to further the needs of a workable international administration of justice.

Thus you can see that in areas of human rights, economy, trade, social welfare, boundaries, justice and other vital aspects of life, Canada and the United States have forsaken the field of battle for the forum of consultation, discussion, debate, agreement - all paths that look to peaceful and permanent resolution of differences.

Our independence, territorial integrity or security are never the subject of threat or invasion by either of us. Neither country has to rattle the sabre or bring up troops and guns to the border, or make any other show of coercion by force or power at any time. The only arms used are arms-length negotiation across the table. The only force is the force of reason. The only power is the persuasion which the demands of justice require. As sovereign equals and as equal partners, our two nations solve their problems within the framework of international law and order.

The relationships between Canada and the United States are evidence that international law can succeed without sacrifice of freedom, honor or national sovereignty.

Our experiences also teach that just as in the case of personal friendships, international friendship among nations does not require complete agreement of opinions on the problems before them. It merely requires trust and faith that one nation has no hidden plans in mind, no concealed weapons in hand, "no slick tricks up its sleeve"

which will be harmful to the other nation.

Differences of opinion are not to be deplored but welcomed and brought into the open for frank discussion. Because only in the give and take of honest exchange of views may we discover the right answer to the issues before us - only in this way is misunderstanding dispelled - only in this way may we achieve a sensible balance and accommodation of competing interests and ideas, without which true friendship, mutual understanding and tolerance would be impossible. This is indeed the way by which mature people adjust and reconcile their differences in every day life - by substituting the elements of reason, calm judgment and knowledge for anger, emotion and resentment. Canada and the United States have adjusted their differences in this manner. This must also be the international process by which mature nations may resolve their difficulties without left-over rancor and hostility. They may then discover that their problems are not really insoluble at all.

Our example is not an isolated one where men have worked for peace with patience, understanding and a fair sense of dealing with each other and where their efforts were crowned with success. For history teaches that disputes between nations do not die with war but are only laid to rest with peace.

Mindful only too well of this history and what is in store for civilization in event of war, President Eisenhower at Geneva recently advanced his proposals for reciprocal exchange of military blueprints and aerial inspection. Through this plan, the President felt that both

the United States and Russia would be relieved of a surprise attack - and also this would be the beginning of a series of many other agreements for the easing of international tensions.

The principle of mutual arms inspection has already been tried out successfully in the pact of the Western European Union. It has contributed to improvement of relationships between Germany and France and all the nations of Western Europe. Its extension to all other great nations would be a milestone in the progress of civilization. It tends to assure that nations who have agreed to disarmament will abide by their agreement. It is essential to maintain the confidence and trust vital to the life of such agreements.

President Eisenhower's plan makes it clear to all that the free world is not afraid of peace and that the free peoples share common aspirations for it which transcend their differences. In this bold plan beats the heart of our philosophy - attainment by the individual of his greatest possible development and fullest life - the loftiest of man's aspirations.

The free world is determined that their fulfillment shall never again be endangered or thwarted by any war. Our mighty forces are dedicated to advance the aims of peace, not to destruction. We know only too well that even the victors of every battle are losers in every war. Punishment, we know, is no deterrent. No sanctions imposed upon the aggressor are great enough to compensate for the human sacrifices made. All sanctions and punishment combined are

little solace for what is lost.

These frightful alternatives make manifest the need to establish through agreement, international laws for a lasting peace. To that end, as it has in the past, the free world will always be open to present, to receive, and to consider, good faith overtures leading to a sound solution which has both the seeds of peace and the poison necessary to the end of war.

In searching for permanent solutions for peace, we must consider, among other things, the kind of peace we want; what our emotional and rational outlook must be for obtaining it; the difficulties to be anticipated during the course of diplomacy; those provisions which will give peace enduring value; the role of the people in securing it; and the safety measures to be taken by us while it is in the making. These are considerations open for discussion everywhere. I should like to touch on them briefly here.

The peace we seek today is different from any other ever attained by our civilization. It does not mean the mere quieting of cannon until the nations involved can rebuild their war machine for still another hostile cause. It means a peace which will restore the faith of the people that preparation for other wars is no longer necessary. It means a peace which will bring to the scientist, the workman, the farmer, the teacher, the student, the housewife and others a feeling of relaxation, relief from grim tension, and opportunity to work toward the betterment of humanity.

It must therefore not be a peace that is preserved by rivalry, competing assertions and build-up of greater military power. It must be a peace that finds its incentives in a more fruitful and happier life, in spiritual growth, in the dignity of man, in a free world that feels at home only under international law and order.

What is the outlook for such a peace, people ask?

In our search we must not mislead the people or raise their hopes with expectations that are beyond fulfillment. But that does not mean that we should approach the problem with any feeling of futility, or without prospect of success, or with hostility, or with lack of confidence in ourselves. When you deal with others in a spirit of pessimism and discouragement you can hardly expect that they will not respond in kind. We must feel that others have a desire for peace as strong as our own until the contrary is demonstrated.

It would be lacking in reality to expect nations, whose grievances are deeply rooted, whose ideologies, peoples, history and training are different, to find the quest for peace an easy one. But just like contentious neighbors, once nations sit down to air their differences they may discover that they are not as far apart in their views as they thought. When this process is tried out often enough with success, it suggests as Canada and the United States have discovered, that there is scarcely any dispute as to which the parties cannot find common ground for agreement.

It has been urged that in the light of its prior conduct, the Soviet Union does not approach these peace negotiations with complete

sincerity. And this is of course a persuasive argument in the face of historical fact. It places a particularly heavy burden upon the Soviet Union to demonstrate beyond a shadow of a doubt that it now seeks peace in good faith.

