

**CONGRESSIONAL COMMENTS
ON THE UN**

(Not printed at Government expense)

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

None Is So Blind As He Who Will Not See

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, I introduced H.R. 9567, a bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations and the specialized agencies thereof and to repeal the Immunities Act relative thereto.

I introduced this resolution because it is my firm conviction that this Nation cannot survive as a Republic as long as we are shackled to an international organization by a treaty which supersedes our Constitution. As stated in the Declaration of Independence:

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

So in this resolution that same decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that I state the causes which impel me to seek this separation.

CONSTITUTION NULLIFIED

To prove my point, I submit the following facts for a candid review. Our Constitution provides:

627560--82589

This collection of speeches, remarks, and article inserts by various Congressmen has been reprinted as a public service by *American Opinion*. Additional copies are available at the following prices, postpaid: Two copies, one dollar; 100-999 copies, 40 cents each; 1000 or more copies, 35 cents each.

Order from:

AMERICAN OPINION
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

Hence, any law enacted by Congress pursuant to a treaty becomes the supreme law of the land even though it would otherwise be unconstitutional.

The supremacy of laws under a treaty was clearly set forth in the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1920 in the Missouri versus Holland case wherein a Federal law, otherwise unconstitutional, was held valid because of a treaty between Canada and the United States. This decision clearly held that where there was a conflict between the provisions of our Constitution and the provisions of a treaty, this conflict must be resolved in favor of the treaty. This same doctrine has been extended to include executive agreements. The result of this situation has been to destroy our limited form of republican government and has denied to each State a republican form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution and has supplanted it with a government of unlimited powers which destroys the historical separation of executive, judicial, and legislative branches of our Government. This was certainly never envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.

SUBTERFUGE AND DECEIT

When the United Nations Charter was submitted to the Senate for ratification, great stress was laid upon article 2, subparagraph 7 which states:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present charter.

I do not believe that the U.S. Senate would have ratified this treaty without relying on the above-quoted paragraph. However, this paragraph has been completely and constantly ignored over the past 16 years and every organization, commission, and covenant flowing out of the United Nations Charter has been for the sole purpose of intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations as well as the several States of our own Union, completely destroying the sovereignty of each State to legislate in contravention of the treaty provisions. Mr. Moses Moskowitz, a noted internationalist, made the following statement in the American Bar Association Journal of April 1949 (35 A.B.A.J. 283, 285):

Once a matter has become, in one way or another, the subject of regulation by the United Nations, be it by resolution of the General Assembly or by convention between member states at the instance of the United Nations, that subject ceases to be a matter being "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the member states." As a matter of fact, such a position represents the official view of the United Nations, as well as of the member states that have voted in favor of the universal declaration of human rights. Hence, neither the declaration nor the projected covenant, nor any agreement that may be reached in the future on the machinery of implementation of human rights, can in any way be considered as violative of the letter or spirit of article 2 of the charter.

Following this, the Acheson State Department made this official declaration:

There is now no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs.

These statements plainly render article 2, subparagraph 7, of the charter meaningless.

John Foster Dulles, former Secretary of State, in a speech before the American Bar Association in Louisville, Ky., April 12, 1952, said:

Treaty law can override the Constitution . . . They (treaties) can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights.

REPUBLIC DESTROYED

This conversion of our limited republic to an unlimited democracy is a death blow to this Nation.

The realization of this tragedy was the reason for the proposal of the Bricker amendment nearly a decade ago. The Bricker amendment simply provided that when there was a conflict between the Constitution of the United States and a treaty, that conflict must be resolved in favor of the Constitution, and yet the Bricker amendment was defeated by a narrow margin under strong propaganda pressure from the Council on Foreign Relations and politicians who gloried in the unlimited power conveyed upon them by the United Nations Charter. There were just too many politicians and too few statesmen.

A SAD INDICTMENT

Now let us look at the record. According to Trygve Lie, longtime Secretary General of the United Nations, he stated flatly that there was a secret agreement between Alger Hiss and Molotov to the effect that the head of the United Nations military staff should always be a Communist. That agreement has never been broken, and we have had a succession of Communists filling that post, the present one being Mr. Arkadov. As a first consequence of this treasonous agreement, this country lost its first military engagement in Korea at a cost to this country of more

than \$20 billion and 145,000 American casualties, to say nothing of the honor and prestige of this Nation.

This was the first war in which we engaged, not as the United States military force, but as a United Nations force, although we contributed 90 percent of the men and the money. How convenient this was to the Communists to have one of their own men as head of the United Nations military staff, who reviewed all orders going from the Pentagon to General MacArthur and gave them to our enemy before General MacArthur received them. The enemy, which consisted of the Red Communist army and Russian equipment and fliers, was driven back to the Yalu River and given sanctuary on the other side. General MacArthur could have destroyed the enemy in short order had he been permitted to pursue them across the river from whence they came. Because General MacArthur could not in good conscience follow these orders, he was recalled and the Korean war ended in dismal defeat.

We were sold the U.N. on a promise of peace, but we failed to realize that this peace was to be on Communist terms; in fact, it was to be a total victory for the international Communist conspiracy. Our faith in this hope was so firm that we were lulled into a state of false security while the Communist world gobbled up 13 or 14 countries, bringing 800 million people under their domination. Russia has used the veto power nearly a hundred times. The United Nations has been completely unable to bring any degree of peace, and Russia itself has created 13 or 14 military conflicts between the East and the West.

SINS OF OMISSION

The United Nations has not as yet passed a resolution of censorship against Russia for its Hungarian blood bath but

rather stood idly by and helped to betray the Hungarian freedom fighters into the hands of Russia. It could not even get a censorship resolution against India for its military invasion of Portuguese enclaves.

Further, Mr. Speaker, what may I ask is the United Nations doing to prevent President Sukarno, of Indonesia, from carrying out his military attack against the island possession of Holland which lies more than a thousand miles away from Indonesia? Is colonialism under Holland a bad thing but colonialism under pro-Communist Indonesia a good thing? I have been unable to get any rationale on this question. In fact, it has passed no resolutions of condemnation against Russia or any of its satellites or against the so-called neutral countries but busies itself with resolutions of condemnation against our allies, such as Portugal, Holland, and France.

The power, the honor, and the prestige of America have fallen from their high point in 1945 to an absolute zero today.

The action in Katanga is nothing short of lunacy. Not a voice was raised in the United Nations when Syria withdrew from the United Arab Republic, but that same organization sent troops into the Congo to prevent self-determination of a civilized and Christian province which did not want to be a part of a Communist-controlled Congo.

Our defeat in the abortive Cuban invasion can be laid on the doorstep of the United Nations, as the United Nations treaty prohibits us from engaging in any military operations without the consent of the United Nations Security Council in which Russia holds the veto power. At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Members of the House and the people of America that the Cuban situation was not even mentioned in the President's state of the Union message on January 11 although the so-called white

paper issued by the Department of State declares that Cuba constitutes a Sino-Soviet bridgehead in the Western Hemisphere and that the military power of Cuba is second only to that of the United States in the Western Hemisphere due, of course, to the millions of dollars of armaments, equipment, and technicians and money furnished by the Communist countries to Fidel Castro. Why, I ask, was not this clear and present danger to the security of our country discussed in the state of the Union message together with a proposal to dispel this danger?

Let me put this in very simple and understandable terms so that no one can misunderstand it. This situation is analogous to having a rattlesnake in the bedroom, and father ignores this danger to his family and starts blithely off on a big game hunt in Africa leaving mama and the children to cope with the rattlesnake in the bedroom.

A MILITARY STRAITJACKET

Mr. Speaker, how silly can we get to relinquish the right to protect our Nation against Communist invasion in the Western Hemisphere? If we continue our membership in this organization, you can look to see this Nation condemned for having our naval base at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. You can also look to see us condemned for owning the Panama Canal, and the same 86 votes which threw France out of its legal position in Bizerte can vote us out of Guantanamo and out of Panama. You can see, and with reason, Mexico demanding through the United Nations all of that territory taken from them under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo following the Mexican War in 1848. You can see Russia demanding the return of Alaska because we only paid them \$17 million when it is really worth billions and certainly the American Indians, if they had representation in the United Nations, could demand the return of Manhattan Island

together with the rest of the land that was legally theirs. You say this is fantastic? You would have said that the present situation in Cuba was a fantastic idea 10 years ago.

You can expect to see a one world government, Communist controlled, under the United Nations. You will see the United Nations run up astronomical debts which we, under the terms of the treaty, are bound to pay.

In a book by William Z. Foster, former head of the Communist Party, U.S.A., entitled "Toward Soviet America," he gives a complete blueprint of the conquest of America by the international Communist conspiracy. It is as clear a blueprint as given by Adolf Hitler in "Mein Kampf." Following are some of the things you may look for under the controlled Communist America as stated by William Z. Foster:

The final aim of the Communist international is to overthrow world capitalism and replace it by world communism. . . . The Communist Party of the United States . . . is the American section of the Communist International. The Communist international carries out a united revolutionary program on a world scale. . . . The American Soviet government will be organized along the broad lines of the Russian Soviets. . . . Under the dictatorship all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated. . . . Likewise, will be dissolved all other organizations—including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary Clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc.—lawyers will be abolished. The press, the motion pictures, the radio, the theater, will be taken over by the Government. . . . Studies will be revolutionized, being cleansed of religious, patriotic, and other features of the bourgeois ideology. . . . The decisions of the Soviets are enforced by the armed Red guard. . . . Citizenship is restricted to those who do useful work: capitalists, landlords, clericals and other nonproducers being disfranchised.

. . . In the so-called black belt of the South where the Negroes are in the majority, they will have the fullest right to govern themselves and also such white minorities as may live in this section. . . . Where the party elects its candidates to legislative bodies they make use of these public forums to bring forward the Communist program . . . the trade unions are the great schools for communism. . . . Religion has sanctified every war and every tyrant, no matter how murderous and reactionary. . . . The free American woman, like her Russian sister, will scorn the whole of bourgeois sex hypocrisy and prudery.

U.N. A GODLESS ORGANIZATION

Our Declaration of Independence concludes with these words:

And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

This is a full and complete acknowledgment of divine guidance. Nowhere in the United Nations Charter or any of its subsidiaries do you find any reference to a Supreme Being. The Bible says:

Unless the Lord build an house, they labor in vain who build it.

There is, indeed, no evidence of the Lord's work in the United Nations.

I know that I will be accused of being irresponsible and fanatical, but I find myself in good company. The testimony of five of our greatest fighting men, General Clark, General Van Fleet, General Stratemeyer, Admiral Joy, and Lieutenant General Almond, before the Jenner Committee in 1954, is summed up in the words of General Stratemeyer:

We were required to lose the Korean war.

Lord Beaverbrook, noted British publisher, said:

Here, in New York City, you Americans have the biggest fifth column in the world—the United Nations.

At this point, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that Alger Hiss recommended the first 500 employees for the United Nations.

Then, after that, the late Robert Taft said:

The U.N. has become a trap. Let's go it alone.

Herbert Hoover said:

Unless the U.N. is completely reorganized without the Communist nations in it, we should get out of it.

Winston Churchill said:

Don't pay attention to the U.N.

Charles de Gaulle has warned the U.N. to stay out of Algiers.

WHO MANAGES THE U.N.?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the present management of the United Nations. Russia had been demanding a troika to supplant the U.N. Secretariat after the death of Hammarskjold. The failure of Russia to secure this troika was hailed as a great victory for the West, but was it? U Thant of Burma, a self-styled Marxist, was chosen and he agreed to invite a limited number of U.N. under secretaries "to act as my principal advisers on important questions." So far he has indicated two: Georgy P. Arkadov, a Communist from the Soviet Union, and Ralph Bunche of the United States. This was a Communist victory in that Russia now has its troika: one an avowed Marxist, the second a dedicated Communist, and the third with a pro-Communist bias. A résumé of Dr. Bunche's record, prepared by Archibald B. Roosevelt, son of Theodore Roosevelt, includes this paragraph:

Dr. Bunche was part of the editorial apparatus of an openly Communist magazine, Science and Society, for over 4 years. He contributed to this publication and added his name and prestige as a professor of Howard University even after the Communists in their publication, The Communist, openly stated that Science and Society maga-

zine had as its function "to help Marxward moving students and intellectuals to come closer to Marxism-Leninism; to bring Communist thought into academic circles."

In a Senate probe by the Internal Security Subcommittee it was brought out that Dr. Bunche had repeatedly pressured persons in charge of U.N. employment to hire a notorious Communist agent, in spite of the fact that here was a derogatory report against the individual by a security agency of the Government.

