

WAR AND PEACE
AIMS
OF
THE UNITED NATIONS

WAR and PEACE AIMS of THE UNITED NATIONS

September 1, 1939 — December 31, 1942

EDITED BY

LOUISE W. HOLBORN

Ph.D., Radcliffe College

INTRODUCTION BY

HAJO HOLBORN

Professor of History, Yale University

WORLD PEACE FOUNDATION

BOSTON

1943

Copyright, 1943, by
World Peace Foundation

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

FOREWORD

This collection of documents bearing on the war and peace aims of the United Nations has grown out of what was originally conceived, in December 1941, as a more modest enterprise, and in the course of growth has passed through numerous vicissitudes which have affected its final character.

The original purpose was to assemble a collection of statements on war and peace aims made by Allied Governments which might be made available in mimeographed form and on a limited basis to certain individuals and government agencies, both American and foreign, which had expressed an interest in and desire for such a compilation. With that end in view, at the suggestion of Dr. S. Shepard Jones, then Director of the Foundation, Professor Holborn agreed to commission one of his research workers at Yale University, Mrs. Edith Bracelin, to undertake, subject to his supervision, the making of such a compilation. While Mrs. Bracelin made a start in the collection of the materials, she was not able to finish the work, and the task of completing the collection and editing of the materials was assumed by Miss Louise Holborn.

With the passing of time, a new conception of the nature of the job to be done came to be accepted. Instead of making a highly selective compilation of statements to be issued in mimeographed form and on a restricted basis, it seemed desirable to undertake a more inclusive compilation of statements of war and peace aims with a view to showing not only what appeared to be the official views of governments but also the development of these views and something of the atmosphere of opinion prevailing in each country. In addition, with inevitable delays, it became necessary to extend the period to be covered.

Since the first announcement of this volume, there has appeared under the name of the United Nations Information Office a collection of *War and Peace Aims*¹ which might on the basis of title be regarded as doing in advance what this volume was intended to do. A careful examination

¹ Special Supplement No. 1 to *The United Nations Review*, January 30, 1943. United Nations Information Office, 610 Fifth Avenue, New York.

will, I think, show that these two collections are intended to serve quite distinct purposes and have quite distinct uses.

This volume has been the work of many hands and many minds. Though it may have suffered from that fact, it is hoped that it has benefited more. It is, in a sense, and subject to the qualifications noted above, a pioneer work and there are undoubtedly many respects in which it could be improved. I am sure that all who have had a hand in its preparation will welcome constructive suggestions to that end, in order that we may benefit from such suggestions if it is decided to publish a supplementary volume.

LELAND M. GOODRICH
Director

July 12, 1943

EDITOR'S NOTE

The collection covers all countries which had signed the United Nations Declaration up to January 1943, certain American Republics that have severed relations with one or more of the Axis Powers, and Fighting France. Its organization aims at showing the development of the ideas of the individual countries on the subject of war and peace aims and also at giving a comprehensive picture of the characteristic outlook of each. While the presentation of material is chronological, a topical approach is facilitated by the provision of a subject index.

The material is drawn largely from statements and speeches by statesmen who hold responsible positions. In addition, agreements and treaties have been included which have a bearing on war and peace aims. Agreements and declarations concerning more than two countries have been placed in the United Nations section; those concerning only two countries appear in the sections of the respective countries. In excerpting documents, the intention has been to provide enough text to indicate the background and character of the whole statement.

Official texts have been used whenever it was possible to secure them, but for material of more recent date, this has frequently been difficult. For material originally published in a foreign language, the translations provided by official information offices have been used. The first reference under each document is to the text used, but other references to more easily accessible sources have also been included.