We must also recognize that rulers of communist-controlled nations who previously were quick to engage in a war have more recently been impressed by the unity and strength of our collective security. Although their peoples have been kept in a state of ignorance on many of the facts of life, they are no longer blind to the suicidal course of an aggressive war or to the economic and social ruin and bankruptcy inherent in a prolonged cold war.

In daily life, the unreliable character of the man across the table does not deter you from dealing with him, much as you dislike to do so, if the alternative is inevitable disaster for both of you.

What choice then do the great nations of the world have, when they come to realize with unshakeable conviction, that the brink of war is the brink of total disaster for all people?

This does not mean that we should be lulled into a sense of false security or abandon our collective security. It merely means that in appraising the conduct of the Soviet Union in ensuing conferences, we must be alert to possible bad faith and even trickery. But by all means, let us also be open-minded and clearheaded. We must not permit fear or past history to chill our diplomacy into inaction. Nor must we allow our deep yearning for peace to drive us into hasty bargains which we will repent in leisure.

There may also be times when we feel that all the acts of Russia are not consistent with the Summit approach or to our immediate liking. We are open to such changes as will be consistent with the spirit and purposes of the Summit Plan. During this period of seeking for fair solutions, it may doubtless be necessary to maintain and improve our defenses and to keep our guard up. And we can scarcely deny the same right to the Russians if they bend every reasonable effort towards progress in our peace negotiations.

The search for peace will require, therefore, constant searching and utmost patience and it may take a long time. It is almost like the preparation and travail that goes into climbing a high mountain. The climbers do not turn back nor is their confidence impaired because they slip back at various points. They retread the lost ground and continue on avoiding other pitfalls until the assault has been completed and the mountain scaled. The cause is too important to ever stop trying. We are not going to succumb to a feeling of frustration just because the task of finding the solution to these problems is at times disheartening and very elusive. Regardless of the difficulties, we are going to try again and again and again.

The next question is what are the minimum essentials of any agreement which are most apt to make for permanent amity?

Primarily, the agreement must be endowed with all possible elements of justice and fairness that man can impart to it, if it is to endure for all time. A few of the more specific essential ingredients that occur to me are: the agreement must not contemplate the sacrifice of any nation, however small, weak or defenseless; provision should be made for freeing those enslaved within the Soviet Union, and for releasing the captive countries which are now held as communist

statellites; and a just peace should recognize that no nation, however benevolent its motives, shall control, dominate or subjugate the people of any other nation. For, in the words of John Marshall, our most renowned Chief Justice: "The parties to the modern law of nations do not propagate their principles by force".

Let it be known then that we enter the doors that lead to peace with strength, not aggression; with determination, not arrogance; with the dignity of a proud nation, not prejudice; with honesty of purpose, not deceit. And we shall hope that the Russians will be no less strong, wise, proud and sincere. As President Eisenhower has said: "* * * We shall extend the hand of friendship to all who will grasp it honestly and concede to us the same rights, the same understanding, the same freedom, that we accord to them".

It is as equals that we will meet to straighten out our differences - each aware of our own mighty power; each cognizant of the calamitous consequences that atomic war and retaliation entail; each expectant of the bounteous fruits and rewards that peace will bear for all of us.

What role must the people play in the difficult days which lie ahead for diplomacy and statesmanship?

The matter of peace is not one solely for diplomats and statesmen. It must be in our hearts. It must be striven for with the same unity, effort and resources as we gird for war. If all the people gave the same attention and national sacrifice to peace,

we would soon have no occasion to be apprehensive of war. Our diplomats and statesmen will continue to look to the people for direction and guidance. The people must not fail them through indifference, or discouragement in the face of occasional reverses. The people must lend their strength, their voice, their intelligence, their concern, their support. For peace means the same thing in every tongue, in every land, and in every heart. It is within the reach of all who will exert themselves to find and preserve it.

Finally, what remains to be done while we await the outcome of negotiations?

There is ample work to be done by all of us. Our vigilance and cooperation in the field of internal security must constantly be re-examined, reinforced and revitalized, with proper balance maintained so that our precious heritage of ordered liberty is never imperiled. The faith of free people in their system of government, in their institutions, in their traditions, must constantly be strengthened through just, fair and humanitarian acts. Consistent with adequate defense needs, sensible limitation and reduction in armaments must gradually be made, for obviously an armaments race is bound to drain from each nation valuable assets which could otherwise advance the cause of progress at home and abroad. In this way, we could devote more of our human, material and scientific resources to a fuller and happier life for all; to enriched cultural opportunities; to expanded educational, health and insurance programs; to reduced taxation; to the elimination of poverty, slums, and inadequate housing which breed delinquency and crime.

Our objective cannot be attained by pious words or prayers alone. It must be made the practical every-day working precept of good government which continues to demonstrate its good-faith intentions and belief in the dignity of man. Then, by comparison, the claims and pretensions of those intent on mass suicide cannot fail to be apparent even to the most naive and unenlightened.

These are the affirmative ways by which we shall secure lasting peace and freedom, and rid mankind of oppression, tyranny and injustice throughout the world. In these ways, also we will have applied to world problems the pointed lesson which we have learned from our own domestic affairs and from our experiences as neighbor nations.

Each of us preserves peace and order at home through justice, fair dealing, mutual trust and recognition of the inherent rights of the individual. These can exist only under government by law rather than government by men. So too, we have preserved peace and order between us as neighboring nations through justice, fair dealing, mutual trust and recognition of the inherent rights of nations. These can exist only under international law as applied to international disputes. And peace and order will prevail for the world as well, when all nations rise to the greatest challenge of all, and live their life in accordance with international law and righteousness.