Bunche was a high official in the Institute of Pacific Relations, an organization investigated thoroughly by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and described as follows:

The effective leadership of the IPR used IPR prestige to promote the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States.

The object of this IPR was, in 1944, to force the Chinese Government to adopt reform measures and make concessions to the Chinese Communists which would pave the way for seizure by Soviet forces.

627560—82589

Individual copies of "None Is So Blind" are available at the following prices, postpaid: Ten copies, one dollar; 100-999 copies, eight cents each; 1000 or more copies, seven cents each. Order from: AMERICAN OPINION, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

The IPR leadership sought to bring into public discussion at a vital meeting internal conditions in China so that Chiang Kai-shek would be criticized for the internal situation in China.

Dr. Bunche is on record as supporting the position of the IPR leadership in this matter.

It is my considered opinion that Dr. Bunche must be considered a security risk for our country in any position which he may hold.

This "troika" arrangement, engineered by the Communists, is frightening and devastating when you consider the United States of America has no foreign policy of its own except the United Nations.

Lincoln once said:

If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be the author and finisher.

This is it, Mr. Speaker. If this Republic is to perish, we ourselves, within our own household, will be the architect and finisher of our fate.

(Not printed at Government expense)

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

UNESCO: Communism's Trap for Our Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 4, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to insert an article by Mr. Paul Harvey, news analyst, American Broadcasting Network, entitled "UNESCO: Communism's Trap for Our Youth."

I have long contended that UNESCO posed a threat to our American youth by imposing international control of our curriculum by an international organization which does not embrace the American ideals liberty and freedom.

This article points up the fact that UNESCO is not tolerated in the Communist countries, as these countries do not accept the precept of UNESCO. Therefore, this program is simply preparing the youth of the free world to the subjugation of international communism. I hope that every parent who has children in school will read this and demand that the UNESCO program be forbidden in our American schools.

The article follows:

UNESCO: COMMUNISM'S TRAP FOR OUR YOUTH

When your child comes home from school parroting some phrase about the "world society of the future—" are you going to tell him it's wrong for him to "love his neighbor"?

When he comes home talking of world brotherhood, are you going to contradict the Christmas message of peace on earth and tell him that all men are not brothers?

Now wait a minute.

When your child goes from house to house for UNICEF, collecting coins for underprivileged children overseas, are you prepared to tell him he should not be charitable to those who have less?

When his elementary school textbooks indoctrinate him with the philosophy of world government are you prepared to insist that world war is preferable?

Are you against world government just because the American Legion is against it?

I have been wrestling with these questions and seeking answers for several weeks.

I told you there was evidence that UNESCO was brainwashing patriotism out of our youngsters and substituting the United Nations for God.

I said if I found fire where I'd smelled smoke we'd go into it further. Well, I have gone into it further, I have burned a lot of late lights digesting and analyzing all the evidence, pro and con, concerning UNESCO, and I have reached a conclusion which I want to discuss with you, but you are going to have to wade with me through some of the preliminary evidence.

UNESCO is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. It is an organization with thousands of publications too vast to enumerate.

UNESCO booklets are distributed through the National Education Association and the PTA to teachers and students.

UNESCO literature is issued through YMCA groups and churches, radio and TV programs, newspapers, magazines, civic groups, government agencies, but mostly directly and indirectly, it's philosophy of one-world government is aimed at the classroom.

Twelve persons connected with the administration of UNESCO have been identified in sworn testimony before congressional committees as Communists.

Seven have been connected with Soviet espionage.

Six others refused to appear before Government loyalty boards.

But now we are not challenging the loyalty or the motives of this organization. We are seeking to determine whether, whatever their intentions, a whole generation of young Americans is getting brainwashed for their own good or somebody else's.

Sometimes the defenders of the citadel, when they get desperate, become as vicious as the attackers.

The critics of UNESCO have sometimes let themselves get so worked up that they start flailing their arms, swinging in all directions,

becoming at once ineffectual and slightly ludicrous.

Let us, instead, suppose that the world government idea is a good one.

Let us admit that all God's children would be better off living together than fighting and that the next generation of children all over the world should be reared to this understanding.

That national boundaries are not something to fight over and that a United Nations is the way to discuss our disagreements.

That it is unnecessary to spill any more blood defending the American flag if we all pledge allegiance to the U.N. flag.

That is what the UNESCO disciples believe.

They are not all Communists. They are decent citizens who are convinced that this is the better way and that is why they are indoctrinating your child today through UNESCO literature and UNESCO influence in his elementary school classroom.

But this is the rest of the story:

Russia is not thus indoctrinating Russian children.

This is the larger issue. This is the point well-meaning veterans organizations and others have missed. While we are allowing our youngsters thus to have their American allegiance brainwashed away so they do not consider Americanism worth fighting for anymore, the Russians in their schools (and I wouldn't say this if I couldn't document it with current evidence) continue to preach and teach their elementary school children that communism is the only efficient government.

That God does not exist.

That Russia will one day rule the world.

Now wait a minute.

I'm talking now to the mostly good American parents who have been convinced that UNESCO was the proper way to prepare the next generation of world citizens to live together.

Don't you see what's happening?

Through UNESCO—American schoolchildren are being influenced away from their national allegiance.

American schoolchildren are being indoctrinated with world government ideals while the Russians prepare their children to run that world government.

They are softening the patriotism of our next generation, while hardening their own.

The end result of this lopsided indoctrination is too obvious to require elaboration.

Ex-Senator William Benton, speaking to UNESCO, said, "We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of our national sovereignty. In this UNESCO can be, and indeed must be, the pioneer."

But Red Poland has pulled out of UNESCO. And Red Hungary. And Red Czechoslovakia.

They will not use this "break down the walls" and love everybody stuff in their schools.

They will love communism and teach communism and only we, United States of Americans will dilute our patriotism until the American flag is a faded rag not worth fight-

ing for.

You may have difficulty getting your school administrators to admit that they are using UNESCO materials even if they are. The best test is to learn directly from the students if they are being taught that "collectivism is inevitable," that "polygamy is acceptable," that "private property has no place in the new order," that "we are all citizens of the world with an allegiance to all nations and to no one nation."

School teachers are vulnerable.

The president of the National Education Association, Dr. Lyman Ginger, says Russia "has an excellent school system." The basis for his judgment is that the Russian teacher is paid 1½ times as much as the Russian skilled worker. Of course, that fact loses its luster when you realize that the Russian factory workers have to work 80 hours and 49 minutes to buy one pair of shoes.

Yet many American teachers have felt that in adopting the international outlook they were being modern and imitating what their NEA president calls the Soviet Union's "excellent school system." Though Russia's schools are not teaching internationalism.

Communism over God. Russia over all.

Ask Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt about her recent visit to Russia. Are Soviet schools incorporating the UNESCO program? Certainly not.

Are Russian schools teaching that one nation is just like any other nation and that we must all live together under a United Nations? Certainly not.

Our UNESCO literature is indoctrinating American children with the idea that we should have an international anthem. Would Russian schools thus teach Russian children? Certainly not.

Mrs. Roosevelt found the Russians demanding an indelible allegiance to their own country. Seeking in every way to strengthen their own country. Teaching their children, by the Pavlovian reflex method, precisely and only what the Soviet state wants them to believe. As Pavlov taught his conditioned dogs, they teach their children to hate the United States.

Is there nothing to encourage international peace in their curriculum? Nothing. The classroom is a nationalistic weapon of the Kremlin.

The UNESCO Seminar—which guides American teachers—states, "One of the chief aims of education everywhere is to develop those qualities of citizenship which provide the foundation upon which international government must be based." No, not "everywhere."

So before we rewrite our textbooks, as the UNESCO Seminar recommends, "on a view to improving them as aids to international understanding," let's be sure everybody else follows suit or the implication is obvious. We grow nationally soft while they grow hard and strong. Only a Russian citizen or a Soviet subversive would want that.

Now please don't come back at me with the many old pro-and-con arguments that

have been weighed by the American Legion and the VFW and countless civic and discussion groups for years. I have, I believe, seen them all and I am not concerned with more hash from these leftovers.

We are not debating whether UNESCO's philosophy is good or evil.

We are not opposing the United Nations. We are not denouncing international cooperation.

We are not challenging the rightness or the wrongness of editing textbooks to put the U.N. in and rewriting history, to take the United States out and coaching our teachers to erase national boundaries from the minds of the next generation.

I only object to this one fact. It is not who is right that is of greatest importance, but what is right.

That while we are thus conditioning our children to salute a mongrel flag, Russia is conditioning her children to salute only the hammer and sickle.

Suppose you and I were trainers, training professional fighters and you taught yours to fight and I taught mine to dance the minuet, we'll have a real happy party. But Russia is training fighters.

Now, you say, what can you do?

If you are concerned with preserving patriotism in the next generation of Americans then the youngster first must hear it at home.

Dad's constant complaining about unfair taxes and "crooks in Washington" does little to instill faith and confidence in our Government. It must be counterbalanced with a respect for the strengths of our Nation, rather than a constant exaggerated emphasis on its weaknesses.

After the youngster has heard a little star-spangled conversation around the house, it's time for the parents to attend PTA meetings and to take an active, intense, personal interest in what the school is teaching and

what it is not teaching.

If you don't others will.

If you figure you can stay home and play cards on PTA night and "let George do it," you'd better expect the worst because George doesn't always agree with you.

The FBI has established that the Communists in the United States, under orders from Moscow, are making a concerted effort to work through respectable forums, including PTA groups. If you can't take an interest in directing your child's education, they will.

They are. Right now.

Much has been said about what Americans stand for. Equally important are the things Americans won't stand for.

And for goodness sake, understand this: Everybody who subscribes to the UNESCO philosophy of education is not a Communist. He may unwittingly be their tool, but a host of them are decent, honorable, entirely sincere parents like yourself who believe this is the best way to prepare their children for a future day when they must live with others in peace or perish in an atomic ash pile.

Don't try to shout them down, but try patiently to help them understand that Russia, as usual, is not keeping her part of this cooperative bargain.

Russia permits no UNESCO indoctrination of her youngsters.

Russia teaches "communism without compromise," and unless we prepare young Americans to believe in freedom without compromise, so that they will keep it strong and defend it against all enemies (foreign and domestic), we are dooming tomorrow's Americans to the fate of today's Hungarians.

But if we can revive in America's youth some of the faith of our fathers then this will again become the land of the free and the home of the brave and strong enough to keep your enemies at arms length which is quite enough to hope for in our time.

Individual copies of "UNESCO; Communism's Trap for Our Youth" are available, in an quantity, at 100 for one dollar, postpaid. Order from:
AMERICAN OPINION, Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

(Not printed at Government expense)

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Power Shift in the United Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, this project might well be termed our 1 great hour of truth. In this world there are moral absolutes which are as immutable as the inexorable passage of time. One of these moral absolutes can be stated in very simple terms:

If something is right, it is right, though all men believe it is wrong, and if it is wrong, it is wrong, even though all men believe it is right.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Lincoln expressed it in these words:

If I am right, history will vindicate me, but if I am wrong, all of the angels in Heaven cannot justify me.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the challenge of that moral absolute in what I have to say to the House today.

It shall be my purpose to discuss the influence of the United Nations on our foreign policy, and to explore the management of the U.N., as well as the shift in the voting power of the General Assembly.

I should like to go back a couple of years and call your attention to a national strategy seminar, held at Asilomar Conference Grounds, Monterey Peninsula, Calif., under the sponsorship of the 6th U.S. Army, the Western Sea Frontier—U.S. Navy—and the 4th Air Force. At that seminar, Mr. Walt Rostow, among other things, made this statement:

Those of us who live in the northern half of the globe . . . know that, in the century about to unfold, the technological monopoly we now hold will slip away and all the values and attitudes and policies that are

rooted in this northern monopoly will have to be transformed.

Specifically, we must count on a redistribution of power and influence on the face of the globe that will increase the relative authority of those who live in the South, whose influence on great events has hitherto been nonexistent or slight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is meant by "a redistribution of power and influence on the face of the globe"? Does that mean that we are to divide our powerful military establishment among all nations of the world, including the emerging African nations and the southeast Asian countries?

At the same conference, Mr. Paul Nitze made the following statement:

In brief, my proposal is . . . that we accept the improbability that we can achieve a true class A nuclear capability . . . that . . . the aim of our foreign policy is to construct a world system compatible with the survival and development of nations with purposes like ours, and . . . that a possible route toward the aim is a series of unilateral actions designed to produce reciprocal action on the part of our allies and also on the part of our enemies.

