

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

1137-1

HEARING
BEFORE A
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-FOURTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
PROPOSALS TO AMEND OR OTHERWISE MODIFY EXISTING
INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ORGANIZATIONS,
INCLUDING THE UNITED NATIONS

PART 10

APRIL 9, 1955
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1955

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Arkansas	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama	BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota	WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California
ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Kentucky	GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont
WAYNE MORSE, Oregon	HOMER E. CAPEHART, Indiana

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*
CARL MARCY, *Consultant*
JULIUS N. CAHN, *Counsel*
PAT M. HOLT, *Consultant*
ALWYN V. FREEMAN, *Consultant*
C. C. O'DAY, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

CREATED PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 126, 83D CONGRESS, AS AMENDED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 83, 84TH CONGRESS, AND CONTINUED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 193, 83D CONGRESS, AND SENATE RESOLUTION 36, 84TH CONGRESS

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia, *Chairman*

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, ¹ Florida	ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Alabama	H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota	WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, California
MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana	GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*
CARL MARCY, *Consultant*
FRANCIS R. VALEO, *Consultant*²
MORELLA HANSEN, *Research Assistant*

¹ Appointed by the Vice President to serve with the subcommittee.

² To be appointed by the Vice President to serve with the subcommittee.

³ On loan from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

CONTENTS

Statements of—	Page
Allen, Miss Marylouise, president, Federated Young Democrats of San Francisco.....	1346
Ammen, Paul Vernon, Orinda.....	1314
Anker, Mrs. Frank, B. E. A. R. section, National Council of Jewish Women, Inc.....	1332
Ayers, Alexander C., Oakland.....	1405
Bauer, Dr. Herbert, Davis.....	1365
Baxter, Miss Leora, member, board of directors, California Chapter, Pro America.....	1247
Beam, A. W., Atherton.....	1245
Bernheim, Louis L., San Francisco.....	1351
Bianchi, Mrs. Adeline H., Concord.....	1404
Brink, Mrs. Paul, Palo Alto.....	1248
Brinton, William M., president, Young Republicans of San Francisco..	1347
Buechner, Frederick W., San Jose.....	1325
Busterud, John A., president, Young Republicans of California.....	1282
Carr, Luther M., Burlingame-San Mateo Kiwanis Club.....	1210
Carto, Willis, Liberty & Property, Inc.....	1316
Cecil, Mrs. Robert E., San Francisco.....	1378
Chambliss, Allan McLane, president, United World Federalists of California, Inc.....	1241
Church, Mrs. John L., Pasadena co-chairman, Californians for the Bricker Amendment.....	1231
Clark, Dr. Max A. X., editor, National Christian Journal; director, American Flag Committee.....	1386
Couture, Mrs. Paul, Modesto.....	1374
Cox, Mrs. W. W., San Francisco.....	1393
Cross, Dr. Nancy Jewell, Las Lomitas.....	1216
Davis, Robert L., Palo Alto.....	1390
Dawson, Laurence, Los Altos.....	1357
Deutsch, Dr. Monroe E., vice president, San Francisco Chapter, American Association for the United Nations.....	1338
Donegan, John M., Palo Alto.....	1222
Douglas, Mrs. W. W., chairman, international section, Berkeley League of Women Voters.....	1323
Dowd, Mrs. James, San Francisco.....	1357
Elsmore, Ray T., Palo Alto.....	1308
Fagan, Myron C., national director, Cinema Educational Guild, Inc..	1310
Frank, Herbert L., chairman, East Bay Chapter, Atlantic Union Committee.....	1276
French, Mrs. Carolyn S., Menlo Park.....	1227
Graydon, Miss Helen, Pasadena.....	1417
Griswold, Capt. Stuart C., Military Order of the World Wars.....	1342
Grothkopp, Mrs. Connie, Modesto.....	1391
Gupta, Kamini K., San Francisco.....	1401
Halloran, Mrs. Pat, San Francisco.....	1365
Happell, Leon, vice chairman, National Foreign Relations Commission, the American Legion.....	1260
Harris, Dr. Florence G., Albany.....	1409
Hayes, Mrs. William J., State vice chairman, National Defense Committee, California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.....	1333
Heisig, Gilbert W., Jr., Sausalito.....	1395
Horton, P. A., member, national Americanism committee and State chairman, National Sojourners, Inc.....	1265
Jackson, Jerry, president, Junior Statesmen, Oakland High School...	1416

Statements of—Continued	Page
Johnson, Richard B., Sonoma.....	1414
Kendall, Thomas E., Walnut Creek.....	1408
Mack, Julian W., II, San Francisco chapter, American Veterans Committee.....	1353
Maxon, Dr. Yale, Oakland.....	1420
McLain, Mrs. Frank L., chairman, international relations, California State division, American Association of University Women.....	1255
Merrymen, Prof. John Henry, Stanford University.....	1236
Meserve, Rev. Harry G., chairman, San Francisco Interfaith Com- mittee for Peace.....	1363
Monaco, Daniel J., the Peninsula Committee for UNESCO.....	1284
Moon, Robert W., chairman, commission on legislation, Northern California-Nevada Council of Churches.....	1319
Murray, Thomas J., senior vice commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California.....	1361
O'Brien, George Michael, San Francisco.....	1432
Ostrander, Mrs. Walter M., member, public affairs committee, San Francisco Young Women's Christian Association.....	1359
Page, Mrs. William A., Antioch.....	1380
Reynolds, Mrs. Lena H., Berkeley.....	1398
Riordan, John, San Francisco.....	1321
Robinson, John K., Central Labor Council of San Francisco.....	1294
Rogers, Mrs. William Lister, president, San Francisco Council of Churches.....	1376
Ryan, Mrs. John J., National Council of Catholic Women.....	1259
Sage, Mrs. Erwin C., president, League of Women Voters of San Francisco.....	1229
Sargent, Aaron M., legislative chairman, California Society, Sons of the American Revolution.....	1213
Scaglione, John, Martinez.....	1410
Scott, Richard F., Oakland.....	1291
Seaver, Benjamin, northern California branch, Friends Committee on Legislation.....	1271
Sisson, Mrs. Mary L., California branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.....	1289
Skewes-Cox, Bennet, Ross.....	1381
Thelen, Max, Jr., San Francisco.....	1251
Tinkham, Mrs. Mildred Taft, Los Angeles.....	1426
Treat, Sidney W., Los Altos.....	1234
Wallick, Mrs. Kenneth Keys, Palo Alto.....	1424
Wasserman, Mrs. William J., Arcata.....	1275
Werchick, Jack, San Francisco chapter, Americans for Democratic Action.....	1385
Wik, Dr. Reynold M., Oakland.....	1396
Wilt, Mrs. Lillian M., Lafayette.....	1415
Statements, etc., submitted for insertion in the record—	
Justus E. Wyman, chairman, United Nations Committee of Sacra- mento.....	1296
Richard F. Short, Sacramento.....	1297
West Wuichet, Los Altos.....	1298
Charles H. Epperson, Stockton.....	1300
Miss Bella N. Zilberman, San Francisco.....	1305
Roger Kent, San Francisco.....	1305
Miss Melissa Sparks, Sacramento.....	1306
Miss Hazel Nickerson, Los Angeles.....	1306
G. Spencer Wice, corresponding secretary, Valley 57th District Re- publican Assembly.....	1307
Mrs. Glenn M. MacHovec and Miss Frances M. Bacon, Los Angeles.....	1307
Mrs. Clara Shirpser, Democratic national committeewoman for Cali- fornia.....	1349
Dr. U. S. Mitchell, San Francisco.....	1350
Mrs. Alice Hamburg.....	1366
Miss Catherine McCann, secretary, San Mateo County Democratic Council of Clubs.....	1367
Mrs. Mildred Machado, coordinator, southern California, Vigilant Women for the Bricker Amendment.....	1367

Statements, etc.—Continued	Page
Mrs. G. S. Malcolm, chairman, Northern California Minute Women, U. S. A., Inc.....	1368
Mrs. Marjory K. LaForge, Sacramento.....	1370
Miss Virginia S. Coleman.....	1372
Miss Kathryn W. Noonan, Sacramento.....	1373
Mrs. Imogen McMurtry, Marysville.....	1373
Mrs. Roy Blackmer, Hickman.....	1379
Norman A. Olson, Berkeley.....	1431
M. C. Neel, Modesto.....	1431
Mrs. Kaya Apaydin, Oakland.....	1434
Mrs. Dorothy Andrus, Sacramento.....	1434
G. Lafayette Bryant, Sacramento.....	1435
E. D. Osgood, San Francisco.....	1436
Totton Heffelfinger, San Francisco.....	1437
Mrs. George M. Sidenberg, Jr., Santa Barbara.....	1438
Mrs. Felicia G. Bock, Berkeley.....	1439
Elmer Booth, Orinda.....	1440
Mrs. Betty Winter, secretary, Northern California Peace Council....	1441
Lemuel H. Matthews, San Francisco.....	1442

[NOTE.—All cities are in California.]

REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1955

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER,
San Francisco, Calif.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:00 a. m., in the chambers of the board of supervisors, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif., Senator John J. Sparkman presiding.

