North Dakota Law Review

Volume 21 | Number 9 Article 3

1944

The San Francisco Conference

David A. Simmons

Personal Characteristics. Under this heading, lits your outstanding physical and mental characteristics, your personal attitudes that might affect your choice of occupation, your qualifications and training, and every kind of business or other experience you have had that might indicate the type of work for which you might be best suited. Any handicaps, weaknesses or shortcomings should also be listed, to the end that this catalogue will present a true picture on which you can base your subsequent conclusions. This should be as complete and accurate as you can possibly make it.

Personal Desires. Now review the outline as to what you want to do, how and where to apply your law training, in the light of this self-analysis. Do not attempt at this point to arrive at a single answer to each question, but give yourself the benefit of any alternatives that may appear to be equally attractive.

Personal Opportunities. You now pass from the subjective to the objective to consider the question of the opportunities that are available for the realization of your desires. You may find that one field of choice is already overcrowded, that another fits into family or other personal connections that would be most favorable. This will help to narrow your inquiry to those occupations that offer your best prospects for success.

Personal Objectives. By the above processes of elimination, you should arrive at a tentative statement of your personal objectives in the profession of law. This can be reexamined in the light of your personal characteristics, desires and opportunities, and you can then begin to plan on how you are going to achieve those objectives. You will know that your decision is based on a thorough self-analysis and consideration of the major factors that affect your choice. Your prospects for personal happiness and satisfaction in your chosen occupation will depend on how honestly and candidly you have conducted this study.

The consideration of all of these elements may appear needlessly confusing to the young man or woman contemplating entering upon the profession of the law. Yet when it is understood that this decision affects your future economic security and a professional career that will occupy the next thirty or more years of your life, the wonder is that it is not more difficult and complicated.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

By David A. Simmons
President of the American Bar Association
Consultant to the United States delegation at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco
(From July Number American Bar Journal)

To a great many people the reports from San Francisco during the Conference have been very discouraging. The disagreements have been so many and some of them so fundamental that

even reasonable headway toward a goal of peace and world security seemed impossible.

Let us ber in mind that the San Francisco Conference did not create any of these differences. They were already in existence and will continue until they are solved in one way or another. The fact that the American public was unaware of many of them means merely that we must make a more active effort toward understanding and then in attempting to help solve international problems which endanger the peace of the world.

The tendency of the press to play up every minor difference of opinion, or even of phraseology, between Russia and the United States as if it were a vital issue or, to use a different figure, as if it were a round in a fight to be won or lost, was not always helpful. Russia takes a firm position whenever she speaks and, perhaps, gives the impression that unless her position is accepted grave consequences may ensue. Witness her refusal to participate in the deliberations of the International Labor Office with Argentina a member. But when Argentina was admitted to the San Francisco Conference after a sharp fight, Russia shrugged her shoulders and went on to the next topic. So, too, was her reaction to the veto power. She desired a veto even over investigations of alleged aggression, but after some interchange of views between the heads of the governments, she smilingly gave way. Any lawyer who has tried and compromised cases for a couple of decades will recognize the tactics immediately and will not cry "Bad faith" every time there is a disagreement. A nation such as Russia, which has been forced to her utmost to keep from being destroyed and which has seen the minor nations about her used as allies or pawns by her bitter enemy, undoubtedly has a different opinion of her security needs and is less sensitive of the right of self-determination of her neighbors than is the United States, happily situated between Canada and Mexico. However, I see little reason for the press to make a Russian conflict out of everything that is said and done.

I had occasion to speak of the resolutions of the American Bar Association several times just before and during the Conference. Before one group of business men I was asked to explain our recommendation that in setting up the Assembly of the Organization consideration should be given to the principle of weighted representation of the nations.

This is a principle as old as the American Union. When the Union was formed several of the colonies insisted on equal voting in the Congress. In the final draft equality of voting was retained in the Senate, but voting in the House of Representatives was based on population, with the result that now Nevada has one vote, Texas twenty-one, and New York forty-five. Under the formula as adopted, weight was given to the factor of population.

I took the position that one day the Assembly would be the most important organ of the world Organization and should be constituted on a basis that would give recognition not merely to

the sovereign equality of the states but also to other factors equally real, such as population, area, industrial production, value of exports, and perhaps other elements; this same formula might be used not only for voting in the Assembly but for apportioning the expense of the world Organization and also as a guide to the maximum military force any nation might be called upon to furnish in the common defense.

The next morning one newspaper had a three-column headline saying that I was supporting the Russian position.

On another occasion I presented to the United States Delegation the views of the American Bar Association on the subject of amendments to the Charter. As the Charter relates solely to international affairs and its provisions were adopted in San Francisco by a two-thirds vote, and as treaties have always been adopted in this country by a two-thirds vote of the Senate, our proposal was in line with the historical American practice. Specifically, our proposal was that amendments to the Charter other than those which might relate to the purely internal affairs of any member State should be authorized by a two-thirds vote of the Assembly when concurred in by a two-thirds vote of the Security Council and not less than three of the five members holding permanent seats in the Security Council. That recommendation was concurred in by an overwhelming majority of the consultants who took a position on the matter, including those representing the American Federation of Labor, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National League of Women Voters, the Federal Council of Churches, the National Education Association, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and others. The only outspoken opposition among the consultants came from the National Lawyers Guild.

(Continued in next issue)

OUR SUPREME COURT HOLDS

In Dr. A. Flath, Applt., vs. E. E. Ellefson, et al, Respts.

That where tax deed has been issued to a county, pursuant to the provisions of chap. 235, Laws 1939, and the county after the issuance of such deed sells the land to a purchaser on contract for deed, and thereafter in suit brought by the owner of the land against such purchaser the tax deed is adjudged to be void, the Board of County Commissioners are not required by said ch. 235, L. 1939 to cancel taxes which were due and delinquent at the time tax deed was issued to the county.

That under the provisions of ch. 286, Laws 1941 a Board of County Commissioners is not required or authorized to cancel taxes against land which the county has acquired by tax deed, until the county has sold such land and received full payment therefor and executed and delivered deed to the purchaser.

That an owner of land which the county purchases at tax sale, and for which it later receives a tax deed, does not become a beneficiary under a contract for the sale of such land by the county to a purchaser other than such owner, whether such tax deed is valid or invalid.

That where a tax deed which has been issued to a county is void for want of legal notice of expiration of the period of redemption, the county