The actions I propose are the following: (1) that we concentrate on building a variety of secure, purely retaliatory systems, (2) that . . . we scrap the fixed-based vulnerable systems that have their principal utility as components of a class A capability, (3) that we multilateralize the command of our retaliatory systems by making SAC (the U.S. Strategic Air Command) a NATO command, and (4) that we inform the United Nations that NATO will turn over ultimate power of decision on the use of these systems to the General Assembly of the United Nations subject to the following conditions:

Subsection (a)—

That we and our allies will assume continuing responsibility for manning, maintaining, and improving these systems.

Subsection (b)—

That U.N. inspectors would be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining.

Subsection (c)—

That a U.N. order to use them will be honored only in the event some nation has initiated the use of nuclear weapons other than on or over its own territory in self-defense against military aggression.

You will note that Mr. Nitze spoke about U.N. inspectors who would be invited to inspect and satisfy themselves that these are the only nuclear systems we are maintaining. Just why did Mr. Nitze invite the U.N. inspectors to satisfy themselves as to the nuclear systems which we are maintaining—why did he limit it to “we”?

He recommended that the Strategic Air Command be made a NATO command and that NATO would turn over the final power of decision on the use of these systems to the United Nations. I must point out that Great Britain is one of our NATO allies and has just discovered a gigantic Communist infiltration into its civil service system. Thus, Great Britain would become a stopping place for the transmission of military intelligence on its way to Moscow. Needless to say, these grave pronouncements by Rostow and Nitze created a deep concern on the part of the American public, and many letters were written to the Defense Department and others, inquiring as to whether such a program was contemplated. A classic reply, in true doubletalk and gobbledegook, dated November 30, 1961, reads as follows:

Thank you for your recent letter enclosing a clipping from your local paper. The article is inaccurate in several respects, particularly inasmuch as the strategy seminar in which Mr. Nitze participated was held in April 1960, well before Mr. Nitze became a member of the administration. The proposal, portions of which were quoted in the clipping, was made in the context of an idea which he put forward informally for critical examination, indicating that it might well prove to be a grand fallacy. Consequently, the implication in the article that such a possibility is under consideration by Mr. Nitze or by the present administration is erroneous. With appreciation for bringing the article to our attention.

This letter was written on the letterhead of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, International Security Affairs, and is signed by Timothy W. Stanley, Special Assistant.

There are several interesting statements in this letter. Mr. Stanley ignores the fact that the seminar referred to was under the sponsorship of the 6th U.S. Army and the 4th Air Force.

Even though Mr. Nitze at the time of his famous statement was not a member of the administration, he shortly thereafter became a top-ranking member of our Military Establishment. My simple

question is, Was Mr. Nitze given this sensitive post because he made such a revolutionary statement and the administration wanted him to implement it, or was he made an Assistant Secretary of Defense in spite of his statement?

Mr. Stanley's letter was dated November 30, 1961, 3 months after the State Department issued its publication 7277, entitled “Freedom From War, the U.S. Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World.” This little 19-page booklet of disaster, defeat, and surrender is not in conflict with Mr. Nitze's statements, but rather supports them. This disarmament program as set forth by the State Department, among other things, proposes:

The elimination from national arsenals of all armaments, including all weapons of mass destruction and the means for their delivery, other than those required for a United Nations peace force and for maintaining internal order.

As states relinquish their arms, the United Nations shall be progressively strengthened.

Stage I: An International Disarmament Organization (IDO) shall be established within the framework of the United Nations . . . Strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles in specified categories and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be reduced to agreed levels . . . The reduction shall be accomplished . . . by transfers to depots supervised by the IDO.

Production of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be discontinued or limited.

Testing of agreed categories of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be limited or halted.

Stage II: Further reductions in the stocks of strategic nuclear weapons delivery vehicles and agreed types of weapons designed to counter such vehicles shall be carried out.

During stage II, states shall develop further the peacekeeping processes of the United Nations, to the end that the United Nations can effectively in stage III deter or suppress any threat or use of force in violation of the purposes and principles of the United Nations . . . The U.N. Peace Force shall be established and progressively strengthened.

Stage III: In stage III, progressive controlled disarmament . . . would proceed to a point where no state would have the military power to challenge the progressively strengthened U.N. Peace Force.

States would retain only those forces, non-nuclear armaments, and establishments required for the purpose of maintaining internal order; they would also support and provide agreed manpower for a U.N. Peace Force.

The U.N. Peace Force, equipped with agreed types and quantities of armaments, would be fully functioning.

The manufacture of armaments would be prohibited except for those of agreed types

and quantities to be used by the U.N. Peace Force and those required to maintain internal order.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening program of surrender. I have here a series of six Air Force recruiting posters which I wish to show to the Members of this House. You will note that the first one is entitled “Go U.S. Air Force.” Six flags are displayed, the most prominent being the United Nations flag. There is no American flag on display. My question is, has our Air Force been turned over to the United Nations, or is the prominent display of the United Nations flag a bit of subtle propaganda? Of course it might be a trial balloon to see how the American public will react. The other five posters which I display do not show the American flag.

Now, I am not one of those who are ashamed of the American flag and the respect which it should demand throughout the world, nor do I believe that the Star-Spangled Banner is a corny ditty for rightwing extremists.

In contrast to these recruiting posters of the Air Force, I shall show you six recruiting posters exhibited by the U.S. Navy, all of which display the American flag.

I was more than shocked to hear of the NBC special television show entitled “Regards to George M. Cohan,” on March 4, 1962. You will remember that George M. Cohan wrote many patriotic songs, among them you will recall, was “It's a Grand Old Flag.” In this NBC special one of the actors came on to the screen holding an American flag and said:

I guess everybody knows that George M. Cohan wrote a lot of songs about this. The Cohan brand of patriotism is a little old-fashioned, and naive for these confused times.

What has happened to America to make the Cohan brand of patriotism “a little old-fashioned and naive”? I am certain that the American people do not so believe, in spite of the so-called liberal movement.

Marcus Raskin, who was the main-spring of the liberal papers, is now employed in our highest level strategic planning agency, the National Security Council. What qualified him for this position? The liberal papers support

the following recommendations: Recognition of Red China; sponsorship of Red Chinese membership in the United Nations; recognition of Red China's claim to Formosa and to the Pescadores; financial aid for Red China; demilitarization of the West German Republic; recognition of East Germany's puppet regime; expulsion of West Germany,

Italy, Scandinavia, and France from NATO, shutdown of American missile bases in Europe; invitation to Russia to plug in on a bidirectional DEW line.

Is Mr. Raskin in his present position to implement these recommendations?

Was Walt Rostow appointed to his high position in the White House to implement his suggestion:

We must count on a redistribution of power and influence on the face of the globe.

Is that redistribution of power going on at the Geneva Conference today?

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us turn our attention to this organization to which some people in our State Department and some people in the Pentagon are suggesting that we turn over our Armed Forces.

The main structure of the United Nations was to consist of the General Assembly and the Security Council, which would have five permanent members. There also was created in the Secretariat an Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs. There was a secret agreement that a Russian national would hold this position of Under Secretary for this powerful committee. This was vigorously denied by the State Department for many years, until the first Secretary General, Trygve Lie, wrote his book entitled “In the Cause of Peace,” after which there was nothing for the State Department to do but admit this agreement. Secretary Lie makes this statement on page 45 of his book:

The choice of the Assistant Secretaries General, who would constitute my cabinet, was, of course, my first concern. It soon appeared that it was equally the concern of some of the great, and a number of the lesser, powers.

Mr. Vyshinsky did not delay his approach. He was the first to inform me of an understanding which the Big Five had reached in London on the appointment of a Soviet national as Assistant Secretary General for Political and Security Council Affairs. Mr. Vyshinsky simply spoke of an agreement—he said nothing of its binding quality, of the right of the Big Five to arrive at it, or of the length of time it was meant to apply. Now, by the terms of the charter, the Secretary General has full authority in the disposition of the assistant secretary generalships, with respect both to their nationality and to their personality. The authority, in fact, was the point of a hard-won decision at San Francisco which rejected an attempt to prescribe that there should be four Deputy Secretaries General, appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council in the same manner as the Secretary General. Strictly speaking, therefore, the Big Five had no right to arrive at any understanding regarding the distribution of the offices of Assistant Secretary General which

was binding upon the Secretary General.

This is not to say, however, that it would have been politic of me to resist the great power accord.

And it is true that there have been seven consecutive Communists as Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, all of them Russians with the exception of one from Yugoslavia.

This might not be so bad, while the United States had an effective veto power in the Security Council, but in 1950 Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in consort with some of the other powers, presented a program to the General Assembly entitled "United Action for Peace." I quote from page 75 of "Everyman's United Nations," a publication of the Office of Public Information of the United Nations:

Resolution A included provision for: (1) emergency special sessions of the General Assembly on 24 hours' notice on the vote of any seven members of the Security Council or a majority of the members of the United Nations if the Security Council, because of a lack of unanimity among the permanent members, failed to act in any case where there appeared to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression; (2) establishment of a Peace Observation Commission composed of representatives of 14 members, including the 5 permanent members of the Security Council, to be utilized by the General Assembly, the Interim Committee or the Security Council to observe and report on the situation in any area where international tension threatened international peace and security; (3) maintenance by member states of elements of their national armed forces for prompt availability as United Nations units, and the appointment by the Secretary-General of a panel of military experts to give technical advice to member states on request; and (4) establishment of a Collective Measures Committee composed of representatives of 14 members to study and report on methods which might be used collectively to maintain and strengthen international peace and security.

The real purpose of this resolution, as you can readily see, was to bypass the Security Council with its veto powers, so that the control of the United Nations has shifted from the Security Council to the General Assembly, giving them full powers to do anything under the U.N. Charter. While Dean Acheson had in mind the circumvention of the Russian veto, he also circumvented the veto of the United States.

The shift in the voting power in the General Assembly is frightening. There are 104 member states of the General Assembly, 50 percent of which have a combined population of much less than the population of the United States. The smallest of these member states, Iceland,

has but 200,000 population. Poor Mr. Stevenson sits as our Ambassador in the General Assembly representing 185 million people with a single vote to match the 52 votes representing a combined population of 165 million people. That is not only ridiculous, and stupid, but poses a catastrophic threat against the United States. On top of this situation, Russia started out with 3 votes and now has 10 under its control.

The real working force of the U.N. is not at the ambassadorial level. It is in the Secretariat and really revolves around three men: Secretary General U Thant, Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs Eugeny Kiselev, and Dr. Ralph Bunche, who is Under Secretary for Special Political Affairs.

I do not know too much about Secretary General U Thant except that he is from Burma, but judging from some of his past utterances I believe he has a strong pro-Communist bias. I would like to quote from one of his speeches.

On April 11, 1958, U Thant delivered a speech before the annual meeting of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia. Here are some excerpts from that speech:

It is not our business to pass judgment on the internal affairs of other countries. The recognition of this basic fact enables us to subscribe to the principle of peaceful coexistence. Our attitude should be governed solely by consideration of peace. We [Burmese] are convinced that it is not the path of wisdom to form military blocs, to enter into a hectic armament race and to rant hysterically at each other. These measures certainly do not make for peace; they only increase tensions. If the world's great religions like Islam and Christianity, after a prolonged and bloody war for centuries, flourish side by side in peace and amity, why should not Communist and non-Communist systems be permitted to coexist peacefully?

Let me be candid. When American foreign policy did concern itself with what was happening in the rest of the world, it did so out of fear and suspicion—fear of communism and suspicion of Communist motives. Fear and suspicion are very undesirable states of mind. They breed hatred, and hatred in turn breeds cruelty and intolerance. Fear of Soviet communism has led the United States, and those who follow her lead, to take a distorted view of the world situation, and of the forces that are at work in modern society.

When I say [this], I think I reflect the views of most thinking Asians. The weapons of the Soviet are in the first instance economic, social, and ideological: only secondarily military. If she relied primarily upon military action why has she not resorted to it before now?

The U.S. policy toward China is unreal. It needs a thorough reexamination and reappraisal. The reason behind the U.S. attitude

toward China is the contention that Communist China is bent on world domination. I find it difficult to understand this attitude when military force is neither in use nor immediately in prospect.

The refusal of the United States to support the admission of China to the United Nations is based on two assumptions—that the Chinese Government's behavior unfits it for membership in the World Organization;

that the Peiping government's grip on China may be broken at any moment. No one, however, believes this.