Present: Senators Sparkman (presiding), and Knowland.

Mr. Marcy (of the Subcommittee staff). The audience will stand while they give the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and then the invocation will be delivered.

(The audience rose and gave the pledge of allegiance to the flag, and the invocation was delivered.)

Senator SPARKMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, let me first say that I am very happy to meet here in San Francisco. I am delighted to have this fine audience and particularly to be associated with my good personal friend and next-door neighbor in the Senate Office Building, your own very able and distinguished Senator, Bill Knowland.

SENATOR SPARKMAN'S OPENING STATEMENT

Ten years ago the United States was at war. Thousands of Americans had already been killed or maimed on distant battlefronts. Thousands of others were to suffer the same fate before the final stilling of the guns.

Our painful experience in World War II was not unique. Other nations underwent the same ordeal. For some, the tragedy was less; for others, it was more. For all who participated in World War II, however, the scars were deep.

And out of the common suffering which the war engendered came a hope, a universal hope, that somehow mankind would put a stop to the repeated scourges of war.

Your people of San Francisco know something of that hope. Yours is an intimate acquaintance with it. For it was in this city, 10 years ago, that the representatives of 51 nations gathered in conference. They came together in an effort to give tangible form to the hope for a stable peace which existed at the time throughout the world.

I remember the atmosphere that prevailed then. I remember it well. It was an atmosphere in which human decency was trying to reassert itself after the inhuman indecencies of the war. It was an atmosphere which was alive with the expectation that a pattern of rational relations among nations would replace or at least mitigate the age-old patterns of war and oppression.

In the years that have passed since the San Francisco conference the hopes of that era have dimmed. The world has not had peace—a meaningful peace. We have instead staggered from one crisis to another. We have had to sustain the added sacrifices of the Korean conflict. We may be facing still others.

Some have lost heart in these circumstances. Others have searched for new methods of assuring peace. It is true that peace at this moment is beyond our grasp. But this, too, I believe is true. The desire of the American people for peace, a dignified and stable and honorable peace is just as alive today as it was 10 years ago. The President of the United States has expressed that sentiment time and again and on that point there are few Americans who will disagree with him.

This subcommittee is meeting here today as part of a Senate study of one of the instruments by which this country and others 10 years ago hoped to establish a means for preserving peace. We are trying to find out what the United Nations can do, what it cannot do, and what it might do. In this connection, we want the views and ideas of interested Americans.

This is a hearing of a Senate subcommittee. It is not a town meeting, nor is it a public opinion poll. We are here to obtain information and enlightenment. We are here to listen and to learn.

I might say that this is one of several different meetings, a dozen different meetings of this type that we have held or shall hold before we conclude these meetings, in all of the different areas of the country. When this subcommittee has finished its hearings, it will have been in all the different general areas of the United States seeking ideas, suggestions, and help from the people of the United States.

We are delighted to be here today.

At this time I want to call on my good friend and your able Senator for such statement as he may care to make.

Senator Knowland.

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman and fellow Californians, I want to say first of all that I am very happy that this subcommittee has met in San Francisco to give the people of this area an opportunity to express themselves on proposed amendments to the United Nations Charter. I have had the privilege of knowing Senator Sparkman for many years. He is considered, rightly so, as one of the able and distinguished Members of the Senate of the United States, and has been a very able and effective member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, on which we both serve.

I quite agree with my colleague that the basic principles of the American people are founded in the desire of peace with honor. I think that if we wanted to illustrate to the people of the world just what that policy means in our belief, we would point to our great neighbor of Canada to the north, where our international frontier runs for 3,000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific and there is not a single soldier or military post of any type or character to guard one of our countries from the other.

We hope that in our lifetime, certainly in the lifetime of our children or theirs, other areas of the world, not only in the Americas, but

in Europe and Asia and the Middle East, might live equally as good neighbors as we do with our great neighbor, Canada, to the north.

I think we are also cognizant of the fact that in this troubled world in which we now find ourselves, unfortunately all countries are not as civilized and as peace-loving as are Canada and the United States. Consequently, we have sought to find means of collective security to preserve the peace of the world for ourselves and for our children.

One of those attempts was 10 years ago in the city of San Francisco, when the United Nations Charter was finally worked out, and this organization was created. We must be faced with the reality, however, that in the 10 years since that time, international communism has made tremendous strides. Then there were only about 200 million people behind the Iron Curtain. Today there are over 800 million people who have lost their freedom under the most terrible tyranny the world has ever known.

I think the American people, the Government and the Congress of the United States recognize this potential threat to our peace, our security and our survival and, the importance of stabilizing the conditions of the world if we are indeed to maintain a free world of free-men.

We have recognized that Washington is 3,000 miles away from certain sections of our country. The Committee on Foreign Relations, under the able and distinguished leadership of Senator Walter George of Georgia, determined that the subcommittee dealing with the United Nations Charter revision should meet in various sections so that the people themselves might have an opportunity to present their views.

We are here, as Senator Sparkman, the chairman of this subcommittee, has pointed out, to have your views. We recognize that there are honest differences of opinion. We believe those differences of opinion can be stated without rancor and with the full realization under our American system that men may honestly differ without questioning each other's motives.

Again I welcome my colleague to the city of San Francisco and to the State of California. We are prepared to proceed with this meeting.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Senator Knowland.

PROCEDURAL INSTRUCTIONS

Now, let me make just a few suggestions as to our procedure, if I may.

The Tenth General Assembly of the United Nations, which meets this fall, under the Charter of the United Nations as originally written, will automatically have on its agenda the question to be determined as to whether or not a conference will be called to review the charter and to decide whether or not revisions should be made. Some people seem to have the understanding that that conference is automatic. That is not true. The question for discussion as to whether or not a conference will be held is automatic.

The United States delegation, of course, will have a voice in determining whether or not that review shall be made. What we are seeking to do is to get ideas and suggestions and recommendations to make

to our delegation to the United Nations in its Tenth General Assembly.

Now, we have over 100 persons who have expressed an interest in being heard. You realize that that is not going to give much time to anyone. Those responsible for making out the schedule have followed, as far as they could, a procedure to guarantee fairness and equitable treatment to all.

Those persons who represent organizations that asked to be heard were scheduled insofar as possible in the first making up of the list, interspersed, of course, with individuals. Individuals who applied were, almost without exception, listed according to the order in which they applied. The only exception I can think of—there may have been one or two others—is one witness who would have been scheduled to be heard this morning, but found it more convenient to be heard this afternoon, and therefore was passed over to the afternoon.

I can assure you we have tried to treat all alike.

We are going to have to ask the witnesses—and I believe they have been notified to that effect—to limit their time to 5 minutes. We have a timekeeper—will he hold up his hand—right here. The witness will sit before that microphone. At the end of 4 minutes the timekeeper will notify the witness that he or she has 1 minute left. At the end of that 1 minute, time will be called, and we shall expect the witness to terminate his or her statement immediately, but not to leave his seat, however, until told to do so, because either Senator Knowland or I might want to ask questions.

Whether or not the statement is completely read, it will all be carried in the record in full.

Furthermore, let me make this suggestion. If any of you feel at any time that your statement has already been fully covered, and would be a duplication or cumulative, if you will let us know, we will arrange for you to appear here, identify yourself in order that the audience, both here and those that might be looking or listening, would know who you are, and present your statement for inclusion in the record, and it will be fully included.

Now, just one other request, please. We are trying to save time. I will ask the audience not to show approval or disapproval; in other words, to withhold your applause.

A while ago when you applauded Senator Knowland, I told him I thought that was a very good exception. But throughout the day, let us withhold the applause, in the interests of saving time, if you will, please.

Is there anything further, Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No.

Senator SPARKMAN. The first witness we have listed is Mr. Luther M. Carr.

Mr. Carr, will you come right ahead.

The next witness will be Mr. Aaron Sargent. Mr. Sargent, if you will be ready to come promptly after Mr. Carr has finished, we will appreciate it.

Mr. Carr, we would like to have you identify yourself and proceed as you see fit.

Mr. CARR. Thank you, Senator.

STATEMENT OF LUTHER M. CARR, BURLINGAME-SAN MATEO
KIWANIS CLUB, BURLINGAME, CALIF.

Mr. CARR. I am Luther M. Carr. I am an attorney at law at Burlingame, Calif. I am authorized by the board of directors to speak for the Burlingame-San Mateo Kiwanis Club.

I would like first to congratulate the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, since I am the first speaker, for this unique approach to this very vital problem, the approach of going to the public at the grassroots for public opinion on this subject.

I think it is a very fine departure in foreign policy.

KIWANIS SUPPORT FOR U. N.

First, I would like to speak briefly from the Kiwanis International resolution passed by our international convention in 1951, and I will read only portions of it that are pertinent here this morning:

Whereas, history shows that peace is the product of law and order; and

Whereas, disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order under international law—

and so on—

under its present charter is incapable of restraining any nation which may foster, foment or wage war; Be it

Resolved, That Kiwanis International reaffirms its complete confidence in the purposes of the United Nations Organization and gives wholehearted support to its ideals, aims and objects, and calls upon the leaders of Government in the United States and Canada to initiate such amendments to the United Nations Charter as will strengthen the United Nations Organization so that it will be capable of insuring world peace and securing to all peoples their right to maintain their own domestic political, economic, social and religious institutions.