For assistance in securing texts, the editor would like to express appreciation to the Department of State, the Embassies of the Chinese Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Legations of Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, the Mexican Department of Foreign Affairs, the British Information Services (formerly the British Library of Information), the Canadian Director of Public Information, and the Information Centers of the following countries: Belgium, China, Czechoslovakia, Fighting France, Greece, Netherlands, Norway, Poland and Yugoslavia. The work has also been facilitated by the friendly cooperation of the staff of Wellesley College Library.

The editor wishes to express her indebtedness to Dr. S. Shepard Jones who was Director of the World Peace Foundation at the time this com-

pilation was undertaken and to Professor Leland M. Goodrich, the present Director, for their invaluable interest, encouragement and counsel. She also makes grateful acknowledgment of the helpful assistance of Miss Marie J. Carroll without whose long and painstaking effort the volume could not have been completed in its present form. Her thanks are also due to Mrs. Ralph de Miranda for her careful preparation of the subject index.

LOUISE W. HOLBORN

Wellesley, Massachusetts

July 10, 1943

INTRODUCTION

This volume undertakes to record the growth of the war and peace aims of the United Nations in the forty months from the outbreak of war to the first anniversary of the Declaration of the United Nations on January 1, 1943. It is hoped that this collection of documents will be found useful by all students interested in the diplomacy of the war and of future peace. Most of the earlier collections have been limited to the declarations of single statesmen and governments, or paid little attention to the historical evolution of policy regarding war and peace aims.

In the preparation of this volume great care has been taken to present critical texts, and the friendly support lent by a great many diplomatic agencies of the United Nations enabled the editor to secure, in most instances, the official texts. It is superfluous to remind the reader that speeches by heads of governments, ministers of foreign affairs and their departmental subordinates, and heads or members of other administrative departments or agencies have quite different values as indications of governmental policy and often reflect different stages in the development of policy.

However, this work is concerned not only with the aims already generally accepted by the United Nations and with definitely adopted national policies, but also with the characteristic ideas and currents of thought which dominate the great debate on war and peace aims among the freedom-loving nations. For this reason, it has seemed useful to include in the Appendices some representative statements of leaders of political parties and the more significant pronouncements of the Christian churches which are likely to affect the development of policy in the future.

The documents contained in this volume tell the history of the growing unity of nations which went to war singly for the defense of their own national existence. There can be no doubt that war would not have engulfed the world if the nations now fighting a common war against the Axis Powers had maintained close and effective cooperation during the last twenty-five years. The disunity and mutual aloofness among the nations desirous of peace and security gave Japan, Germany and Italy their opportunities for the invasion and destruction of small and great nations alike.

However, it would be incorrect to ascribe the breakdown of international cooperation exclusively to preoccupation with ideas of national interest, the more so since even from a nationalistic point of view the diplomacy of the past has proved a dismal failure. The great ideological, social, and economic conflicts which followed in the wake of the first World War weakened not only the clear recognition of the forces of evil but confused the sane appraisal of the realities of international politics. No individual national state in our age is strong enough to resist aggression and international lawlessness. International cooperation, as is so clearly demonstrated on the far-flung battlefronts of the present war, is not an idealistic aberration, but the soundest realism.

This does not mean that national life will die. On the contrary the war has taught us again the intensity of national feelings. All countries arrayed against the Axis are fighting to maintain their national identities threatened by the specter of an all-embracing world empire. The war has resurrected deep-rooted loyalties to the national community and has helped to overcome social and economic conflicts which at times seemed to cripple the capacity for the achievement of national unity. Actually the desire for national isolation was often enough in the past the result of fear that international cooperation might intensify the domestic conflicts and necessitate social and political adjustments which appeared detrimental to the selfish interests of particular groups within the state. In other words, the conflict between national and international ideals was at no time merely a conflict between two concepts of national foreign policy, but served to a large extent as a cloak for an unwillingness to subordinate egotistical interests to the imperative demands of any communal life, national or international.