[It is] unprofitable to ask who fired the first shot in a war between two countries. The relevant consideration is that, unlike Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union did not compel by actual military invasion any of its neighbors to become satellites. Eastern Germany and Austria are exceptions, but Soviet troops established in those territories were, like Western forces, legitimate armies of occupation.

It can be argued, however, that though the Soviet Union has not as yet attempted to impose its will on any state outside the Communist cordon, the Soviet has had and still has the intention to do so whenever the circumstances are favorable. But it is very difficult to arrive at an objective appraisal of such suppositions. Suspensions are not proof, and it is doubtful whether any proof has been established to sustain this charge.

Nothing needs to be said about Eugeny Kiselev, as he is a well-known hard-core Communist, and is not only Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs, but he was also immediately made a top adviser for U Thant.

That brings us to the other powerhouse in the United Nations Secretariat, Dr. Ralph Bunche.

Anyone who does not speak in glowing terms of Dr. Bunche is considered to be a heretic or a segregationist. Let me state that I am not a segregationist, and we have millions of loyal, patriotic American Negroes, many of them capable of this assignment. All that I intend to say about Ralph Bunche is by pointing out some of his former connections and quoting from some of his speeches.

In an article written for the Journal of Negro Education in 1936, volume 5, No. 3, page 356, he wrote as follows:

We are now witnessing an unusual era of academic repression, but the controls are always present, in good times or bad. The repressive measures, Red riders, gag laws, and oath clauses of the present period of hysteria are merely forceful reminders of the fundamental bias of our educational system.

In his pamphlet entitled "A World View of Race," pages 64-65, he makes this suggestion:

If the oppressed racial groups, as a result of desperation and increasing understanding, should be attracted by the principles of equality and humanitarianism advocated

by the Soviet Union [and it is both logical and likely that they will] then racial conflict will become intensified. In such case, however, racial conflict will be more directly identified with class conflict, and the oppressed racial groups may win the support of oppressed, though previously prejudiced, working-class groups within the dominant population.

He concludes this pamphlet by saying:

And so class will some day supplant race in world affairs. Race war then will be merely a sideshow to the gigantic class war which will be waged in the big tent we call the world.

He continually refers to the imperialistic capital system indicating a complete disdain for the American capitalistic system.

Dr. Bunche was the main force in organizing the National Negro Congress. He not only takes credit for this but is given credit for it by none other than the Communist Party leader, William Z. Foster, in these words:

Among those present were such notables as Ralph Bunche, W. E. B. DuBois, A. Phillip Randolph, R. A. Carter, John P. Davis, James W. Ford, and others (book: "History of the Communist Party," by W. Z. Foster, International Publishers, 1962, p. 309).

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a good look at the National Negro Congress.

NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS

First. Cited as subversive and Communist—Attorney General Tom Clark, letters to Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Second. A. Phillip Randolph, president of the congress since its inception in 1936, refused to run again in April 1940 on the ground that it was deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists.

From the record of its activities and the composition of its governing bodies, there can be little doubt that it has served as what James W. Ford, Communist vice-presidential candidate elected to the executive committee in 1937, predicted "An important sector of the democratic front," sponsored and supported by the Communist Party—Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pages 7687 and 7688.

Third. "The Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes is known as the National Negro Congress. The officers of the National Negro Congress are outspoken Communist sympathizers, and a majority of those on the executive board are outright Communists"—Special Committee

on Un-American Activities, report, January 3, 1939, page 81; also cited, reports, January 3, 1940, page 9; June 25, 1942, page 20; and March 29, 1944, page 180.

Fourth. A "Communist-dominated mass organization"—California Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1947, page 230).

Fifth. William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party, U.S.A., stated that the role of his party was one of central importance in the organization of the great united front National Negro Congress in Chicago, February 1936—Massachusetts House Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1938, page 298.

Those citations are certainly evidence of the pro-Communist bias exhibited by Dr. Bunche.

Dr. Bunche became a contributing editor of *Science and Society*, a Marxian quarterly. Among his fellow contributors were: Paul Langevin, a top level member of the French Communist Party who upon his death was publicly lauded for his dedication to communism; Joseph Needham, a British professor who has led in the Soviet charge accusing the United States of germ warfare in Korea; and W. P. Parry—he was managing editor of *Science and Society* when Bunche first appeared as contributing editor. Parry was director of the Communist Progressive Labor School in Boston. Appearing before the Un-American Activities Committee he refused to answer whether he was or has been a Communist.

The Communist publication entitled "The Communist," carried an article by V. J. Jerome, a top Communist writer. The January 1937 issue makes this statement:

We have stated earlier, and we wish to reaffirm at the conclusion, the considerable achievements of the magazine [*Science and Society*], its auspicious beginnings, and the hopeful prospects for its realization of the purposes the editors have set for it. On the basis of its efforts and of its realizations to date, *Science and Society* is deserving of the fullest support of the Communist Party and of all progressives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bunche remained a contributing editor of this Marxian quarterly for 4 years and when he finally resigned he sent a letter to the editor of *Science and Society* explaining that other duties prevented him from further serving and wishing them success in their future endeavors. Does that sound like a dedicated American?

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

First. Cited as a Communist publication—Special Committee on Un-American

Activities, report, March 29, 1944, page 96.

Second. Among publications which the committee found to be Communist initiated and controlled, or so strongly influenced as to be in the Stalin solar system—California Committee on Un-American Activities, report, 1948, page 225.

Third. Cited as a Marxian quarterly distributed by the Communists' Progressive Book Shop in Boston, Mass. William T. Parry, director of the Communist Progressive Labor School in Boston, is the managing editor—"Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications," May 14, 1951, issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, page 149.

It is a matter of official record that Bunche sponsored a Communist to a key post in the U.N. In fact, this Communist had received an award of \$40,000 in lieu of reinstatement from the U.N. after he had refused to answer as to whether or not he had been and was a Communist. This Communist who took the fifth amendment many times before the Senate Internal Security Committee was Mr. Harris.

Dr. Bunche was an active participant in the Institute of Pacific Relations—IPR.

The IPR was completely infiltrated with Communists and pro-Communists. Among those active in the IPR were: Alger Hiss, Soviet spy; Laughlin Currie, named by Elizabeth Bentley as connected with Soviet spy ring; Frederick Vanderbilt Field, convicted Communist agent; Harry Dexter White, spy exposed by the Attorney General of the United States and Edgar Hoover of FBI; Joseph Barnes, identified as a member of the Communist Party; and Benjamin Kizer, identified as a member of the Communist Party.

The Communist Daily Worker always comes to the defense of Dr. Bunche. If he is such an anti-Communist, why should he be receiving the constant praise of the Communist Daily Worker?

There, Mr. Speaker, is the blueprint for the full surrender of this great Republic. The implementation of this tragic program of the New Frontier can only be stopped by the American public, when the people are fully informed as to the truth, and demand that the administration take a firm stand.

It is no longer a question of "better Red than dead"—it is a question of being both Red and dead if we surrender or even try to coexist.

God forbid that this Nation shall ever fall into the hands of a foreign foe.

(Not printed at Government expense)

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 85th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Congressional Investigation of International Labor Organization Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 29, 1957

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate recently considered a resolution (S. J. Res. 73) to raise the ceiling on United States contributions to the International Labor Organization from \$1,750,000 a year to \$3,000,000 a year.

The Senate approved an increase of \$250,000, which would raise the ceiling to \$2,000,000 a year.

The resolution has now been referred to the House Foreign Affairs Committee. It will come up for discussion and action at the next session. It would be most constructive, therefore, to give the questions raised by this resolution some study in the meantime—and I therefore propose to go into it today, with the hope and expectation that what I have to say may lead to a closer examination of the advisability of the ILO budget increase.

Just what is the ILO?

Most of us know that it is a holdover from the League of Nations, and that it is now one of the agencies of the United Nations.

We know that it holds an annual conference every June in Geneva, attended by representatives of labor, employers, and government from each of its 78 member countries.

We know that the ILO is presumed to concern itself with the welfare and the standards of living of the workingman, all over the world.

We are told by the Labor Department, the State Department, and various in-

ternational idealists, that the ILO is a vital instrument for the preservation of world peace.

But all of this still leaves us in the dark. I repeat—just what is the ILO, and what does it do?

Fortunately, we have available factual information on this subject, gathered from people who have had ample experience in ILO conferences. I refer in particular to William L. McGrath, of my own city of Cincinnati, who served for 8 years as a member of the United States employer delegation to the ILO, and has also served a 3-year term as a member of its governing body.

Mr. McGrath's reports on the actual workings of the ILO have aroused the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, which nominate the employer delegation to the ILO, to the point that these two organizations have seriously questioned the advisability of further participation in the ILO. They sent a delegation this year practically under protest, at the urgent insistence of the Government, and have recommended that the Congress of the United States conduct a searching joint investigation as to the advisability of the United States continuing to remain a member of the ILO.

The concern of the NAM and the United States Chamber of Commerce lies in the fact that the ILO has long since ceased to be a body devoted to the affairs of labor, and has instead become a political forum and propaganda agency devoted chiefly to fostering the philosophy of socialism, communism, and nationalization of industry.

To further its purposes the ILO uses

the convention device. As you know, a convention is, in effect, a draft of a basic law which, when ratified by member countries, stands as a treaty among the nations which have ratified it.

ILO conventions can be, and are, used as the framework for specific legislation in countries all over the world. Left-wing political orators use them to lend support to their campaign proposals. From the standpoint of ideologies the ILO is probably the most influential propaganda organization in the world today; and this propaganda is in the main absolutely contrary to the beliefs and principles of the United States.

We, that is, the great majority of us, believe in freedom for the individual; the ILO is dedicated to mastery by government. The underlying intent of practically every ILO proposal put forward in recent years has been along the lines of more power for government, more control by government, more regimentation by government, more regulation by government—until the state would be the complete master of human destinies and affairs.

In its earlier days the ILO devoted itself to subjects concerned directly with labor. But then, in 1944, the ILO passed the so-called Declaration of Philadelphia, which said, among other things, that it was a responsibility of the ILO to examine and consider all international economic policies and measures in the light of the attainment of conditions under which human beings pursue their material well-being and their spiritual development.

By incorporating this declaration in its constitution, the ILO assumed the presumed right to draft proposed international laws on any subject under the sun; and that is exactly what it has proceeded to do. Let me give you some examples:

The ILO has drafted a proposed international law to the effect that government should give people money for illness, injury, childbirth, unemployment, old age, invalidity, which is defined as the inability to engage in any gainful activity, and a morbid condition. Intertwined in the provisions of this convention is a complete system of socialized medicine.

The ILO has drafted a proposed international law to the effect that all private employment agencies should be put out of business, and all employment placement should be concentrated in the

hands of government. If government can tell people where they must go for jobs, government can direct the destiny of mankind.

The ILO has drafted a proposed international law to the effect that government should pay benefits to employed women at the time of childbirth, that the children should be put into a Government-run nursery, and that interruptions of mothers' working time for purposes of nursing the baby should be counted as working hours and paid for as such by the employer. I am told that when this convention was being drafted, an argument arose as to whether the convention should prescribe that a woman should nurse her baby for 1 hour during the working day, or for 2½ hours.

The ILO enacts recommendations as well as conventions—and in its recommendations it can give its socialistic ambitions full sway, for recommendations are pure propaganda, and do not have to be held within bounds which are practical for ratification purposes.

In 1955 the ILO passed a recommendation to the effect that in each country the public authorities, meaning government, should take over the education of all youngsters on the farm, providing them with textbooks, and teachers, prescribing examination requirements, and providing buildings, transportation, equipment, and so forth. This was a blueprint for the Communist technique of forcing young minds into the pattern prescribed by government.

In that same year the ILO recommended that the competent authority—meaning government—should prepare suggestions and guidance for the operation of canteens and cafeterias in industrial plants, subject to legal enforcement. In short, government is going to prescribe what people shall eat.

The ILO also enacts resolutions. One of its resolutions, passed under the pretext of dealing with unemployment, prescribed that government should take over production, allocation of markets, distribution of products, price fixing, wage fixing, financing—in fact, all phases of the economic system—and in addition, prescribed how workers should use their leisure time.

The ILO has what it calls a program of technical assistance. Theoretically, the ILO is supposed to send out experts to underdeveloped countries to help them increase productivity. But a large share of the technical assistance projects

undertaken by the ILO turn out to be projects having to do with giving government a greater voice in the affairs of men.