And in 1954, at Miami, to which convention I was pleased to be a delegate, we passed this resolution:

Whereas, Kiwanis International believes that world peace and security can best be obtained by an association of nations acting in good faith in their relations with one another—

and so on—

Be it further resolved, That in the conference scheduled for 1955, to review the United Nations Charter, efforts be made to find means to curb those nations who continually obstruct, by abuse of the veto, the endeavors of other member nations to bring about world peace.

This morning, in view of the fact that our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, has created a new post in his Cabinet, namely, the post of Secretary for World Disarmament, I would like to spend the remainder of my time in remarks pertinent to that particular subject.

DISARMAMENT

First, I believe that the United Nations Charter must be amended in order to achieve effective world disarmament.

In my opinion, two elements are essential to the accomplishment of universal reduction of armaments to the point where the world is safe from atomic destruction. First, of course, is complete, unhindered, rigid inspection and control throughout the world by an agency whose authority commands respect.

Second, and not so widely recognized, is the creation in such agency of sufficient increasing strength and authority to take the place of the reducing military strength of the individual nations—in short, the creation of an international police power to guarantee law and order at the international level throughout the world.

In my humble opinion, no disarmament plan can ever succeed beyond the propaganda stage until these two fundamental conditions precedent are recognized and adopted by the United Nations and put in its charter.

In the absence of these two steps, no nation will feel secure or be willing to surrender its means of waging war, in the absence of such a program.

In the absence of such a program, I would not want to see the United States reduce its military power, helpless though we recognize it might be to prevent damage widespread in this country through intercontinental missiles.

Now, obviously changes in the world community in that respect would require some cooperative changes in our political relations with each other. For example, in order to establish international law and order the United Nations must obviously have universal membership with all the nations in the world, this planet on which we all live, and which is rapidly being shrunk by science.

The United Nations Assembly should be on a more representative basis than it is today with each nation having but one vote.

Our world court should have compulsory jurisdiction over international disputes, and individual and compulsory jurisdiction over individuals, as distinguished from over nations themselves.

We should have an international police power, not just a posse as we sent to Korea, but an international police power that can permanently enforce the edicts or determinations and decisions of the world court.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, fellow Kiwanan.

Mr. CARR. Thank you, sir.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Carr is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY LUTHER M. CARR, ATTORNEY, BURLINGAME, CALIF.

The United Nations Charter must be amended in order to achieve effective world disarmament.

Two elements are essential to the accomplishment of universal reduction of armaments to the point where the world is safe from atomic destruction.

First, is complete, unhindered, rigid inspection and control in all nations under the authority of an agency that is strong enough to command respect.

Second, is the creation in such agency of sufficient increasing strength and authority to take the place of the reducing military strength of the individual nations—in short, the creation of an international police power to guarantee law and order at the international level, throughout the world.

In my humble opinion, no disarmament scheme can ever succeed beyond the propaganda stage, until these two fundamental conditions precedent are recognized and adopted by all the nations of the world.

In the absence of these two steps, no nation will feel sufficiently secure to be willing to surrender its means of waging war. In the absence of such a program, I would not want to see the United States reduce its military power, helpless though it is to prevent widespread destruction in America from intercontinental missiles with atomic warheads.

Even our pioneer ancestors refused to lay aside their Colt 45's until effective law and order was established, in place of anarchy, in the Wild West. Nations are after all, only large combinations of individual people.

Now, obviously, such changes in the world community would require some cooperative changes in our political relations with each other; but let us not forget, that the initial changes that require political cooperation, have already been brought about by the nuclear scientists who have given us the ultimate in military power, the ability to destroy all mankind. None of us, Russian, Frenchman, American, or Chinaman, are in any position to quibble too much.

The objectives which each nation will seek in a review conference, aimed at accomplishing world disarmament as a means to peace, are these:

1. Absolute security for their people.
2. The preservation of their own way of life within their own borders, economically, socially, politically, and from a religious standpoint.

These national ambitions held in common by all peoples can only be realized under a system of worldwide law and order, based on a charter of delegated powers, with a representative, democratic system of enacting rules of conducting and determining international disputes, universally applied throughout the globe, a court with compulsory jurisdiction over international disputes, and individuals, an adequate police force, and sufficient taxing power to support these institutions.

This is federation of the nations, similar to the federation of our Original Thirteen States. It is world government if you will. But let us not shrink from the term "government" and tumble backward into the abyss of mutual suicide.

Abraham Lincoln defined "government" as, "* * * a combination of the people of a community to effect certain objects, by joint effort."

Our Declaration of Independence recites that to secure life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, "Governments are instituted among men." Certainly these words were prophetic in our case.

Without speculating as to the reaction of the Communist nations to such a plan, and their public utterances indicate clearly that they probably will not be receptive, it is America's privilege and duty as a Christian nation to proclaim to the world's peoples, our willingness to subscribe to such a plan.

Only by such means can we guarantee the American way of life to our posterity.

Senator SPARKMAN. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL (Junior Chamber of Commerce). Mr. Aaron Sargent. He will be followed by Dr. Cross.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Sargent, we are glad to have you, sir. Identify yourself and proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF AARON M. SARGENT, LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, CALIFORNIA SOCIETY OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. SARGENT. My name is Aaron M. Sargent. My address is Hobart Building, San Francisco. I am an attorney at law. I represent the California Society of the Sons of the American Revolution. I am its legislative chairman and special counsel.

I speak also on behalf of the National Society of Sons of the American Revolution in relation to resolutions it has adopted bearing on the matter before you.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

That organization has approximately 25,000 total membership.

Our national society met in annual meeting in San Francisco July 11, 1951, adopting a resolution, a copy of which I will ask leave to file with you.

The gist of it is that it was resolved that the United States should withdraw from the United Nations at the earliest reasonable moment, and until such time, care should be taken in regard to various provisions of the United Nations Charter that threaten infringement of the Constitution of the United States.

This resolution, gentlemen, was adopted at a time when the Korean casualties were already 78,000, and as we know, mounted to approximately double that number later on.

In Cincinnati on June 17, 1953, our national society adopted a further resolution stating their opposition to world government or other limitation on the national sovereignty of the United States.

On May 23, 1954, our annual meeting was at Williamsburg, Va., the birthplace of American liberty. At that time we adopted a resolution pointing out the dangers in the various committee reports of the United Nations and recommending the exercise of extreme caution, lest rights granted by our Constitution and Bill of Rights be infringed.

Now, as to my presentation here directly, I am speaking on the question set forth in our original resolution, the San Francisco resolution: Withdrawal at the earliest reasonable moment.

WITHDRAWAL URGED UNLESS CHARTER AMENDED

Certainly none of us wants to undermine any institution capable of maintaining world peace or having a reasonable opportunity of doing that. However, we must recognize that we have had 10 years' experience. Carrying this out depends on whether this charter is reasonably amendable or not.

I have in my statement here a total of six which I consider to be extremely vital points to be considered on amendment. First of all, is it feasible and is it possible to amend the Charter of the United Nations to prevent that organization and its specialized agencies from infringing the Constitution of the United States? In other words, can the purposes of the Bricker amendment be secured by the amending process?

Second, is it possible to adopt clauses here to prevent the further abuse of the processes of the U. N. by Communist nations and their satellites, using it as a sounding board for propaganda and to further world revolution? If it can be done, it is desirable and should be. If it cannot, American adherence is extremely doubtful.

Third, can the veto power be changed to prevent vetoing a proposal to expel a nation, a Communist nation, for example, abusing the processes of the U. N.?

We also have the question brought out by the Senate Internal Security Committee involving the refusal to dismiss American citizens found guilty of Communist activity within the United Nations. Certainly that right should be secured; otherwise extreme danger to our country can occur, particularly where these things happen on American soil, as they did in the city of New York.

Fifth, we have a question whether this coexistence, which we now have and which Senator Jenner pointed out is at best organized coexistence where the U. N. must either be neutral, against communism or pro-Communist; it cannot be pro-American.

Now, gentlemen, the expiration of my time indicates already that 5 minutes' presentation of these matters is impossible. I recognize that and so do you.

I would like leave to file a supplemental statement with the committee at Washington, elaborating on these points which I think are of very vital importance.

I would like to call your attention to the tax-exempt lobby which is promoting one side of this presentation, and which the Reece committee of the House of Representatives referred to in that connection. You are getting an enormous flood of propaganda which should be considered in the formulation of your report here.

I will be in Washington the week of May 16. I shall be very glad to send a further statement to you in advance of that time, to appear before this committee to make any further statement desired, and be cross-examined on it.

I think, gentlemen, you have an extremely important question here in determining whether this charter is amendable and if so, how it should be done.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Sargent, we should be very glad to have your supplemental statement. Will it be possible for you to get that to Washington, say, by April 20?

Mr. SARGENT. I will do my level best. I think so, yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. You see, we are fast closing these hearings. Therefore, we are getting the record ready for printing. If you will submit it by that time——

Mr. SARGENT. I will do that.

