

# Foreign Ministers Conference, Geneva 1959 ; Berlin question 1959 ; Outer sp...

HS L 179:90



Dag Hammarskjöld's sand.

Disarmament

15 March - 9 April 60

Lodge, Henry Cabot (Peru. Representative  
of U.S.A. to the U.N.)

- 3 letters from D.H.

15 March 1960

Dear Cabot,

Yesterday night I studied the disarmament paper that Charles Cook had brought over while I was sitting in my talk with Ben-Gurion. It confirmed on one point my previous fears, and I felt that as, at all events, I have to address Herter, I should take the opportunity to tell him about the difficulties I foresee.

I believe that we see eye to eye on this matter. Anyway, the letter only puts on record what, in anticipation, I told Barco.

Dag Hammarskjöld

H.E. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge,  
Permanent Representative to the United Nations,  
United States Mission to the United Nations,  
2 Park Avenue,  
New York, N.Y.

9 April 1960

Dear Cabot,

.....  
.....  
I would like to draw your attention to my comments on IDO in my press conference yesterday. You may already have seen it, but as the Times did not take it up, it may have escaped your attention. You will find the story in the enclosed transcript on page 16 and following.

.....  
I enclose also an excerpt from a letter in which Mr. Protitch tells about a recent talk with Ambassador Cavalletti, the second man in the Italian Delegation to the Disarmament Conference. It points rather directly to the influence of an anti-United Nations thinking of one or two Western members of the Conference.

Dag Hammarskjöld

H.E. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge,  
Permanent Representative to the United Nations,  
United States Mission to the United Nations,  
2 Park Avenue,  
New York, N.Y.

25 March 1960

Dear Cabot,

I would like to draw your attention to the following statement of Mr. Martino at the Fifth Meeting of the Disarmament Conference. I quote from the public record:

"I have one other comment. Mr. Zorin seems to believe that in our view the United Nations would have to be suppressed once the machinery for the maintenance of peace and security had been set up. It is evident that although, on the one hand, the United Nations has as one of its purposes and goals the maintenance of peace and security, it has not, on the other hand, the means to ensure this. Has the United Nations the necessary arms and men to impose respect of its law on anyone? It is for this reason that we envisage the creation of special machinery. Whether this machinery would be within the framework of the United Nations or outside it constitutes another question which we can take up in due time." (\*)

This statement, if taken at face value, confirms my worst fears. It is recognized that the U.N. has "as one" of its purposes and goals the maintenance of peace and security, but the speaker adds that it has not the means to ensure this. He draws the conclusion that special machinery would have to be created -- obviously with the somewhat unexpected hope that a new body could have "the necessary arms and men to impose respect", although the U.N. could not get it -- and winds up by leaving it as an open question whether the new machinery should be within the framework of the U.N.

I find it difficult to formulate my reaction to the present trend, but I guess that the most adequate word would be "irresponsible". Instead of discussing what, if any, changes of the Charter might be desirable and possible, one scraps, by implication, all that has been done and argues as if a new start would be all that is needed in order to get over the difficulties with which we have been battling within the U.N.

---

(\*) I annex for your information the statement of Zorin to which this refers.

H.E. Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge,  
Permanent Representative to  
the United Nations,  
United States Mission to the  
United Nations,  
2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Similar observations apply to the talk about an international peace organization which has now been elaborated by Koch in the Sixth Meeting. What he paints before us -- this year when it is impossible to get rid even of the Connelly amendment -- is a developed International Court with compulsory jurisdiction and disposing over an international force so that it can order an enforcement of its decisions. It would seem that the normal distinctions between the legal and political elements, and the need to keep them apart, as well as the accepted distinctions between judiciary and executive have been forgotten.

With the frankness to which I feel that I am entitled with you, I confess I am at a loss to understand what is happening. I am deeply frustrated to see what strikes me as a mixture of dilettantism and utopianism tainted by what appears as a predominant desire to get away from the U.N. while paying lipservice to it.

Dag Hammarskjöld

In this connexion I have another small remark to make with regard to the statements made by Mr. Martino who tried to convince us that it was necessary to have a special organisation for the maintenance of peace and security even after the complete liquidation of the military machinery. Well, apart from other possible considerations, a question inevitably arose in my mind: What would then become of the existing international organization especially created for the maintenance of peace and international security? I am speaking, of course, of the United Nations. Now, what would happen under the Western plan? The United Nations would be liquidated by that time -- or would it still be in existence? And if the United Nations is still in existence, why should we think of setting up a new organization? This is not clear to me at all. I am even afraid that perhaps Mr. Hammarskjöld might find himself out of his job once we begin setting up such a new organisation -- and I doubt very much whether this can be our common purpose.

In this connexion I have another small remark to make with regard to the statements made by Mr. Martino who tried to convince us that it was necessary to have a special organization for the maintenance of peace and security even after the complete liquidation of the military machinery. Well, apart from other possible considerations, a question inevitably arose in my mind: What would then become of the existing international organization especially created for the maintenance of peace and international security? I am speaking, of course, of the United Nations. Now, what would happen under the Western plan? The United Nations would be liquidated by that time -- or would it still be in existence? And if the United Nations is still in existence, why should we think of setting up a new organization? This is not clear to me at all. I am even afraid that perhaps Mr. Hammarskjöld might find himself out of his job once we begin setting up such a new organization -- and I doubt very much whether this can be our common purpose.