The war should have restored our sense of perspective. It has brought about a revival of the loyalties to common causes which transcend particular social groupings. At the same time the war has taught us that communal action cannot end at the borderlines of national states and national civilizations, but calls for the ultimate integration of all nations into a lawful international system. In view of this fresh desire for a general reform of the social and political forms of human association which the war has stirred up among all peoples, it is not surprising to see that the discussion of peace aims in the present war is not confined to the discussion of diplomatic issues, but is deeply concerned with problems which were formerly deemed the exclusive concern of sovereign national states. There is no longer in our age a clear distinction between internal and foreign politics and as a consequence it has become more difficult to define common international aims.

Another new aspect of the discussion of war and peace aims during the present war is the democratic method by which the United Nations try to achieve a solution. During the first World War the European

nations were tied together by secret diplomatic agreements and treaties and the evolution of a democratic program of peace was hampered by previous acts and commitments of governments. The American peace program, as expounded by Woodrow Wilson in 1917-19, was jeopardized from its inception by the necessity to compromise with the exigencies of the prearranged diplomatic situation. During the present war there is ground to believe that no secret diplomatic treaties have been concluded. The problem of war and peace aims has been left largely to public discussion. Only occasionally have governments tried to set up landmarks for the discussion by making diplomatic agreements which have at once been made public. We have embarked upon the most ambitious attempt ever undertaken to lay the foundation for future peace-making through free public discussion within and among the nations of the world.

This procedure implies heavy risks since the diversified attitudes and philosophies of more than thirty nations can easily crystallize into conflicting views. It is on the whole impressive to see how much unity exists in the vast chorus of voices heard. The general trend of the great debate, as displayed in this collection of documents, shows a very far-reaching agreement on the major principles of a desirable world order. However, the distinct interests and preoccupations of individual nations are bound to produce sharp contrasts in the application of these basic assumptions to the practical problems of future peace. It will be highly desirable to work with the greatest possible speed toward a precise and realistic agreement among the United Nations on the major political issues which will present themselves at the end of the present war.

It is often said that we should not think about concrete peace aims until we have defeated the Axis Powers in war, but such statements completely overlook the fact that a peace program is a political instrument which will contribute towards the winning of the war. This is true not only with respect to our present enemies whom we want to induce to throw off the chains of their present enslavement, but even more with regard to the strength and determination of the United Nations. Their power to strike will increase to the extent that their final aims are unified. Any doubt that the United Nations will not stand together in world affairs after the defeat of one or all of the Axis states will raise fears and will give the Axis an opportunity to try again its old game of "divide and conquer." The integration of the individual United Nations into one mighty block of powers depends to a large extent on our ability to translate whatever common ideals we have into a clear and practical vision of future international cooperation. This would at the same time doom all Axis schemes to raise mutual suspicion among the members of the present alliance.

The most intimate form of inter-Allied cooperation that exists at

present is to be found in the armed forces of the United Nations. This cooperation will, we hope, develop into a true comradeship in arms as the final stages of the war unfold. Behind it is an elaborate machinery for the planning and direction of the common war effort. This organization of the United Nations is by no means all-embracing and calls for both expansion and simplification.

It is often argued that the whole problem of future international cooperation can be solved beforehand by boldly setting up a comprehensive scheme of United Nations councils. They would serve as the nucleus of a future world system. However, this would demand a close understanding with regard to post-war problems of common interest, such as the treatment of enemy countries. Moreover, it is not altogether true that psychological and political adjustments will be produced by technical organization. The League of Nations did not collapse because it was imperfect, but chiefly because democratic governments failed to support it. A fully integrated organization of the United Nations Councils can only be accomplished if the nations are ready to place complete trust in unified representation. Such confidence can only spring from growing acquaintance and esteem which will develop in the course of joint fighting. In addition, the common effort for the solution of specific problems indispensable to the successful conduct of the war and the common planning of the post-war world will prepare the ground for the evolution of a concrete peace program of the United Nations.