Senator SPARKMAN. Of course, we anticipate it will be of reasonable length.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes. It is manifestly impossible to do this in 5 minutes. I thought the best thing was to enumerate the questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes. We all realize that.

Mr. SARGENT. Yes. I will be happy to do that. I will be in Washington on May 16. I will be glad to appear personally if you feel there is an advantage in doing that. You will have to judge from my statement, of course.

Senator SPARKMAN. I am under the impression that we shall have concluded the hearings before that time.

Mr. SARGENT. That may be.

Senator SPARKMAN. However, I will keep that in mind and see that Chairman George knows about it.

Mr. SARGENT. I am making that as an offer, Senator. It so happens that I will be there. I am making that as an offer to you.

Senator KNOWLAND. I have no questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Sargent is as follows:)

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 8, 1955.

Re April 9, 1955, San Francisco hearing.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,

*Chairman, Senate Subcommittee, United Nations Charter Revision,
City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.*

DEAR SENATOR: Notice has already been given of my request for leave to appear before your subcommittee on behalf of the California Society, Sons of the American Revolution. This organization, and the National Society, SAR, with which it is affiliated, are opposed to the granting of any further authority to the United Nations and its specialized agencies, particularly in the case of UNESCO.

The regulations furnished me concerning my appearance at your April 9 hearing indicate that the total time allotted will be only 5 minutes, and that statements must be furnished 24 hours in advance with 12 copies. The burden imposed by these regulations are such that I feel bound, in justice to the organization which I represent, to request leave to file a more extended statement with

your subcommittee at Washington, and to ask that the data set forth therein be included in the published hearing of this meeting for the benefit of interested parties.

In support of this request, I cite the following questions of major importance which should be fully debated in public with an adequate presentation for the opponents of the existing U. N. setup—time equal to that allotted to those in favor of the existing setup or promoting an expansion of U. N. power and authority, viz:

First: Amendments needed to prevent the action of U. N., and its specialized agencies, from superseding the Constitution of the United States in relation to domestic affairs.

Second: Clauses to stop further abuse of the processes of U. N. by Communist nations and their satellites, bent on using the U. N. as a soundingboard for propaganda and for world revolution—including adequate sanctions to permit the expulsion of any such nation or nations.

Third: Limitations of the veto power to prevent its use for the purpose of blocking such expulsions.

Fourth: Provisions requiring dismissal of citizens of any nation found guilty of Communist activity within the U. N. where such action occurs on the soil of the complaining nation, or such dismissal is requested by proper action of the country of which such U. N. employees may be citizens.

Fifth: Determination of the extent to which it is possible to prevent the U. N. being further used as an agency of coexistences with communism, and to avert the dangers in this respect noted in public utterances of Senator Jenner; determination of the question whether it is possible to prevent U. N. from serving as an agency for the promotion of national and international socialism, and affirming of appropriate amendments that will definitely secure the United States Government and its economic system from such interference.

Sixth: Finally, and most important, adoption of a positive declaration asserting that the United Nations does not presently constitute a world government; that the U. N. Charter is not intended to be employed for that purpose, and that the United States of America, is a member of U. N., is irrevocably opposed to the use of the charter powers of United Nations for any such object.

The experience of 10 years, which our country has had with the practical operation of this international agency, is such as to demand that this study be made, that there be full publicity in connection with it, and that the extent of the public opposition to the expansion of U. N. powers be adequately recorded.

I do not propose to discuss any of this proposition now, on their merits, because limitations imposed on this hearing are such as to make it impossible. I therefore request that an opportunity be granted to read this statement in the course of your meeting, to have it inserted in the record, and that proper leave be granted to file documents as indicated.

Very truly yours,

AARON M. SARGENT,

Attorney for California Society, Sons of the American Revolution.

Senator SPARKMAN. Call the next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Dr. Nancy Cross, followed by Mr. Donegan.

Senator SPARKMAN. Dr. Cross, we are very glad to have you. Just proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF DR. NANCY JEWELL CROSS, LAS LOMITAS, CALIF.

Dr. Cross. Thank you.

I am Nancy Cross. I live in San Mateo County, in Las Lomitas. I am appearing as an individual.

Senator SPARKMAN. Now, will you observe the microphone in front of you so that the people in the rear can hear? It might be well to sit a little closer to it.

Dr. Cross. Members of the Senate and members of the community, the community for each of us is as wide and friendly as our heart and understanding. I am here to propose 1955 revisions to the 1945 United Nations Charter.

In this 5-minute discussion, I will not set out the exact amendments proposed, but would prefer to have my written statement incorporated by reference. I will speak generally to the purpose of the amendments here.

As I conceive it, the United Nations should be an expression of the popular will to survive and progress in the good things of life. As such an expression the United Nations represents human beings everywhere. Insofar as the United Nations organization in fact represents all people and utilizes equitably the unique contributions of women and men all over the earth in the arts, the natural sciences, and the sciences of government and human relations, the United Nations organization offers means of common achievement.

The validity of its decisions will be measured, and the decisions enforced, by educating social contacts and the psychological compulsion from manifest fairness and the limits of human imagination in solving problems. War and the instruments and thinking of war are the expression of organizational inadequacies and the immature desire to use public authority and resources to achieve individual ends at any cost to others.

MEMBERSHIP OF NATIONS HOLDING FREE ELECTIONS

Therefore and in pursuance of the foregoing, any nation providing free elections with secret ballot for representatives to the United Nations may have a voice and an ear in the corporate proceedings of the United Nations.

You will note the distinction here: (1) That the United Nations, ipso facto, represents all the people. Those who appear and can decide and make determinations are those who have free elections for United Nations representatives.

This, I believe, is the keystone of more adequate organization of the United Nations through amendment of the charter. Adequacy of decision in imagination of solutions to problems and responsibility for the best solutions being carried out, requires the utmost of authentic independence of viewpoint—the richness of diversity and the responsibility of direct representation—at the conference table.

Delegates all chosen by one person or group less than the whole, whether or not that person or group was or were elected, represent that person or group and not the people and nation. Men cannot speak for women, nor women for men; white men cannot authentically act for colored men, and vice versa. The organizational requirements of the United Nations demand that women and men and people of whatever color, language, religion, and nationality shall—within the limit of the number of persons who can work together—hear and be heard themselves in equitable proportion as delegates and that the utmost diversity in origination of delegates within each nation shall be provided to maximize the resources in ideas of affected interests and means of carrying out decisions in the commonweal.

I would like to cite as one of the changes in membership that the kind of election that I would envision in the United States would involve 5 regional primaries for the selection of 1 man and 1 woman in 5 approximately equal population districts. And from those primaries, there would be 2 top candidates, 2 men and 2 women, who

would appear on a national ballot of 10 women and 10 men, from whom we would all elect our first choice of 5 women and 5 men. There would also be 1 woman and 1 man appointed by a chief executive of the State.

I believe in such a procedure there would be increasing feeling of responsibility by the people in each country; there would be a real representation, and with such a system we could accept such countries as Russia and China.

VIEWS ON RED CHINA MEMBERSHIP

Now, I would like to point out that the opinion for China is changing very much. In a debate at Stanford, in which London debated Stanford students, a poll was taken. Of approximately 1,000 people in attendance, only 21 percent opposed the recognition of diplomatic relations between the United States and China at this time; 54 percent were in favor and 25 percent were undecided.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Dr. Cross.

Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Cross is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF DR. NANCY JEWELL CROSS, PH. D., LAS LOMITAS, CALIF.

Members of the Senate and members of the community, the community for each of us is as wide and friendly as our heart and understanding. I am here to propose 1955 revisions to the 1945 United Nations Charter. Before noting the specific form of amendments I will give the purpose which the amendments are intended to serve.

As I conceive it, the United Nations should be an expression of the popular will to survive and progress in the good things of life. As such an expression the United Nations represents human beings everywhere. Insofar as the United Nations organization in fact represents all people and utilizes equitably the unique contributions of women and men all over the earth in the arts, the natural sciences, and the sciences of government and human relations, the United Nations organization offers means of common achievement. The validity of its decisions will be measured, and the decisions enforced, by educating social contacts and the psychological compulsion from manifest fairness and the limits of human imagination in solving problems. War and the instruments and thinking of war are the expression of organizational inadequacies and the immature desire to use public authority and resources to achieve individual ends at any cost to others.

Therefore and in pursuance of the foregoing, any nation providing free elections with secret ballot for representatives to the United Nations may have a voice and an ear in the corporate proceedings of the United Nations.

This, I believe, is the keystone of more adequate organization of the United Nations through amendment of the charter. Adequacy of decision in imagination of solutions to problems and responsibility for the best solutions being carried out, requires the utmost of authentic independence of viewpoint—the richness of diversity and the responsibility of direct representation—at the conference table. Delegates all chosen by one person or group less than the whole, whether or not that person or group was or were elected, represent that person or group and not the people and nation. Men cannot speak for women, nor women for men; white men cannot authentically act for colored men, and vice versa. The organizational requirements of the United Nations demand that women and men and people of whatever color, language, religion, and nationality shall, within the limit of the number of persons who can work together, hear and be heard themselves in equitable proportion as delegates and that the utmost diversity in origination of delegates within each nation shall be provided to maximize the resources in ideas of affected interests and means of carrying out decisions in the commonweal.