For instance, the ILO calls the setting up of a social security system, the organization of a labor department, the establishment of a cooperative, the undertaking of a manpower survey, technical assistance. It is my suspicion that the technical assistance of the ILO consists largely of providing assistance in the promotion of socialism.

The Socialists took control of the ILO some years ago, when socialism took a firm hold in Europe. The underdeveloped countries of the Far East, impressed with Socialist ideas, followed the European pattern. Then in 1954 the Communists came back into the ILO in a big way. Russia returned as three nations—the U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, and Byelorussia—and began to bring its satellites back in full strength.

Today the Soviet countries have a solid block of 36 potential votes in the ILO, as compared to 4 for the United States.

The recent Communist invasion of the ILO has operated to push the nature of its proposals further to the left. While the Socialists and the Communists compete for followers, they nevertheless agree on certain basic theories such as nationalization of industry and government regimentation.

The net result is that today, as I said before, the ILO is spreading the doctrines of socialism and collectivism all over the world.

The Labor Department and the State Department say that the ILO represents an opportunity to sell the American way of life and the competitive system to the rest of the world. But have our Government delegates ever stood up at an ILO conference and made such an attempt? The answer is "No."

The employer and worker delegates from the free countries of the world have tried to have the so-called employer and worker delegates from the Soviet nations disqualified, on the ground that they cannot possibly represent free associations of employers and workers, and are merely stooges of their governments and the Communist Party. But has the United States Government helped in this effort? Again, the answer is "No." Our Government's policy has been simply to accept the doctrine of coexistence.

In short, the Socialists and the Communists have been gaining increasing headway in the ILO, and the influence of the United States has been growing less and less.

Hour after hour, in the plenary sessions, I am told, the Reds condemn our way of life and make frequent abusive reference to the United States—and for the most part we just sit and take it.

And is an international forum in which free enterprise is damned by a continuous flow of leftwing and Communist oratory of any possible help in selling the philosophy of the United States or in the preservation of world peace?

This brings me to the question of the proposed increase in our annual contribution to the ILO. We are asked to give more money to an organization in which our influence has been growing steadily less, and which is becoming increasingly successful in selling the rest of the world the very principles to which we are most opposed.

But that is just the beginning of the budget story. The detailed facts are almost incredible.

The United States pays 25 percent of the ILO budget; the other 77 nations pay the rest. This means that we bear one-fourth of the cost, and have one-seventy-eighth of the votes.

Sixty-four member nations of the ILO pay a total of 24.07 percent of its budget. In short, 64 nations, all rolled together, pay less than the United States; and yet those 64 nations, which include the smaller, underdeveloped and Socialist nations, can completely outvote the United States on any issue.

In 1955 the budget was apportioned among 66 member nations. But then the three Russian nations, the U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, and Byelorussia, came back in, and Honduras also joined. These 4 new members contributed 11.5 percent of the ILO budget. As a result, 41 nations got reductions in percentage allocations of ILO expense. But did the United States get a reduction? The answer is "No." For some years there has been a persistent drive within the ILO to get an even higher percentage from the United States of America.

The 1958 budget for the ILO contemplates a further percentage reduction for 27 member nations.

Now, in the face of the facts I have previously given you, let me ask this

simple question—why should our country provide additional financing to an organization which is dedicated to the destruction of the very principles for which our country stands?

Of course, there are people who gaily assume that everything is for the good and that the ILO must be a noble enterprise because of its announced intentions. There are also people who may feel that the interests of the United States are well protected in the ILO because Mr. David Morse, Director General of the ILO, is an American citizen.

I would like to say a few words about Mr. Morse. Back in the Roosevelt era he was General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, and then became Under Secretary of Labor. He headed the Government delegation to the ILO, and then in 1948 was elected its Director General. This was a natural progression, the implications of which you can judge for yourselves.

When the Russians came back into the ILO, bringing their satellites with them in full force, Mr. Morse took a very factual view of the situation. After all, they represented a substantial increase in the ILO budget.

At the May meeting of the governing body this year, the question arose as to the reelection of Mr. Morse as Director General. His term was to expire in 1958. The governing body voted to extend his term for 5 more years.

Speaking in support of that proposal, Mr. Arutiunian, representing the Government of the U. S. S. R., said that he wished to stress the fact that Mr. Morse had been personally responsible to a very large extent for "certain developments in ILO activities in recent years"; that during his directorship it had become a universal organization, which made it possible to organize cooperation between countries which had different social and economic systems.

Following his reelection, Mr. Morse "hinted"—according to the Christian Science Monitor of June 27—that he would submit formal proposals soon for full ILO recognition of employer delegates for Communist countries.

I draw no implications and make no criticism of Mr. Morse. The executive head of an international organization owes his allegiance to that organization, and must shape his policies in line with majority opinion of its membership.

When he assumed his office, Mr. Morse took the following oath:

I solemnly undertake to exercise in all loyalty, discretion, and conscience the functions that have been entrusted to me as Director General of the International Labor Office, to discharge these functions and regulate my conduct with the interests of the International Labor Organization alone in view, not to seek or accept instructions in regard to the performance of my duties from any government or other authority external to the International Labor Organization, and at all times to uphold the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

It is my understanding that Mr. Morse is an exceptionally able man, which he must be to hold the position he does. I simply wish to point out that the fact that Mr. Morse is an American citizen does not make him, in the ILO, an official representative of the interests of the United States. To carry through his job with honesty and integrity, he must follow the thinking of majority ILO membership, and such thinking is contrary to the philosophy of the United States.

I would like to mention another individual currently in the limelight in connection with ILO affairs, Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Last year, when the NAM and the United States chamber launched a serious blast of criticism of the ILO, the administrative branch of the Government set up an independent committee composed of college professors to look into the matter. Mr. Johnson was the chairman.

The Johnson committee came up with a report to the effect that, although there were many things wrong with the ILO, it was nevertheless a glorious institution. I have always been intrigued by the unfailing instinct of people in Government to select a committee chairman who will come up with a report which suits their purposes.

Mr. Johnson showed up this June as one of the advisors on the United States Government delegation to the ILO Conference in Geneva. No doubt this is merely a singular coincidence.

I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States turned the spotlight on the ILO.

The Congress has not been in the least backward in turning the spotlight on organized labor. Why should we hesitate as far as the ILO is concerned? It is rather interesting that, when Dave

Beck was wanted by Senator McCLELLAN'S committee, the first story was that he could not come because he was on his way to attend an ILO meeting in Hamburg. I believe the time has come for the Congress to take a new look at this whole ILO proposition.

I should like to explore this pertinent question—can anyone from the Labor or State Department, or any place else, point specifically to any particular advantage or accomplishment gained for the people of the United States as a result of our participation in the ILO?

I say that either the United States should be more effective in the ILO than it is now, or we should get out of it—one or the other.

But the correct answer can only be

obtained by really digging into the subject. That is why I think we should have a joint congressional investigation.

Mr. McGrath, who has devoted many months of time and effort to the ILO, was once told by a member of the State Department that as to ILO matters there were "global considerations which no mere businessman could be expected to understand." Perhaps there are global considerations which no mere Congressman can be expected to understand. If so, I would like to know what they are.

It is my present intention to introduce at the next session of the Congress a joint resolution calling for a complete investigation of the International Labor Organization.

(Not printed at Government expense)

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

The Great Conspiracy to Destroy the United States

SPEECH

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that there now exists a widespread understanding and agreement made between the agents of this Government and the United Nations and North Atlantic Treaty Organization to build a world government, and to make the United States a part of it, regardless of our Constitution, laws, and traditions. This is to be done in the name of peace, but will result in the total destruction of our liberty. The agents representing the United States may not be deliberately trying to do this treasonable work, but the best that can be said for them is that they are dupes. Some mighty important people who are United States citizens are not only going along with this scheme, but are daily and hourly contributing all their efforts in that direction.

What proof do we have to back up this general statement? The purpose of this speech is to lay this proof before the American people.

First of all, the people of the United

States were so completely sick of war after World War II that these schemers found a fertile field to exploit. They appealed to churches, schools, and every other organization they could reach, on the basis that the way to secure peace in the world was to organize a United Nations group, and that through the machinery which they proposed to set up wars could be stopped before they started. It seemed like a plausible idea, and not knowing the sinister purpose behind the move, millions of people supported the suggestion.

The first move was made at San Francisco, where many nations met, drew up a charter, and submitted that charter to the Senate of the United States for approval as a treaty.

This document had none of the earmarks of a treaty, because the Supreme Court of the United States has held in many cases that a treaty is an agreement made between nations, to do or not to do particular things. In the case of the Charter of the United Nations, it was not an agreement between nations. It was an agreement made by the agents of several governments, and there is no contention from any quarter that the United Nations at that time was a nation with which we could make a treaty agreement. The dark forces behind this move knew that the United Nations was not a nation with which we could make a treaty, but intended to make it an integral power at the first opportunity.

How these forces for evil planned to make the United Nations a nation is clear now, since they propose at this time to build a world government by simply amending the Charter of the United Nations.

Who were the principal movers at San Francisco for this United Nations Charter? Who wrote the charter, and who had the most to do about shaping its provisions? The answer is that the Russian Communists and Alger Hiss, a representative of our State Department, were the prime movers and schemers in arranging its provisions. That is the same Alger Hiss who was convicted for perjury when he denied sending secret material to the Soviet Union representatives. Its very beginning gave this document a bad odor.

The universal approval of a plan to preserve world peace had not worn off and the facts were yet unknown when the Senate was called upon to approve the United Nations Charter. The sentiment for peace was so strong that only two Senators refused to approve the charter. If the question were to come up now, a great majority would say "No."

If the real purpose of this charter was to outline a method to secure and preserve world peace, why was it necessary in that charter to make an assault upon the Constitution of the United States? Are we not already a peace-loving nation, without having to rely upon the Soviets and Hiss?

Here you see again that world peace was not the object of this scheme at all. The real purpose was to build a world government, controlled by the Communists and their dupes in the United States.

As soon as this charter was approved the courts of the United States began to hear about it. In the Fujii case in California, the Charter of the United Nations was substituted for the laws of the State of California, and that remained so for several months, until a higher court overruled the court that made this finding. It was a precarious situation,

depending upon the whim of a court.

Again, in the Steel Seizure case, where the Supreme Court was searching our Constitution for some provision that would uphold the President in his action, the same Charter of the United Nations once more appeared. Failing to find any authority in the Constitution to fortify the President's position, the Chief Justice resorted to one of the most unheard-of things in American history. He produced the Charter of the United Nations as the authority for the seizure and cited its provisions in an effort to support the President's act. Fortunately for the people of the United States, the majority of the Court would not permit this communistic charter to supplant the Constitution of the United States. It was, however, a close call, and abundantly proved the need of the Bricker amendment. No one can ever tell what the next decision might be, although throughout our history God seems always to be on our side; and no matter what the political complexion of the Supreme Court may be, the decisions have upheld the Constitution.

The next assault on the Constitution is found in the Covenant of Human Rights, which has not as yet been presented to the Senate for ratification. The United Nations has amended its first draft several times, and because of the rising tide of objection to what it is doing and planning to do, the latest draft has not come before the Senate.

The subtle and fraudulent work of the United Nations in trying to prepare the people of the United States for the approval of this un-American document ought in itself to condemn its further consideration by the people and their leaders.

To prove to you that its procedure was fraudulent and totally dishonest, I wish to clearly state that the United Nations put out a Declaration of Human Rights, which, upon its face was not objectionable. This declaration was propagandized by the spreading of millions of copies among church people, in the com-

mon schools, and in the higher institutions of learning. Every civic organization was also the object of this avalanche of propaganda.

There was a cunningly designed purpose in this. It was necessary to prepare the people for the advent of the Covenant of Human Rights. When the propagandists thought the ground work had been sufficiently laid, the real human rights document appeared. It was and still is called the Covenant of Human Rights, but it is entirely different from the propagandized Declaration of Human Rights. Here in this Covenant of Human Rights the United Nations, among other things, undertakes to do three important things, all of which threaten the Constitution of the United States. It has rewritten what is meant by free speech, a free press, and free religion. The Constitution is not in doubt in defining these three fundamental attributes of a free government. Here is what it says:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

If the provisions of the document called the Covenant of Human Rights are adopted by the Senate please ask yourselves what has become of these precious constitutional rights. Here is what the covenant says about them:

Article 15, section 3: Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

Article 16, section 2: Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art or through any other media of his choice.

Section 3: The exercise of the rights provided for in the foregoing paragraph carries

with it special duties and responsibilities. It may therefore be subject to certain restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary (1) for respect of the rights or reputations of others, (2) for the protection of national security or of public order, or of public health or morals.