At the present moment the nations fighting the Axis are diplomatically united by their common determination to conquer the forces of aggression. In the Joint Declaration of January 1, 1942, they have proclaimed their willingness to cooperate fully in the war "against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war." All of them have lived up to this promise and there is no reason to fear that the pledge to make no separate armistice or peace with the enemy will not be equally respected. However, little has been accomplished to implement the Atlantic Charter by a more detailed program of future international action. The Atlantic Charter has played a historic role in this war. Drafted at a moment when the fortunes of the free nations were low, its proud expression of faith in the capacity of democracy to deal with the political problems of our world in a constructive manner gave new courage and hope to the outnumbered defenders of democratic institutions. It served as a beacon light in dark days of military retreat. The documents contained in this volume show the influence which the Atlantic Charter exercised in rallying together the nations fighting the Axis oppression.

The Atlantic Charter will continue to give a dominant direction to all post-war planning, but we still have a long road to travel in the elaboration of a concrete program of peace and future world order. Arrange-

ments like those concluded between the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union for a continued close cooperation after the war should go far to expedite the official negotiation of a more detailed peace program if all the United Nations could pledge themselves in a similar fashion. We may have to work towards such aims more slowly by negotiating bilateral rather than universal agreements, or by developing step by step a technical organization of the United Nations. It seems most likely that all these approaches will have to be used simultaneously as common setbacks and victories bring all the nations closer together.

This volume attempts to acquaint the reader with all these aspects and to allow him to choose his own position in the discussion. It tries at the same time to present a full picture of the individual reaction of each of the Allied nations to the problems of war and peace. The diversity of opinions among the United Nations is fortunately not only the result of differing interests but of unique experiences as well. The Allied nations have much to learn from each other and it is a gratifying experience to study the rich variety of ideas expressed in the many nations bent on winning a common war and a common peace.

Hajo Holborn

New Haven, Connecticut
July 9, 1943

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	v
EDITOR'S NOTE	ix
INTRODUCTION	xi
I. THE UNITED NATIONS	1
1. JOINT DECLARATION	1
A. ATLANTIC CHARTER	2
2. DECLARATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, SEPTEMBER 3, 1939—DECEMBER 7, 1941	3
3. DECLARATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, DECEMBER 8, 1941—DECEMBER 31, 1942	7
II. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	15
1. FORMAL NEUTRALITY AND LIMITED NATIONAL EMERGENCY, SEPTEMBER 3, 1939—MAY 16, 1940	18
2. ACTIVE NATIONAL DEFENSE, MAY 16, 1940—MAY 27, 1941	26
3. UNLIMITED NATIONAL EMERGENCY, MAY 27, 1941—DECEMBER 8, 1941	40
4. STATE OF WAR, DECEMBER 8, 1941—DECEMBER 31, 1942	61
III. THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS	155
1. THE UNITED KINGDOM	155
A. THE CHAMBERLAIN GOVERNMENT, SEPTEMBER 1, 1939—MAY 9, 1940	157
B. THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT UNDER PRIME MINISTER WINSTON CHURCHILL	183
(1) From May 10, 1940 to the French Armistice with the Axis Powers, June 22, 1940	183
(2) From June 22, 1940 to the German Invasion of the Soviet Union, June 22, 1941	187
(3) From June 22, 1941 to the Japanese Attack on Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941	207
(4) From Pearl Harbor to December 31, 1942	223
ANNEX: BRITISH DECLARATIONS REGARDING INDIA	278
2. THE DOMINIONS	301
A. CANADA	301
B. AUSTRALIA	315
C. NEW ZEALAND	326
D. UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA	340
IV. UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS	351
V. CHINA	378