The following amendments to the United Nations Charter of 1945 are suggested in pursuance of the foregoing conception of the United Nations and its essential organizational requirements.

Chapter II.—Membership: Instead of the present chapter 2, articles 3–6, substitute as follows:

"3. All people in the world are within the purview of the United Nations and are individual members of the United Nations Organization whether or not they have personal representatives at the sessions of the United Nations.

"4. To be personally and actively represented at the sessions of the United Nations, the people of any nation shall send to these sessions 6 women and 6 men chosen as described hereafter; 5 men and 5 women shall be elected by the people of the nation directly and 1 woman and 1 man shall be appointed by the chief executive officer of the nation. The delegates of a nation shall serve a fixed term between 2 and 5 years determined once or from time to time by the nation and announced in advance of the delegates' selection. Delegates may serve continuously for not more than 5 years without an interim of 2 years. Every nominee for delegate to the United Nations shall, prior to election or appointment, subscribe and file with the Secretary General of the United Nations without fee a statement that he or she has read the United Nations Charter and if elected or appointed as a delegate will be honor bound to observe the charter's provisions and work with the other delegates pursuant to their common interests and that he or she does hereby resign all national, state, and other public or private office and employment whether with or without salary contingent upon valid election or appointment as a delegate to the United Nations. The dates and particulars of elections of United Nations delegates in all cases shall be consistent with this charter and in unspecified regards shall be determined by the nation to coordinate with its internal affairs.

"5. In the final selection of elected delegates from a nation, 5 men and 5 women shall be chosen from a slate of 10 women and 10 men by secret ballot in free elections in which every person over 21 years of age may vote for his or her choice of 5 women and 5 men. If the nation can so provide, the 10 candidates shall appear together on television on 3 separated occasions prior to the election to people everywhere in the nation. The 10 women and 10 on the final ballot shall be the 2 men and 2 women who poll the most votes in each of 5 primary elections on a geographical or other population basis determined by the nation in which every person over 21 years of age may vote by secret ballot in a free election for his or her choice of 2 women and 2 men from all persons nominated. The names of all nominees shall appear on the ballot, which shall separately list the women and men. Nominees on the primary ballot shall be all persons eligible to vote in that particular primary election who have filed the statement required in article 4 with the Secretary General of the United Nations and to a petition beginning with a copy of that statement have obtained verifiable signatures and addresses of 1,000 other said persons eligible to vote in the particular primary election. Said petition shall be filed without fee with the Secretary General on or before a date to be specified by the nation and shall be accompanied by an original typed and 2 carbon copies of the petition including names and addresses of at least 1,000 persons. One copy of the nominating petitions shall be sent by the Secretary General to the chief executive officer of the nation for verification of the eligibility of the petitioner and signers as being over 21 years of age and belonging to the population group eligible to vote in the particular primary election rather than in 1 of the other 4 primary elections. If the nation enters no objection on specified grounds before 30 days prior to the election the Secretary General shall deem the petition regular and the person applying a nominee qualified for the ballot in the particular primary election. In case of difference of opinion of the Secretary General and the chief executive officer of a nation on the eligibility of the applicant, the applicant shall be given the benefit of the doubt and if the person is favored in both the primary and the final elections any person may except to the seating of the person questioned as a delegate by appeal to the General Assembly and if their decision is in favor of the applicant and not acceptable to the appellant, then to the International Court of Justice. If the nation can so provide, the nominees in the 5 primary elections shall appear with other nominees in the same primary election on 3 separate occasions prior to the election to the persons who are eligible to vote in the particular primary election.

"6. Each nation shall notify the United Nations of its intentions regarding representatives, and the United Nations shall send election advisor-observers to all nations near the times of elections for United Nations delegates. The advisor-observers shall report to the General Assembly the material facts con-

cerning elections for United Nations delegates. If any irregularities reported are considered material by the General Assembly they may require a new election to be held before any representatives from the nation may be seated. A decision adverse to any nation on election of delegates may be appealed by the chief executive of the nation or any recognized delegate, to the International Court of Justice. The membership of a nation and the people of a nation in the United Nations is independent of the presence or absence of their delegates at the sessions of the United Nations, as declared in article 3."

Chapter III.—Organs: Add to article 8 as shown:

"8. The United Nations shall place no restriction on the eligibility of men and women to participate in any capacity and under conditions of equality in the principal and subsidiary organs. The General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and the International Court of Justice shall be regularly constituted of equal numbers of women and men, but this shall not prevent action by an organ named due to temporary vacancies or incapacities of members which reduce the proportion of men or women to not less than one-third of the principal organ's acting membership."

Chapter IV.—The General Assembly: Amend articles 9 and 18 to read as follows:

"9. The General Assembly shall be comprised of all the delegates of nations duly chosen as set forth in article II except for those delegates who are seated on the Security Council.

"18. Each nation which sends duly chosen delegates to the United Nations shall have 12 votes in the General Assembly. At the beginning of the session each nation with delegates shall announce whether it prefers to vote in one unified block of 12 votes or in what units and whether it will vote by individual delegates contingent upon unanimous vote of the General Assembly that all delegates do so."

Chapter V.—The Security Council: Amend article 23 to read as follows:

"23. (1) The Security Council shall be comprised of delegates of 11 nations duly chosen as set forth in article II. The particular nations with delegates seated on the Security Council shall be determined as follows. All the nations with delegates shall be ranked by a measure of the education, productivity, and independence of their people and the number of their people, defined as the Security Council index number, as follows:

$$\text{Security Council index number} = \left(\begin{array}{l} \text{Median grade-years of education} \\ \text{Per capita median com-+income per hour} \\ \text{Median of bread plus square dekameters} \end{array} \right) \times \text{population}$$

25 years and over+4 quart of milk

"Five nations with delegates on the Security Council shall be those with the highest Security Council index numbers, with the following exceptions. Any nation among the highest five in Security Council index number may waive its rating in favor of the General Assembly's choice of an additional member of the Security Council. Any nation among the highest five in Security Council index number forfeits its place and any place on the Security Council, but not in the United Nations or the General Assembly, by failure in the judgment of the General Assembly or the Security Council, or, if appealed, of the International Court of Justice, to meet substantial United Nations obligations. The General Assembly shall elect the six or more remaining nations to have delegates on the Security Council, due regard being specially paid in the first instance to the contribution of members to the maintenance of international peace and security and to the other purposes of the organization, and also to equitable geographical distribution.

"(2) The nations to have delegates on the Security Council shall be elected for a term of 3 years, subject to resignation or forfeiture as indicated in the preceding portion of this article. A retiring member nation of those elected by the General Assembly and the retiring delegates generally shall be eligible for reelection or reassignment to the Security Council after an intervening 3 years.

"(3) The distribution of a nation's delegates between the Security Council and the General Assembly shall be decided by the delegation from the nation and the rules of the General Assembly so far as may be needed for compliance with article 8. Each nation on the Security Council shall have 12 votes. At the beginning of the session each nation with delegates on the Security Council shall announce whether it prefers to vote in one unified block of 12 votes or in what units and whether it will vote by individual delegates contingent upon unanimous vote of the Security Council that all delegates do so."

Chapter XIV.—The International Court of Justice: For the present paragraph 2 of Article 93 substitute as follows:

“(2) People everywhere are subject to the jurisdiction of the United Nations, and judgments may be rendered with respect to any individual or nation notified of provisional jurisdiction of the cause and given opportunity to appear in public hearing and present his, her, or its case and evidence directly to the International Court of Justice or any other United Nations body or officer which renders a decision affecting him, her, or it. A party to such proceeding shall have all the rights of due process of law and equal protection of the laws which are accorded in his, her, or its own country and those additionally accorded in the country of every other party to the cause, as the several requirements of due process of law and equal protection of the laws are resolved by rule of the International Court of Justice and approved by the General Assembly.

“(3) In any cause of which the court takes provisional jurisdiction, the costs of reasonably necessary travel and papers filed by an individual or individuals to present his or her or their case to the court shall be paid by the United Nations. Every decision of the court shall be accompanied by an opinion or opinions and the decision and opinion or opinions shall be published in all of the official languages and also in the language of each party to the case and distributed in the appropriate language to one library open to the public in every incorporated community and political subdivision in the world, and to other libraries and individuals for a nominal fee.”

Chapter XV — The Secretariat: In article 97 for more statesmanship through universality of reference, change “He” to “He or she”; in article 98, change “him” to “him or her”; and in article 99, change “his” to “his or her”. In article 101 let paragraph 3 read as follows:

“(3) The paramount consideration in the employment of staff and the determination of conditions of service shall be the necessity of securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity. Due regard shall be paid to the importance of recruiting the staff on as wide a geographical basis as possible. Vacancies shall be publicly announced as soon as they occur or are expected, in all incorporated communities of 100,000 or more population, and competitive examinations shall be scheduled in countries and communities most convenient to applicants. United Nations examinations shall be open to all persons without restriction and each person examined shall be given a certificate of his or her score on each and all parts of the examination and a summary of the statistics of the examination and the names, addresses, and examination rank of all persons who passed the examination. The papers shall be scored anonymously and no question shall require information as to race, religion, sex, or marital or military status. In making application for examination, a person in lieu of first name shall select a number of five digits and use this and his or her family name or other identifying word and his or her address, and specify the position or positions applied for and the places in order of preference where the applicant could appear for examination. The Secretary General shall publish the names of persons appointed to vacancies and from what examination list they became eligible.”