When we go so far as to hedge in, restrain and circumvent free speech, then there is no free speech. There will be no free press. There will be no free religion. Does anyone who is acquainted with these facts want to say that the United Nations is not trying to rewrite our Constitution, with the aid and support of Communists and revolutionists? Just why is it necessary to emasculate our Constitution if the only object of the United Nations is world peace? Is not our Constitution and the desire of all the people of this country in favor of peace?

It is necessary to change our Constitution in order to carry out the design and conspiracy to build a world government. Is it not perfectly clear to you now that this was the real purpose of the framers of the United Nations from its very beginning? It ought to be obvious to any fairminded person that it is the deliberate scheme of the United Nations to destroy the Constitution of the United States, and should need no further proof.

But that is not all, as the following steps will disclose. The United Nations has produced another convention, which in time they will ask the Senate to approve. I refer to the Genocide Convention. This is an appealing subject and it has caught in its net a great many good American citizens. As defined by the dictionary, genocide is "the use or a user of deliberate, systematic measures toward the extermination of a racial, political, or cultural group."

The wholesale destruction of a race or group of people for no reason at all except that they are a race or group, is against all principles of humanity, and in this country is a violation of moral

and civic law. Is there anything in the Constitution of the United States, or even in the laws of any State of this great Union, that approves such crime? Why is it necessary to change and amend, abrogate and repeal, our own Constitution in order that we shall be authorized to rise up against such a moral and legal crime? The answer is that there is no possible reason for this action—if the purpose of the covenant is to prevent genocide.

This Convention undertakes to further amend the Constitution of the United States and deny the rights of our citizens under the Bill of Rights in another respect. The sixth amendment to the Constitution provides:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

The Genocide Convention provides that a citizen of the United States, who has, in the opinion of the United Nations, libeled or injured the feelings of a race, a group, or any member of a group, shall be subject to trial for violating the covenant. Will the accused be tried here in the United States, where the crime was alleged to have been committed? No. He will be tried wherever the United Nations may decide. Will he be tried under the Constitution and laws of this country, with the safeguards provided by the sixth amendment? No. He will be tried under such laws as the United Nations World Court shall prescribe. Why was it considered necessary to take away from the citizens of this country the protection our Constitution gives them? Are our people engaged, or were they ever engaged in race annihilation?

The real, hidden, and treasonable pur-

pose of this provision was and is to tear down our Constitution and make all citizens, who are entitled to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, subject to the provisions of a world court, which is already being set up to function in this supergovernment—a world government.

Do we need further proof that the real and only purpose of the builders of the United Nations was to fashion a world government and to make our citizens subject to that world government, and to strip from them the protection guaranteed them under the Constitution of the United States?

If this is not treason, then I do not understand the provision of the Constitution defining it. Section 3 of article III of the Constitution says:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

For fear that there may be some in the United States who are not yet convinced by what I have said so far, I will not rest this case there, but will present further evidence.

The United Nations set up an organization known as UNESCO—United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—for the purpose of spreading universal learning, which the promoters contended would bring the people of the world more quickly to a mutual understanding than anything else would.

There was no objection to this proposal—at least on the face of it. But it turned out to be the most dangerous, the most dastardly undertaking of all that the United Nations had theretofore contrived. Its purpose was not what its promoters said it was. It was a deliberate plan to create public opinion for the coming world government. The malicious and cowardly element of the enterprise was that it was directed to the schoolchildren of the Nation, where minds are young and impressionable,

and it is patterned exactly after the Soviet teaching of the youth of the country.

These schemers knew that the United States has a strong national spirit; they knew that the average American loves his country; they knew he would defend its institutions, which had brought freedom in a new land. The plotters determined that this spirit must be destroyed, or at least minimized. So UNESCO went to work.

The first step was to train teachers at Columbia University, at the expense of the United Nations—principally at the expense of the taxpayers of this country—to teach our children ways by which they could become world citizens, and that a strong national spirit interferes with this world venture. The birthdays of our great leaders, like Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Lincoln were not to be celebrated in honor of these leaders, but the day of celebration should be devoted to propagandizing these children on the benefits of this future world government. They made it exceedingly plain that love for the United States and its institutions prevented our participation in such a world government.

Printed matter, radio and television were used night and day to carry on the cultivation propaganda, and to root out the love of country from these United States. This program is still being carried on, and the worst part of it is that the people who will eventually be stripped of the protection of our Constitution will pay the price of its destruction in taxes. It should now be proven overwhelmingly that the United Nations was organized to destroy the Constitution of the United States. This is all done in the name of world peace—but who wants to substitute world peace for the liberty and freedom we have? Who wants to surrender the sovereignty of this great republic to an organization which has been assiduously at work from its very beginning to abolish our Constitution?

Two very important sessions of the world government advocates have been

held in London, and in the proceedings it is made plain that the machinery for world government is already set up in the Charter of the United Nations, and all that is necessary is to make a few amendments to that charter. Many advocates of the United Nations have now come out openly for this world government. Some very influential men in public life say that we can afford to give up some of our sovereignty to obtain world peace. The propaganda for a world government has flourished in many quarters. I am here to tell you that we cannot afford to give up any of our national sovereignty for any cause.

We have the only government on earth where the people themselves rule. The government here exists for the people, and the people do not exist for the government. For over 160 years we have gone on our way with our own concept of government, and we know what freedom means. Are we fools enough to abandon our course and listen to the siren songs of those whose design it is to destroy this great Government, and fit it into a new world government with a heterogeneous collection of nations whose ideas of the purpose of government conflict with our own? Instead of destroying our national spirit, it should be increased. If other nations want to follow our example, let them do it; but to let any foreign combination direct the affairs of this Government would be intolerable and will never be permitted. It could not be done by force. And if the American people are alert and prize freedom and liberty as much as I think they do, this false, insidious, and conspiratorial scheme to subdue us will never prevail.

The world government proposes a world congress where members are elected according to the population of the member nations. This means that Soviet Russia and Red China and their enslaved comrades will control that government.

After examining this record, can anyone doubt that the United Nations was purposely set up to do to this country

what could not be done by force of arms, but through the blandishments of Communists, fellow travelers, and dupes, get us to surrender our liberty without firing a shot?

There are some questions that should be answered. One of them is, "Why does this Government permit the recognition of Soviet Russia, when it is known by all, including all the administration leaders, that from the Russian Embassy here in Washington there is a constant flow to all parts of the country of propaganda that is inimical to the United States?" The next question is, "Why do we remain

in the United Nations when we can plainly see that the whole scheme is directed to our destruction?" If the administration officials hide their heads in the sand for security, I am sure that the people will not.

I have faith in the American people, when they are armed with the facts.

I have faith in the Divine Ruler of this universe, who has sustained us in the past; and I have an enduring faith that He will not desert us in our efforts to maintain a government of freedom and liberty here on these shores where it began.

(Not printed at Government expense)

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

The Story of the United Nations

Address of Hon. John T. Wood, of Idaho, Before the United States Flag Committee
of New York State, at Hotel New Yorker, October 10, 1951

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 15, 1951

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, Hon. JOHN T. WOOD, Member of Congress from Idaho, delivered an address before the United States Flag Committee at Hotel New Yorker, October 10, 1951. His speech should be of great interest to the people of this country as it sounds a warning to the people of just what attempt is now being made to build in this world a super-government of which the United States is to become simply one state in this great world organization. Here is the speech:

THE STORY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Hon. JOHN T. WOOD)

The story of the United Nations is one of the strangest, most weird, and most tragic which has perhaps ever been unfolded upon this earth. Motivated by a universal desire for peace, almost at any price, which still thrills the soul of America, it is a strange compound of love and hate, a burning desire among the millions of Americans to banish war from the earth; while on the other hand it has well served the purpose of still more millions of an alien horde of Communists, still other millions of Socialist or near Communist nations, with a still greater admixture of savage or barbarous peoples who have not yet learned the first lessons of living decently with their fellows more or less under a reign of law and order.

Gendered by the American people in an

honest and fervent desire for universal peace, proclaimed from most pulpits as more or less of a going concern, and almost a panacea for the reign of godliness and Christian living, there can be no reasonable doubt at this time that it was a made-to-order trap for the Communists to bring into being a one-world government, a Communist world state, and a pliable instrument for Soviet aggression. It is all so incredible that the good people of America, not being used to Oriental duplicity and intrigue, simply cannot believe that men could be so utterly false to all the laws of decent living, regard for the rights of minorities, and the great moral principles upon which this Government was founded, and which its people have followed for the past 175 years.

DUPLICITY OF SOVIET RUSSIA

Lying, duplicity, treason, suicide, bloodshed, genocide on a scale never before witnessed upon this earth have been practiced in the rape of Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Rumania, China, Tibet, East Germany, and many other smaller states, whose peoples were either brutally murdered when they refused to bow the knee to the invader, were sent to a fate worse than death in the slave labor camps of Russia and Siberia, or who are living in peril of their lives in the police states set up in these overridden countries.

And yet the Communist hordes of Russia and her satellites piously profess their adherence to the alleged principles of the Genocide Convention. What a strange thing it is that the people of America, blinded by their desire for universal peace, have either overlooked this discrepancy, or refused to believe it. One of the five original signers of the United Nations Charter still poses as a liberty-loving democracy, in spite of all these hideous crimes against the minorities in the states it has engulfed. No wonder I shudder every time I hear the word "democracy."

It is now Stalin's word, and has an entirely different connotation than when Webster wrote his dictionary. Certainly no American should ever now use the term. I am sure I do not need to remind you that we are not now, and never were a democracy; we are a constitutional republic, and have nothing in common with that hated term, which has now become opprobrious to a most extreme degree.

THE WORLD'S MOST GULLIBLE NATION

The American Nation is undoubtedly the smartest on the face of the earth in its scientific know-how, and in its capacity for getting great things done quickly, as witness the speed with which, starting from scratch, we armed ourselves, the rest of our allies, and even Communist Russia. At the demand of the President, 60,000,000 workmen sprang to work, and with the expenditure of almost unlimited savings of American citizens, we truly became the arsenal of the world. And we are doing it again, though our savings are almost gone, and we are reaching a most dangerous stage of inflation, where our dollar is only worth about 40 cents.

But it is a tragic fact that, with all of this capacity to produce, we have been the world's most gullible Nation, blinded by our inherent love for peace, to the Communist menace which has been set up within our own borders by this spider web thing we call the United Nations, an instrument designed by the Communist hordes to compass our enslavement and destruction as a freedom-loving people. It is my purpose tonight to categorically give the facts which support this thesis.

AN INTERNATIONAL FRANKENSTEIN MONSTER

Possibly no one could have envisaged the ultimate purpose behind this Communist plot at any single given time. It is only as the dark schemes unfold that we may begin to realize the ulterior motives present from the beginning in the ignoble birth of this international Frankenstein monster. It is no wonder that President Roosevelt, the bewildered partner of the compact, said that he did not see how it could work, but that it must work. If he could see it now, he would realize that it has worked all too well in the Russian design to enslave America for communism.

Frequently the accumulated wisdom of the ages may be compressed into a few simple and homely sayings. Among these might be mentioned: "A stream cannot rise higher than its source"; "Like begets like"; "Men do not gather grapes from thorns, nor figs from thistles"; and "You cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear." And with all our boasted modern wisdom, much of which is spurious, we still do well not to run counter to the

truth expressed in these timely maxims.

Contrary to its stated aims, the United Nations Charter was never an instrument dedicated to the cause of universal peace as its Charter proclaims. It has always been an instrument of force from its inception. And while its founders cloaked the application of power with the universal desire for peace, even a cursory reading of the Charter will demonstrate that a solid backbone of military power occupies almost one-third of the body of the Charter, with speculations as to its effective use on occasion by the dominant Big Five of the contracting powers.

Power in itself is entirely an unmoral thing. It knows neither right nor wrong. The same force which might loose cataclysmic destruction in the explosion of an atomic or hydrogen bomb, might conceivably run farm machinery, or help in the production of crops, or increase the number and complexity of labor-saving devices. In fact, this is the purpose of the atomic plant set up in my own State of Idaho. Power may be a good thing or a bad thing, depending upon the moral nature and aims of its users.