	PAGE
VI. OCCUPIED COUNTRIES	404
1. CZECHOSLOVAKIA	404
2. POLAND	446
3. NORWAY	486
4. LUXEMBURG	501
5. THE NETHERLANDS	505
6. BELGIUM	523
7. GREECE	530
8. YUGOSLAVIA	547
9. COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES	557
ANNEX: FRANCE	559
A. THE FRENCH REPUBLIC — PRE-ARMISTICE STATEMENTS, SEP- TEMBER 3, 1939—JUNE 22, 1940	559
B. FIGHTING FRANCE	563
VII. THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS.	577
1. CONFERENCES	577
2. MEXICO	592
3. OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS	602
A. PANAMA	605
B. VENEZUELA	605
C. COLOMBIA	606
D. BRAZIL	606
E. URUGUAY	607
F. COSTA RICA	607
G. PERU	607
H. CUBA	608
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX I. THE CHURCHES	610
1. THE VATICAN	610
2. THE UNITED STATES	627
3. GREAT BRITAIN	639
APPENDIX II. POLITICAL PARTIES	647
1. THE UNITED STATES	647
2. GREAT BRITAIN	668
BIBLIOGRAPHY	687
INDEX	697

I. THE UNITED NATIONS

1. JOINT DECLARATION

A Joint Declaration by United Nations, Washington, January 1, 1942, Signed by The United States of America, The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, Yugoslavia

The Governments signatory hereto,

Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Joint Declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter, [see text below]

Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to decent life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world,

Declare

(1) Each Government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

(2) Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the Governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.

[Here follow signatures of the representatives of the 26 nations.¹]

D. S. Bul., VI, p. 3; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 203.

¹ Adherences to the Declaration: Mexico, June 5, 1942; the Philippines, June 10, 1942; Ethiopia, October 9, 1942; Iraq, January 16, 1943; Brazil, February 6, 1943.

Peru notified its "adherence to the principles of the Atlantic Charter," by telegram of February 8, 1943 (*D. S. Bul.*, VIII, p. 154).

2 WAR AND PEACE AIMS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A. Atlantic Charter

Declaration of Principles, Known as the Atlantic Charter, by the President of the United States (Roosevelt) and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom (Churchill) August 14, 1941

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all States, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic adjustment and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea or air

Statement of January 5, 1942, by Department of State on Adherences to the Declaration: "In order that liberty-loving peoples silenced by military force may have an opportunity to support the principles of the Declaration by the United Nations, the Government of the United States as the depository for that Declaration will receive statements of adherence to its principles from appropriate authorities which are not governments." (*D. S. Bul.*, VI, p. 44.)

armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

United States, Executive Agreement Series 236, p. 4;
D. S. Bul., V, p. 125; *D.A.F.R.*, IV, p. 209.

2. DECLARATIONS AND AGREEMENTS, SEPTEMBER 3, 1939— DECEMBER 7, 1941

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London:*¹ *Resolution, June 12, 1941*

The Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, the Government of Belgium, the Provisional Government of Czechoslovakia, the Governments of Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, and Yugoslavia, and the representatives of General de Gaulle, leader of Free Frenchmen, engaged together in the fight against aggression, are resolved:

1. That they will continue the struggle against German or Italian aggression until victory has been won and they will mutually assist each other in this struggle to the utmost of their respective capacities;

2. There can be no settled peace and prosperity so long as free peoples are coerced by violence into submission to domination by Germany or her associates or live under the threat of such coercion;

3. That the only true basis for enduring peace is the willing cooperation of the free peoples in a world in which, relieved of the menace of aggression, all may enjoy economic and social security; and that it is their intention to work together with other free peoples both in war and peace to this end.

U. K., Cmd. 6285, Misc. No. 1 (1941), p. 15; *D.A.F.R.*,
III, p. 444; *I-A.R.*, 1941, I, 5, p. 1.

*Inter-Allied Meeting, St. James's Palace, London:*¹ *Resolution regarding the Atlantic Charter, September 24, 1941*

The Governments of Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, and the representatives of General de Gaulle, leader of Free Frenchmen,

¹ For statements made by representatives of the signatory countries see the respective sections.