Or instead of these provisions about examinations: “In order to use the highest skills of women and men in positions of equal status in the secretariat, appointive positions shall be filled so that the average annual salary of women and the average annual salary of the men employed, regardless of the number of each employed, shall be approximately equal. The Secretary General shall report to the General Assembly once each year and to individuals upon inquiry the number of women and men employed and their average annual salaries.”

Chapter XVII—Transitional Security Arrangements: Strike this chapter, articles 106 and 107.

Chapter XVIII—Amendments: For present articles 108 and 109 substitute as follows:

“108. Amendments to the present charter shall come into force by being adopted by a vote of two-thirds in the General Assembly and either by affirmative vote of all of the members of the Security Council or by ratification in accordance with their respective constitutional processes by two-thirds of the nations of the world.

“109. A general conference of the members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present charter shall be held at a date within 10 years from the preceding such conference, the exact date thereof and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly or by a vote of seven members of the Security Council, whichever organ considers such general conference earliest needed.”

Senator SPARKMAN. Call the next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. John M. Donegan, followed by Mrs. French.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come right around, Mr. Donegan. We are very glad to have you, sir.

Mr. DONEGAN. Thank you, Senator.

STATEMENT OF JOHN M. DONEGAN, PALTO ALTO, CALIF.

Mr. DONEGAN. I am John M. Donegan, appearing as an individual. I am an attorney at law, practicing in Palo Alto, Calif.

Honorable Senators, the attitude concerning the United Nations Charter, which I urge as best for the United States, is that we should proceed and proceed with caution.

It is essential, first of all, that we do proceed to make such changes as are necessary to give the United Nations the strength to prevent aggression.

To accomplish that, I believe we must proceed in the direction which history shows is the only effective way to protect individuals or groups from violence by others. That way is by developing a system of law and order, which is backed up by a police force considerably stronger than the would-be law breakers.

But in proceeding in this direction, we should at the same time use caution. We do not want to remove ourselves from the fire of atomic warfare only to end up in the frying pan of a tyranny.

DELEGATION OF LIMITED POWERS TO THE U. N. ADVOCATED

As Americans, we are familiar with a magnificent example which shows us how we can give to the U. N. some power without turning over all power. That example is the Constitution of the United States of America. It reveals two basic ideas, which would allow us to give the U. N. the strength to do its job without unreasonable risk that it would also interfere in the private affairs of ourselves and our Nation.

The first idea is that of delegation of powers, the idea of expressly stating the particular fields in which the States are giving power to the United States, and in which the nations are giving power to the United Nations, on the basis that all powers other than those expressly delegated powers are kept by the nations and their peoples.

As to the particular powers which should be delegated to the U. N., I believe they should be kept to a minimum, but they still must be sufficient to enable the United Nations to prevent aggression.

MILITARY FORCES FOR THE U. N.

To do this, the forces of the U. N. must be as much stronger than the forces of individual nations as the police forces in communities are stronger than the law breakers within them. This, of course, requires that we delegate to the U. N. the power to maintain strong military forces, to control the production of atomic weapons, and to limit armaments among nations.

Within those fields of police military power, it seems obvious that no nation should have any veto over the operation of the United Nations, any more than any law breaker should have a veto over the operation of the police force.

A BILL OF RIGHTS

The second idea exemplified by our Constitution, which will help us safeguard against tyranny, is that of a Bill of Rights, as in our first 10 amendments. The charter of the U. N. should contain similar provisions to clearly protect individuals and nations against interference in their religion and other private affairs.

If our United States delegation to the charter review conference promotes provisions along these lines, I believe we are certain to obtain worthwhile advantages. Even if completely unsuccessful in obtaining changes, we will at least gain the small benefit of favorable propaganda, and if successful in establishing a workable and strong United Nations, we will gain the great benefit of lasting peace.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEMBER NATIONS

Senator KNOWLAND. I have just one question here. I think that a great many people who have given thought to the possibility of amending the United Nations Charter have given rather careful consideration as to how that might effectively be done. Very often we hear the comparison made between the United Nations and the United States Constitution in its formulation.

Of course, there is one very vast difference. The people of the Original Thirteen Colonies had a common language, which is not perhaps unsurmountable so far as the United Nations is concerned, if there were common ideas. But they also, prior to Philadelphia, had common ideals of freedom. They had the Magna Carta and they had experience with representative government in England and in the colonies.

Now, that is not, of course, true of all the nations constituting the United Nations. With universal representation under the charter, whether they assume obligations or not, they would more or less be entitled to membership.

It is difficult, I think, for a great many people who are trying to find some means of amending the charter, to understand how you could make the U. N. universal without seriously damaging and diluting the freedoms guaranteed, for instance, under the American Constitution, under our Bill of Rights, or even under the English system of government.

How do you believe that this protection might be granted if you surrender to the United Nations certain of these additional powers to which you refer?

Mr. DONEGAN. Senator, first of all, in comparing our situation at the present time to that of the Thirteen Colonies who formed the United States, as you point out, there are certain obvious differences. No one pretends or could reasonably think that they are exactly the same problems in all respects. But I think it is clear that the basic problem is very similar. It is a problem of having—at that time we had Thirteen Colonies. They did have the same language, mainly. But they also had different backgrounds. Some of them had come from France, some from Spain, most from England.

Even within the individual Colonies there were a great many persons who had been Tories, for example, and had not participated in

the revolution. Some of the States, I believe, were at the point where they were almost ready to battle with each other over certain boundary lines.

LIMITED POWERS ONLY TO THE U. N.

Now, we do have the problem now, as then, of setting up a central agency with enough power to prevent aggression between its members, and I think that the same principles which are so ably and magnificently applied in our Constitution would work in the United Nations.

Now, I think also there is an important difference in this, which would help it work equitably and in fact have much less effect on the members of the United Nations than our own Constitution does on the individual States. That is the fact that powers which I believe should be delegated to the United Nations would be much more limited than the powers which the States delegated to the United States, for example, the power over commerce; the power over our currency; the power over immigration.

Now, those powers were delegated by the States to the United States. I would not be in favor of delegating them from the nations to the United Nations. I would delegate to the United Nations, not such powers as might try to work out all of the problems in the world, all of the economic and difficult social problems in the world, but simply the basic problem of setting up enough law and order that aggression between the member states could be prevented.

IF RUSSIA SHOULD VETO CHANGES

Senator KNOWLAND. Can you ever prevent that aggression as long as a would-be aggressor could exercise a veto on police action against the aggressor?

Mr. DONEGAN. No, Senator. I believe it is impossible as long as there is a veto.

Senator KNOWLAND. Then supposing the Soviet Union or the Communist world insists on exercising its veto, and would oppose the changes such as you have suggested; what then?

Mr. DONEGAN. With reference to changing the charter and organizing that way in the first place?

Senator KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. DONEGAN. I think, Senator, first of all that we would have gained for the United States some favorable propaganda. We would have shown that we were willing to go a long ways in our efforts to establish a peaceful world and to help us with our allies.

Now, secondly, I think it is barely possible—not probable, but barely possible—that Russia might go along soon, and her satellites. If Russia did not, then I think we would have the problem. We could always go along with the United Nations the same as it is now, or if there were enough other nations that were willing to go along with us, that we would have a preponderance of strength, then I believe it would be worthwhile for us to proceed to organize with them and leave the door open for Russia and her satellites to come in at such later date, if ever, as they ever were willing to make the concessions that we were willing to make to accomplish that. And I think that it would help us in the meantime in cooperation with our other nations, for exam-

ple, to have allies with the guaranteed airfields and airbases, which are necessary for us to maintain strong defensive positions.

I believe it would help us to maintain more adequately than we can now the military strength which would prevent Russia or others from attacking us because of the knowledge that retaliation would occur.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Donegan.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Donegan is as follows:)

SUGGESTED UNITED STATES POLICIES WITH REFERENCE TO REVIEW OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, BY JOHN M. DONEGAN, PALO ALTO, CALIF.

First, as a citizen of the United States, I wish to express to this subcommittee of the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, what I am certain is a very widespread feeling of appreciation for the efforts and attitude of the subcommittee. The issues of peace or war and the related issues of what our policies should be toward possible changes in the United Nations Charter are vital issues about which innumerable citizens feel the deepest interest and have many ideas. These ideas are, of course quite varied and many citizens have views which are completely opposed to those of others. But the important thing is that the members of the subcommittee are willing to devote much time and work to hearing all of these different views, and to considering them in formulating the policies to be recommended to the Senate. Regardless what the ultimate decision is, the grassroots hearings by the subcommittee are a most commendable example of the democratic process.