UNIVERSAL PEACE ACHIEVED ONLY THROUGH SLOW EVOLUTION

I believe firmly in the innate nobility of the soul of man. But it has seemed to be God's will that largely such a growth of the soul from the savage to the highest characters in a Christian community has followed a process of slow evolution, and while there are abundant exceptions to this general law, certainly the larger growth of nations has seemed to follow such a general evolutionary plan. Any scheme for universal peace shall probably fail unless predicated upon this fact; and also upon the additional fact that, even in more advanced peoples, selfishness still remains the dominant factor which determines their collective actions and reactions. Freedom from the bonds of the flesh comes slowly and painfully rather than by some arbitrary convention such as the United Nations; and a study of its results so far will demonstrate even it is not far removed from the reign of tooth and claw.

Ever since there were mothers, there has been more or less of a universal desire for peace. For no mother, unless fired by profound family, religious, or patriotic urges really wants her sons to go to war; and even then does so shudderingly and shrinkingly.

There have always been efforts to preserve peace by means of union with stronger nations, leagues, balances of power, and what not. Such may have prevented some wars, but sooner or later, selfishness in persons in authority, nationalistic or religious urges, or the desire for national aggrandizement has triumphed over the desire for peace. For there are many things worse than death; and the stultifying Munichs and

Tehrans of the past have frequently been the basis for future wars. It seems inevitable that large power concentrations shall sooner or later override the rights and national aims of minority nations, until the emotional strains of the less powerful nations at last become vocative and explosive enough to result in war. And even if the minority may lose the war, there is always the chance the victor may be outsmarted at the peace table, as happened with the last war.

CECIL RHODES OBSESSION OF PAX BRITANNICA

Possibly the first of the modern urges toward universal peace originated in the fertile brain of Cecil Rhodes, who envisaged the role of Great Britain as the one power able to enforce world peace. Originally Great Britain was supposed to act alone in this capacity, but later he began to comprehend the rising power of the United States was necessary to be joined with Britain to accomplish his aim. And thus originated his idea of Rhodes scholarships, through which American young men, possessing the necessary elements of leadership, which was prime in his scheme, should be taken back to English universities and there indoctrinated with his compelling idea of a Pax Britannica, with the aid and assistance of the United States. Hundreds of these young men have returned to America to foster the idea that the great English-speaking peoples should eventually rule the world.

And in spite of the fact that the sun of the British Empire seemingly set at Dunkerque, this idea is still far from dead. Rhodes scholars in the United States are plentifully present in every department of public life, and are still attempting to warp the policy of this country toward a strong union of the English-speaking peoples, both in and out of the United Nations. Much of the near treasonable policies of our State Department are perhaps as much pro-British as pro-Communist. Many of them are present in Congress, and one may almost always determine beforehand what their votes shall be, particularly in foreign policy.

One must never forget that the lifeblood of the British Isles is foreign trade. They cannot exist without it. The greatest opportunity for foreign trade at present exists between them and Communist China, and Socialist Britain finds it politically easy to forget her many obligations to us, even to the extent of shipping potential war materials to our common enemy, even if United Nations rules did not prohibit such a restriction, and those rules do just that.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER DESIGNED AS INSTRUMENT OF FORCE

The Charter of the United Nations was written by Alger Hiss, the treasonable felon,

assisted by Harry Dexter White, later cited before a Congressional Un-American Activities Committee as a possible Communist, and who died shortly afterward from causes which were never cleared up; Molotov of Russia; and Edward Stettinius, who was then Secretary of State. It was patterned to some extent upon the Constitution of the Soviet Republics, frequently paraphrasing the wording of that document.

A perusal of articles 43 to 51, inclusive, will reveal the fact that it was designed as an instrument of force; and the finagling of Russia in obtaining the preponderance of votes over ours, proves that she intended to use it as an instrument of aggression against us. This fact was dimly realized by the other signers of the pact, to the extent that a General Assembly had been formed, in addition to the original Executive Council of the big five, wherein Russia and her satellites could be outvoted, and where her veto would not be permitted. And in point of fact, most of the deliberations of the United Nations at present are carried on in this General Assembly.

UNITED NATIONS SELF-GRANTED POWERS FORMING ONE-WORLD GOVERNMENT

All of this was bad enough, and hopeless enough, as far as the best interests of the United States were concerned, but worse was still to come. Entirely through self-constituted authority, without a single particle of any grant of power from the American Constitution, there was formed within the body of the United Nations, self-granted powers to form a one world government, with hundreds of subsidiary organizations, such as UNRRA, UNESCO, the International Labor Organization, the International Court, the International Economic Organization, the Atlantic Pact, the Atlantic Community, International Education Organization, International Child Welfare, the Human Rights Convention, the Genocide pact, and many others of a similar ilk. While the Charter of the United Nations was brought into being by a treaty signed by the President and the United States Senate, certainly it was never intended that these later powers should be spawned from the womb of the United Nations Charter, each of which by the terms of the treaty becomes the highest law in the land for this country, and superseding the laws of the individual States.

The United Nations, I repeat, was bad enough, and illusory enough but the later inclusion of the idea of a one-world government, dominant over the Constitution, and the laws of every State in the Union, and which is even now actively functioning, to our great detriment, is intolerable.

AMERICA IS ON THE MARCH TO REGAIN NATIONAL HERITAGE

We shall never surrender the freedoms set up for us by the founding fathers to this alien monstrosity, this malignant being we are now sorry we ever gave the right to live and function in this free America. It is our modern Frankenstein which must be destroyed ere it destroys us. Free America is on the march to regain our glorious national heritage, and we shall be satisfied with nothing less than the destruction of this mongrel and alien entity, with its total expulsion from our shores, along with the Communist traitors who have gained refuge in its welcoming arms.

Reexamination of the basic recognition of the United Nations by the United States Senate is being conducted at this time by a Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, based upon testimony brought to the floor of the House in a debate, through a speech by Congressman USHER L. BURDICK, of North Dakota, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 27, 1951, page 12540, and which was spearheaded by a report of the American Bar Association as to the possible loss of our national sovereignty through the later inclusion of the idea of a one-world government in the United Nations, which is superseding our body of Federal and State laws as in the California Fujii case. Congress is becoming exercised about the increasing perils for continuing American institutions in the handling of our internal affairs, free from the encroachments of this cancer implanted within the body of the United Nations. My own House bill 5080, introduced into the House August 8, 1951, seeks to strike at the root of the matter by a complete severance of our national fortunes from the United Nations, with all its monstrous accretions.

Since the filing of my bill, which seemed to focus the attention of the House, as well as patriotic people in every State in the Union, there have been four bills introduced into the House, either seeking to withdraw from the United Nations, or to pull its teeth by limiting its power to destroy the United States through the host of conventions introduced by one-world devotees in that body, which are plainly designed to merge the people of the United States, with their glorious national institutions, into a fantastic and unworkable world government which, in the opinion of most thinking and truly patriotic Americans, promises nothing for us but enslavement to European and Asiatic hordes, hungry for our wealth, but without the slightest comprehension of the freedoms we have toiled so long and with such difficulty to obtain.

FALLACIOUS REASONING OF ONE WORLDERS

Proponents of this one-world government are apt to point a similarity between the position of the Thirteen Original Colonies under the articles of confederation and the condition of the United Nations at present.

But what a foolish simile this is, and how designed to point up the differences. In the Thirteen Colonies, we had groups of brave and adventurous peoples, who certainly had this great compelling thought in common: a burning desire for freedom from a domestic oppressor, and the will to fight and die for the attainment of those freedoms. And history records how well they succeeded in the quest of their holy grail of freedom. The less adventurous, and those who were willing to submit to oppression, stayed at home.

As over against this intrepid band of modern Jasons, united in the search for the golden fleece of freedom and self-expression, let us compare for a moment, the motley lot, other than the United States, providing the present complexion of the alien countries within the United Nations:

Great Britain: A Socialist state, shorn of most of her former glory.

Russia and her satellites: Completely Communist and pledged to destroy everything we hold dear.

France: Thirty-percent Communist, the balance strongly Socialist.

Australia, New Zealand, and Canada: Representative democracies and worthy allies.

Argentina: A Fascistic, totalitarian state.

Brazil: A representative democracy, with socialist or Communist leanings.

China: Nonexistent through our base betrayal.

Czechoslovakia: Betrayed by the United States; and now Communist.

Denmark: A constitutional kingdom inclined toward socialism.

Ethiopia: A barbarian monarchy.

Greece: A kingdom, leanings toward communism.

India: Problematic; leanings toward communism.

Indonesia: Strong Communist leanings.

Iran: Mulcted by the British. Tendency toward socialism or communism.

Mexico: A republic; some leanings toward communism.

Netherlands: A monarchy.

Norway: A constitutional kingdom.

Sweden: A constitutional kingdom.

Turkey: A republic with totalitarian leanings.

Yugoslavia: Communistic.

Besides those mentioned, there are other smaller states, most of which have little conception of what membership in the United Nations is all about, merely looking to it for protection against their stronger neighbors; or with strong desires to participate in American give-away programs, which have been plentiful enough to almost bankrupt us, with little avail in increasing the national standard of ethics in the countries receiving the gratuities. Not only so, but they have become quite insolent in varying degrees in their demands for bigger and more expensive aid.

WE MUST NEVER SURRENDER OUR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

I submit that it might be perfectly proper to join with some of these nations who really desired it, and who have even a slight conception of freedom and free institutions, in some form of an international league, in which international problems could be discussed and helpful solutions sought; but to merge our national fortunes in a firm union with such, giving them the right to tax us out of 300 years of our earnings, and to surrender land and property rights to them, our freedom of speech and press, our rights to be secure in person and property against the encroachments of any state, whether domestic or foreign. I repeat this: We cannot, should not, and will not tolerate. I am sure no patriotic and thinking American would tamely submit to such atrocious doctrine. I feel sure every American citizen will cry out with Patrick Henry: "I care not what others may think; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

USURPATIONS OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Now, lest you should think some of my conclusions are far-fetched, let me quote some of the comparatively recent usurpations of our constitutional rights promulgated by the United Nations; and the result of these orders to a free people, whose tax-gathering principles are well defined, and the subject of many statutory safeguards, which alien orders shall be inevitably reflected in the taxes you will pay next year.

1. While standing by the ticker tape in the cloak room of the House about midsummer of this year, I saw spelled out the news item that the International ECA Committee of the United Nations had met that afternoon, and had decreed an annual tax levy of \$19,000,000,000 upon the peoples of the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and of all peoples, Western Europe, who are at present the recipients of our national ECA.

Within a few days, the President sent to the House Appropriations Committee a request for \$7,500,000,000 for our international ECA fund, as our share of the \$19,000,000,000, allotted to us for this purpose, by order of the international ECA committee of the United Nations. And this was done, in the face of an amendment placed in the measure appropriating funds for the continued existence of the United Nations, and passed by the House, placing a ceiling upon our contributions to this body to not over one-third of the amount paid by the other member nations. And it is well to further remember that many of the member nations have not paid a single cent into the United Nations since they were admitted, while our payments have run between 90 percent and 51 percent of the total. And our percentage has been paid. Not only so, but we loaned, or perhaps one should say, gave them \$65,000,000 for the building of their new home. So we now occupy the unique position of not only being destroyed by the United Nations,

but paying them for the privilege of destroying us. In other words, we are having a royal set of horns placed upon our devoted heads, by this group.

ACCEPTS PRESIDENT'S CHALLENGE

The House cut the seven and one-half billion to something over five and one-half billions, on which I voted "nay." A few days later, the President wrote a stern letter to Congress, suggesting that if any of its Members felt that way about the foreign-aid bill, they should immediately submit a bill to get out of the United Nations, which I did, 8 hours afterwards, as soon as the bill could be drawn.

In doing so, I remembered that the founders of this country had fought the Revolutionary War on the principle that they could not, and would not submit to taxation without representation; and it seemed to me this was just that same old principle wherein we had merely exchanged masters.

UNITED NATIONS CAN SEND YOUR SON TO WAR

2. The constitutional right of Congress to declare war has been completely transferred to the Military Committee of the United Nations, both in foreign countries, as well as those comprised in the Atlantic Pact. Articles 43 to 51, inclusive, leave little doubt of the fact that the United Nations now has the power to order us into war at any time, without the consent of Congress. What we have done in the acceptance of the United Nations is to take away from Congress the power to say when, where, and with whom, we may engage in war. In the name of the United Nations, we may bring freedom to a foreign nation; but we shall have lost our own. Moreover, our soldiers are to be denied the privilege of serving under their own glorious flag, the beautiful Stars and Stripes. They must serve under the hated spider web banner when going into battle, and its alien folds are to enshroud their coffin should they have the misfortune to be killed while serving under it. They must wear its emblem on their sleeves, and serve under its generals.