Each individual, in arriving at his own views as to what policies are desirable, is, of course, influenced by what he believes to be facts. The facts in this matter, which seem to me to be most basic and most important are simply these: I believe that whenever human beings have much contact with each other, then disagreements and disputes are inevitably going to develop. And I believe that it is then inevitable that physical force and violence will frequently be used by the disputing persons, unless those persons are living in a system of law and order, and unless that system of law and order is backed up by superior forces which are strong enough to prevent the use of violence by the persons within that system.

Such systems of law and order, backed up by sufficient strength, are familiar to all of us. They include city governments with their police forces, county governments with their sheriffs, State governments with their State militia and National Guard units, and the United States Government with its various law-enforcement agencies and its military forces. Being composed of human beings, it is, of course, true that none of these governments is so perfectly effective that the use of force and violence is completely prevented. But it is certain that all of these governments are effective in greatly reducing the amount of force and violence which would otherwise exist.

If that is true, then it seems only reasonable to apply the same principles in attempting to solve the problem of preventing the use of force and violence between nations. For it is clear that there is now little law and order among nations. And it is even clearer that what law there is cannot yet be enforced, since there is still no law enforcement agency with sufficient power to prevent the violence of war between nations.

In attempting to apply the principles of enforceable law and order internationally, we have available the help and inspiration of a magnificent example, the Constitution of the United States of America. True, even our Constitution has not provided a perfect guaranty of peace: it had a terrible failure almost a century ago. But who can doubt that its framework of enforceable law and order has provided much better chances for peace than would otherwise have been possible among a large group of independent States?

Our Constitution is a magnificent example for us in another way also—in demonstrating how it is possible to proceed with caution and with reasonable safety in our attempts to strengthen the United Nations. Strengthen it we must, if we are to have any chance of success in creating a system of enforceable law and order capable of preventing war. But we must, at the same time, strengthen it with care, using caution not to let it develop into a tyranny.

Our Constitution shows us, first of all, how some powers may be given to a government without giving that government all power. By delegating merely the specific powers which are necessary to solve the problems which must be

solved, it is possible to retain for ourselves and for our Nation all other powers. And it should be made clear in the United Nations Charter that the United Nations has no power outside of the strictly limited fields in which power is expressly delegated to it.

And I believe that we should delegate to the United Nations only the minimum powers which should enable it to prevent war. That, of course, must include the power to control the production of atomic and hydrogen bombs (including the power of inspection). Also, the power to reduce and to limit conventional armaments among the nations, at least to the point where no nation would have forces sufficient to enable it by surprise attack to overcome the military forces of the United Nations, and to seize its atomic and hydrogen bombs. The military forces of the United Nations must be as much stronger than the forces of individual nations, as the police forces of our communities are stronger than the possible violent lawbreakers within them—for only in this way can our Nation, or other nations, be protected from the aggression of Russia, or of Communist China, or of whatever other nations in future years would otherwise become a menace to us.

It is true that such a delegation of power covering the fields of military weapons and forces would be a serious thing. It would completely restrict our national sovereignty in those fields. But in overall effect, the benefits to us would far outweigh the apparent sacrifice. For, as a peaceful Nation, we are not interested in using our military forces for gain. We use them only for the protection of ourselves and our allies. So in enabling the creation of strong United Nations police forces, we would actually be accomplishing our own purposes. And, in the long run, we would then have a much better chance of succeeding in those purposes. At the present time, we are in the awkward position of feeling, for moral reasons, that we cannot strike Russia unless Russia first strikes us. It is obvious that this is a great handicap to us. It makes it necessary for us to maintain forces of such strength that the threat of retaliation will persuade Russia not to attack—we hope. But we have no right to expect this situation to improve. And in the long run, it seems probable that the Russian wolf may sometime put on the sheepskin of false peacefulness—and that American public opinion may be lulled into an assumption of safety and may require that our military expenditures be reduced and our forces weakened—and then that the men in the Kremlin would strike. I believe that something of that sort is very probable, if in the meantime we do not succeed in strengthening the United Nations enough to prevent it. Of course, we would continue to have many problems and difficulties even with a strong United Nations, but we should have a much better chance of achieving lasting peace.

In addition to the military powers, there is one other power which would necessarily have to be delegated to the United Nations.

That is the power to raise revenue by taxation. Such revenue would be necessary to enable the maintenance of strong police forces. The power to tax should be limited to such types of tax and in such amounts as would be adequate for the necessary forces. And the ultimate effect on the taxpayer would be probably be a decrease rather than an increase in his total taxes, since the expenses for national military forces would be greatly reduced.

Outside of those specific powers—broad power in the field of military force, and very limited power in the field of taxation—it should be made clear in the charter that the United Nations is not given any other powers and does not have other powers. It might recommend programs in such fields as education or health or technical assistance. But it should be made clear that participation in any such other programs is purely voluntary (including the financing of such programs). And it should be definitely stated that, except for the expressly delegated powers, all powers and all rights to make decisions in every field of human activity are retained by the nations and their parts. Under those provisions, then, practically all of human affairs would be governed just as they are governed now—by cities, counties, states, and the national government. The effect of delegating those limited powers to the United Nations would be completely insignificant as far as the life of the individual citizen is concerned—except that it would give him a much better chance of living a longer life.

In addition to the example of delegation of powers, our United States Constitution is an example of another important method of insuring that we can strengthen the United Nations without letting it become a tyranny. That is by the inclusion of a Bill of Rights. Our own first 10 amendments were adopted to safeguard citizens against interference by the Federal Government in their

private affairs (their religion, their politics, their publications, et cetera), and to protect them against unjust means of government. Likewise, the Charter of the United Nations should contain similar provisions, to protect citizens and nations against interference and injustice from the United Nations.

As to the governmental organization of the United Nations, it would seem desirable to have it somewhat similar to our own Federal Government, within the much narrower limits of its delegated powers. And it seems obvious that nations and individuals should not have any veto over the operation of the United Nations, any more than any possible lawbreaker should have a veto over the operation of the police force.

If the United States delegation to the charter review conference promotes provisions in the charter similar to those suggested above, I submit that we will obtain considerable benefits. Even if completely unsuccessful in obtaining changes, we will at least obtain propaganda advantages by showing the efforts we are willing to make to promote peace. If a strengthened charter is developed along workable lines, there would, of course, be the problem of whether the Communist bloc would ratify it. Since the Communists probably desire to live out their lives as we do ours, it is barely possible that they would be willing to ratify it soon. Probably, however, realizing that a peaceful world would be more to our advantage than theirs, the Communists would refuse to participate.

In that case, it is possible that we would feel it best for the United States to continue under the present charter—and we would still have gained propaganda advantages. But it is also possible that there would be enough non-Communist nations, willing to participate along with us in a strengthened United Nations, that it would be worth while for us to organize without Russia and her satellites. The absence of the Communists should be more than offset by the advantages of being able to develop united military forces together with the other nations united with us. This should be of particular advantage in connection with the widespread military airplane bases which are necessary; it would give us a much better guaranty of having such bases available than we now have in our loose alliances which could end at any time. It would improve our chances of maintaining retaliatory forces so strong that Russia would be afraid to attack. And over a long period of time, through internal revolution or otherwise, Russia and her satellites might become reasonable enough to participate.

The alternative to strengthening the United Nations almost surely would be a continuation of the cold war, and someday a very hot war—and undoubtedly, regardless who wins, a very disastrous one for us. In the face of that alternative, it seems much to the advantage of the United States to urge the strengthening of the charter. We will then gain at least the small benefits of favorable propaganda. And we may gain the great benefits of lasting peace, through a workable and effective United Nations.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. Carolyn French, followed by Mrs. Sage.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are very glad to have you, Mrs. French. You proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF CAROLYN S. FRENCH, MENLO PARK, CALIF.

Mrs. FRENCH. I am Carolyn French. I am a housewife from Menlo Park, Calif., and I am speaking as an individual.

It is my considered belief that the United Nations Charter must be constructively revised if the civilized nations of the world are to survive the destructive byproducts of civilization. The charter must be changed to make universal disarmament a reality, not the visionary object of wishful thinking. Disarmament can only be accomplished if the United Nations is empowered to conduct a gradual and proportionate reduction of arms in all member nations simultaneously. In the event of hostility between nations, the enlightened and objective decisions of the Security Council must be enforced, in the same manner that our own courts enforce the law against carrying concealed weapons. The United Nations should be strengthened so that poten-

tial outlaw nations would think twice before resorting to arbitrary violence which would ultimately result in their own annihilation.

It is true that Russia has repeatedly indicated opposition to charter revision. However, like many individuals, nations, particularly politically unstable nations, have been known to change their minds, even on important issues. Whatever Russia's faults, she cannot be so blind as to favor the continuance of a costly and suicidal arms race. At any event, I do not think that we should let the current party line deter us from taking the initiative and acting upon our own convictions should we agree to the necessity of charter revision.