Present examples of these facts are the police action in Korea, which has already cost us 100,000 casualties; and the continuing sending of our troops to Europe, to countries with which we are at peace; and which it is now decreed to continue until we have a total of 4,000,000 men serving upon foreign soil, in a war which has never been declared, and with which Congress has had nothing to do except appropriate money to charge the account to the taxpayers of this country.

And this sending of our troops abroad is plainly illegal, for the terms of the Atlantic Pact provide that only in case of actual war may troops be called upon to serve under

that treaty; and there has been no aggression demanding it. In an article published in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C., recently, bearing the heading "United Nations group urges call on force such as Eisenhower commands" it went on to say: "A special United Nations group recommended today that in case of future aggression, the United Nations should call on regional defense, such as the army of General Dwight Eisenhower, to act in the name of the United Nations."

This was one of the main points in a report by the military subcommittee of the General Assembly's Collective Measures Committee which is preparing a master plan to meet future emergencies. The subcommittee also proposed that the military-command structure be revised generally to give both the United Nations and the participating countries a bigger voice in the combat operations.

DICTATES OF UNITED NATIONS SUPERSEDE STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS

3. The superseding of the dictates of the United Nations International Court over our Federal and State laws, as in the Fujii case in California.

4. The International Labor Organization dictates much of our internal labor legislation. For instance, the Wagner Labor Relations Act was written by this body, and submitted to Congress without any alterations. The composition of this body at that time comprised about the same number of Communists or Leftists as does the general complexion of the United Nations.

5. The International Child Labor and Child Welfare Committee, the International Health Organization, and socialized medicine are sponsored, and frequently dictated, by these committees of the United Nations, and are usually introduced into Congress later by leftists.

SUBVERSION IN OUR SCHOOLS AND CHURCHES

6. The educational policies of the National Education Association follows the general line of those laid down by the International Education Committee of the United Nations. For instance, when Congressman A. L. MILLER of Nebraska recently made a survey of the textbooks used in the District of Columbia schools, he found quite a proportion had been printed in Russia, containing clear Communist teachings, and even including pictures of Marshal Stalin. A number of the teachers belong to subversive organizations, and a certain number of them were discharged. Undoubtedly large numbers of these same subversives are employed in the structure of our high schools, colleges, and universities throughout the United States.

The recent Pasadena case will point the fact that the situation is becoming serious.

7. Religion even is not exempted, though communism is known to be atheistical and opposed to all religion except the worship of totalitarian force. One of the high officers of a national religious organization has publicly stated that "The living of the Christian religion is not possible except in a Communist state." I may say parenthetically, that I consider this the greatest example of fuzzy thinking I have ever observed. Many of the high officials of this church organization belonged, or had belonged, to from 3 to 41 subversive organizations.

8. The Human Rights Convention of the United Nations takes away the vested right of every American citizen to acquire property by lawful means and to remain secure in its ownership under American law. The recent Fujii case in California has proved that this right is now no longer secure; that the rights of citizens, States, and even the rights of the Federal Government may be contravened at the will of the International Court of the United Nations.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION CONTRAVENES AMERICAN LAWS

9. The Genocide Convention dictates that not only must nations abstain from the wholesale destruction of other peoples, as occurred in some of the countries of Europe during the last war, and since the last war by Russia in the Baltic Provinces and the eastern states of Europe, but that also one cannot inflict mental harm to any other person, or any other national of other countries, or even hurt his feelings, without being liable to be called to account before the International Court of the United Nations, wherein he would be denied the rights which have always been accorded to him under American law, such as the right of trial by a jury of his peers, and the right to be tried in the court nearest to him. Under this convention, if he happened to call Stalin a murderer, even though Stalin might secretly feel complimented, he might even be taken to Russia and tried under Russian law. Thus the Genocide Convention contravenes the entire framework of American jurisprudence.

10. They have their own postal system, a most decided advantage to the free exchange of information between the Communists within our borders, and those in other countries bent upon our destruction.

11. They have diplomatic immunity from arrest, and full diplomatic release from import or export duties. No American legal process can attack them.

12. Salaries of all employees are exempt from taxation by the United States. This immunity from taxation is not enjoyed by any other person in the United States, not excepting the President.

13. The seizure of nine cities in southern California by Military Reserve units, trained

by the United States Army, and acting under the authority of the United Nations, with the immediate institution of martial law, accompanied with the declaration that all civil functions were hereby taken over by the military forces of the United Nations until further notice.

The statement was made that this action was taken for practice; and that it was planned to seize cities on the Atlantic States in the near future.

Mayors were displaced, newspapers taken over, civil and criminal courts closed, all schools closed, and all the populations of these cities were warned to look to the commanding officer of the occupying force for further orders. Apparently the enemy is moving faster than we thought to our attempted complete subjugation.

"Upon what meat doth this, our Caesar feed?"

MY FIRST SIGHT OF OLD GLORY

I well remember the first time I ever saw Old Glory. Upon leaving England with my parents, when I was 10 years of age, we had sailed down the river Mersey from Liverpool, and were in the Irish Sea. There sailed into view a big ship with the Stars and Stripes at its masthead. Its colors were gloriously beautiful against the glow of the setting sun. I asked my parents: "What flag is that?" They said: "That is the flag of America, where we are going." I said: "How beautiful it is." Little did I think I should be here much later in life seeking to defend Old Glory against its own citizens.

The imperial eagles of Rome, the lily banner of France, the composite Saint George's cross of Britain, the rattlesnake banner of the Thirteen Colonies, all have a connotation which has fired the imagination, and provoked the patriotic fervor of all who have looked upon these symbols as the outward manifestation of an inward and spiritual faith.

Fellow countrymen, this should not be my job at all. I am an Englishman, but many of you present tonight were born in this country. You, like Paul of Tarsus, in Biblical days, could stand before Lysias, the Roman captain, who had just told Paul that he had purchased Roman citizenship with a great price, and could answer with Paul: "But I am American born."

TO BE AN AMERICAN IS GREATER THAN TO BE A KING

You were born to the purple; born into a glorious heritage where every man is a king by divine right. All the enginery of our free institutions were yours for the asking. You were privileged to enjoy by birth the priceless boon of hard won freedoms, secured for you through the blood and strivings of your liberty loving forefathers. The freedoms you enjoy so thoughtlessly were won

for you on hundreds of battlefields.

The sighs of dying soldiers, the wounded on the pain-racked beds of countless hospitals, the fortitude and wisdom of a Washington and Lincoln, the forensic abilities of a John Marshall and a Daniel Webster, and the mighty works of numerous other wise and patriotic giants wrought the privileges which have been yours to enjoy, and I might here add, to defend.

THE STARS AND STRIPES FOREVER

This flag of ours, and I refer only to the Star-Spangled Banner, is something more than merely a piece of colored bunting. It stands for the bravery of the colonial soldiers fighting the French and Indian wars; for the drums and fifes of the Revolutionary War; for the hungry and frozen soldiers at Valley Forge; for the peace at Yorktown; for the Articles of Confederation, the nursing ring for that most glorious of all state documents, the Constitution of the United States.

It is the glorious fight of the good ship *Constitution*; the sturdy defense of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans; the matchless seamanship and naval skill of Decatur at Tripoli; Jefferson, and the acquirement of a western empire in the Louisiana Purchase; the glorious epic of the western trappers and voyageurs; the spiritual gallantry of the Jesuit "black robes" winning the western Indians for Christ; the Mormon trek; the Alamo, with its glorious defense; the building of the transcontinental railroads; the Civil War, with its almost healed wounds; the death of the great and good Lincoln; our great industrial progress; the First and Second World Wars; and the present Korean episode; all are in that beautiful flag.

Our national fortunes are not ensouled in the United Nations flag. We cannot hitch our wagon to that star. Its motive power is too erratic, and its orbit is ill-determined by treacherous and ignorant captains. Straight ahead under the glorious banner which has won our hearts, and is capable of exciting our love and devotion, is our only safe course. There is no other millennium for America. We cannot become traitors to our forefathers, and cast their hard-won freedoms, and our glorious heritage into their teeth. If we do, then they have wrought, won, and died in vain. God grant that we may survive as a United States, worthy of such beginnings, determined to carry the torch of freedom they have handed to us, to the conclusion of the glorious race. We are on the march to the completion of our marvelous destiny; and in that march, we must continue to have our eyes fixed upon the Stars and Stripes before us to hearten us with the memory of what it represents in the building of America. We cannot march under a hybrid flag else our hearts shall have no song.

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED AT A MEETING

OF THE AMERICAN HERITAGE PROTECTIVE COMMITTEE IN SAN ANTONIO, TEX., OCTOBER 3, 1951

The American Heritage Protective Committee desires to submit to the membership and visitors at this meeting (October 3, 1951) an opportunity to endorse H. R. 5080, a bill introduced in Congress by the Honorable JOHN T. WOOD. This bill calls for the complete withdrawal of the United States from its membership in the United Nations.

We believe that continued membership of the United States in the United Nations Organization will ultimately result in the destruction of our Republic as a sovereign Nation, and urge the support of H. R. 5080 for the following reasons:

1. Because membership in the United Nations Organization has the binding force of a treaty, and in cases of conflict of our do-

mestic law with the United Nations Charter, the latter will supersede our own domestic law, thus rendering our Constitution a meaningless document.

2. Because the United Nations is composed almost entirely of men and women who advocate and think in terms of political and economic theories diametrically opposed to our American heritage of freedom.

3. Because the United Nations, in its cumbersome and negative policies, is causing an international confusion among nations, and instead of promoting peace, is actually promoting the very conditions which breed wars among men, and needlessly and brutally prolong those wars which are already in process.

4. Because the leadership of the United Nations is, of record, Socialist-Communist, which has resulted in the subordination of the wishes of the American people and the continuing and seemingly endless prolonging of the Korean tragedy.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to every Member of the United States Senate.

A BOMBSHELL!!!



The Story That's Rocking America

a dispassionate account of the racial turmoil that now plagues our land

Price: Five dollars

Paperbound: Seventy-five cents

Available at your favorite bookstore

or

directly from

WESTERN ISLANDS

BELMONT, MASSACHUSETTS 02178

NEW
A Shocking exposé
of the U. S. Supreme
Court's release of hundreds
of hardened criminals

THE GREAT PRISON BREAK

The Supreme Court Leads The Way

by

G. Edward Griffin

In recent years the United States Supreme Court has freed from prison

Andrew Mallory — rapist
Danny Escobedo — murderer
Ernesto Miranda — kidnap-rapist
Robert Anderson — child slayer
James Dombrowski — subversive

In seven years crime in America has gone up eighty-nine percent, yet hundreds, and soon thousands, of convicted criminals — murderers, rapists, kidnapers, child-slayers, and narcotic-pushers — are set free. Why is this happening? Who is responsible? What can be done? Every American must learn the answers to these questions. And now he can, in G. Edward Griffin's new book, *The Great Prison Break: The Supreme Court Leads The Way*.

The Great Prison Break is a second triumph for Griffin, author of the internationally best-selling book, *The Fearful Master: A Second Look At The United Nations*. In commenting on Griffin's new work, the Honorable Loyd Wright, Past President of the American Bar Association and Honorary Life President of the International Bar Association, said: "The author

presents . . . a most incisive exposé of the unbelievable conduct of the Supreme Court of the United States. It is a work that every person concerned with the ideological opinions handed down by a majority of the Court must read."

G. Edward Griffin masterfully states his well-documented case against the actions of the present Supreme Court. He scores it for denying juries "full access to material evidence pertaining to . . . the vital question of guilt"; for "preventing juries from learning that . . . criminals had voluntarily confessed to their crimes"; for causing the "release from prison of an untold number of dangerous convicts . . . by a search for technical error"; and for allowing hardened criminals to "return time and time again to repeat their crimes of passion and violence."

Griffin charges that the Supreme Court "has sanctioned massive lawlessness, anarchy and revolution masquerading as 'civil

disobedience' . . . has stymied the States and municipalities in any effective control of pornography which, like narcotics, is directly related to and partly responsible for the rising crime rate in America . . . has prohibited the free exercise of religion for believers, and has established Agnosticism as the official religious doctrine of the United States, thus undermining one of the most vital pillars supporting our system of law and order."

Any hope of stopping the rampage of the present Supreme Court and of reversing its decision will greatly depend on the number of patriotic Americans who are *really* concerned enough about their country to read and distribute *The Great Prison Break*.

Order Today
Only One Dollar
from

Western Islands
Boston and Los Angeles