CHARTER REVISION URGED

It is my understanding that if those who formed the present charter had conceived of the devastating efficiency of improved nuclear weapons, they would have made more explicit provisions for disarmament in that charter. Now we have a chance to remedy the defects of the preatomic charter before it is too late. I realize that there are persons better informed than I who oppose charter revision at the present time. Their reasons undoubtedly have a certain validity, but I believe they are tragically shortsighted. They fear that if the foundational charter is seriously questioned now, the entire structure of the United Nations may topple, so precarious is its present state. It seems to me that the opponents of revision who share this view are entirely too confident in the temporary security of a United Nations which is now said to be united in name only. The United Nations has been notably ineffectual in handling the problem of aggression in Indochina and Formosa. If the charter is allowed to remain as it is, the United Nations will soon be obsolete, and when this happens the blame will rest squarely upon the people who thought they were protecting the U. N. by discouraging timely charter revision.

Those who optimistically believe that things can go on as they are indefinitely are only deceiving themselves. There will be no security in the United Nations as long as the balance of power is maintained by threats of violence.

I do not want my child to go through life in a world that is governed by fear and insecurity. Continued international tension is bound to have profound repercussions upon the mental and emotional stability of our children. Under the strain of ever-impending atomic destruction they may abandon all respect for our moral and civil laws and choose to live dangerously from day to day, sensing that each day may be their last. Or they may lose all desire to work for a better world and become blind conformers, using up their youthful energy in attacks upon minority groups and helpless individuals. If the world is to be an abiding and creative community it must be governed not by fear, not by violence, but by enforceable law, and to this purpose the United Nations Charter must now be dedicated.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. French.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. Erwin C. Sage, followed by Mrs. John Church.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. ERWIN C. SAGE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.,
PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF SAN FRANCISCO**

Mrs. SAGE. Gentlemen, I am Mrs. Erwin C. Sage, president of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, and speaking for that organization.

The League of Women Voters has supported the United Nations from its beginning—indeed it was one of the few national women's organizations which was invited to send a representative as a consultant during the conferences which framed the charter here in San Francisco in 1945. Since the United States was represented at that conference by a distinguished bipartisan delegation largely drawn from the Congress and since it was ratified almost unanimously by the Senate, this charter represented the thinking and the desires of the American people.

INCREASE EFFECTIVENESS OF CHARTER WITHOUT REVISION

In spite of the fact that all of our high hopes of that day just 10 years ago have not been realized, the league believes that the United Nations has an impressive record of contribution to the establishment of world economic and social stability. Unfortunately, however, war is not abolished by a stroke of the pen, but by the willingness—the dedicated willingness of nations to settle their differences by means other than those of barbarism. We cannot assess the costs of war in terms of human sufferings, tragedy, and waste; but in dollars and cents, over 75 percent of our total national budget goes to pay for past wars and for present defense. Contrast that figure with the one-tenth of 1 percent of our budget which is our contribution to the United Nations to improve our chances for peace.

The United States' position of world power gives it a special responsibility within the United Nations and also a special obligation to contribute to its successful functioning. The manner in which we accept that responsibility and obligation is the measure of our maturity as a nation. Much as we might like to retreat to childhood with its freedom from responsibilities, we cannot do so. We cannot be isolated and alone in a century in which loneliness can mean extinction. Intelligent American patriotism calls for American leadership toward a world dedicated to meet the problems we know we must face.

The League of Women Voters supports the United Nations as essential to the conduct of foreign relations today. We believe that its success depends not entirely upon organization and procedures, but on the very real desire of the member nations to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war.

The member nations can do much to increase the effectiveness of the organization without amending its charter. The Uniting for Peace Resolution of 1950 which gave the General Assembly responsibility for considering threats to the peace is an illustration of this possibility.

The League of Women Voters believes that any changes which might be made in the charter should be limited to those which would strengthen the United Nations' ability to fulfill its twofold purpose—that of preventing war and of promoting peace.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. Yes, I have a couple of questions, Mrs. Sage. To be of value to the Senate and the country, there are some specific problems which it seems to me that we should mutually explore in order to try to find the answer, if indeed there is an answer.

FULFILLMENT OF OBLIGATIONS TO THE U. N.

When the United Nations was formed in San Francisco some 10 years ago, the question was raised as to whether it should be a universal organization or whether it should be an organization of member states willing to assume certain obligations under the charter. And I believe it was this latter concept which was adopted.

Under the United Nations Charter, then, each of the members assumed certain obligations. On June 25, 1950, the United Nations Security Council called upon its members to resist the aggression which had taken place in Korea.

Of the 60 member nations, only 17 of them, including the United States of America, responded to that call. We furnished about 90 percent of the manpower, or roughly 450,000 men to carry out the request of the United Nations. The other 16 nations furnished about 45,000.

The Republic of Korea, which was the victim of the aggression, furnished about 600,000.

Now, the Soviet Union, as a specific example—I am coming now to the point of my inquiry—furnished no forces whatsoever, though it had assumed an obligation under the charter, though it was a permanent member of the Security Council. During the 3 years of the Korean war they refrained from supporting the action taken under the charter. While the war was still going on and before the Panmunjom negotiations had been completed, Mr. Vishinsky, who was representing the Soviet Union before the Assembly, admitted that his Government had not only been giving moral support to the Chinese and North Korean aggressors, but also had given material support in the form of planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition to the aggressor.

Has your board or your organization given thought as to whether a nation which violated the charter and the resolution should be allowed to continue in membership? Do you think under those circumstances the Soviet Union had made a prima facie case for being expelled from membership? I was wondering whether that matter had been given any attention.

Mrs. SAGE. Senator Knowland, I am sorry, I am speaking for my organization and can only express the result of the members in the whole United States of the conclusions that have been reached by the member organizations, by our local leagues. We have not at the moment given specific attention to the point that you raised, and I can only speak within the framework of what our league has said.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Mrs. Sage.

Call the next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. John L. Church, followed by Mr. Treat.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mrs. Church. Proceed in your own way.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN L. CHURCH, PASADENA COCHAIRMAN,
CALIFORNIANS FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT**

Mrs. CHURCH. I am Mrs. John L. Church of Pasadena. I represent Californians for the Bricker Amendment, with a paid membership of 700 and a mailing list of about 5,000.

I want to thank the members of the committee for permitting us to be heard.

We are particularly concerned with preserving the sovereignty of the United States. The Senators who ratified the United Nations Charter were assured that article 2, paragraph 7 of the charter, was ample protection. Since then, a body of opinion has developed in the United States which holds domestic and foreign law to be identical: that national sovereignty is a silly shibboleth, and that UNESCO, viewed in its historical context, is a halting, painful, but real progress toward world government.

In the United States, the individual citizen is sovereign and he is protected against encroachment by the Constitution. particularly the Bill of Rights, the rights of a minority, even to a minority of one, are protected by the first amendment.

DANGERS TO CONSTITUTION AND CIVIL LIBERTIES CITED

Obviously the United States cannot embrace world government and at the same time retain United States constitutional government. The transition can be made by reinterpretation of the charter from a treaty to a constitution.

The treaty loophole makes this possible without Americans being able to make their wishes known. The actual violations of sovereignty are too numerous to list, but I shall cite, to focus the attention of the public on the United Nations Charter, interference with the Constitution, first, our entrance into the Korean conflict without congressional approval, and second, the NATO Status of Forces Treaty which denies American servicemen the protection of the Constitution.

In the specialized agencies, the entrance of Russia and her satellites into the International Labor Organization destroys the original intention of a separation into three groups, government, employer, and employee.

I cite the vote by the Commission on Human Rights on March 3, 1954, not to include in the covenant on human rights any provision recognizing the right of an individual to own property and be secure in its enjoyment against arbitrary seizure by the Government. There are other threats to the sovereignty of individual Americans in proposed treaties which I haven't time to list.

In all discussions concerning the transformation of the United Nations into a world federation, the success of our 48 States in a Federal Union is cited as evidence that it can be done worldwide. Overlooked is an extremely important provision of the United States Constitution, article IV, section 4, part of which reads:

The United States shall guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government.

We have seen no suggestion from the advocates of world government that nations involved in it should have a uniform type of government.

REPEAL OF CHARTER URGED

We feel the repeal of the charter is imperative because of the role of Alger Hiss in the formation of the United Nations Charter, and believe the whole subject should be thoroughly explored. We feel that the ability of the Soviet Union to control and dominate over 600 million more people while the United Nations has been functioning, belies the claim that it has preserved the peace, unless we mean to equate peace with the extension of tyranny.

We know we are on their timetable for destruction.

We believe the citizens of the United States have the finest government ever devised, and indeed, we have grown to be the colossus of the world under its protection of freedom for the individual.

Since no other nation has chosen to adopt our form of government, we are convinced that no form of world government could possibly afford us the protection we enjoy under our Constitution.

We therefore respectfully request that the attention of our elected representatives be focused on protecting and defending our sovereignty under the Constitution.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Church.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Church is as follows:)

CALIFORNIANS FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

(A Nonprofit, Nonpartisan Organization), Publishers of Californian U. S. A., Pacific Palisades, Calif., Submitted by Mrs. John L. Church, Pasadena cochairman Californians for the Bricker Amendment

Californians for the Bricker Amendment are virtually interested in the proposed review of the United Nations Charter, looking toward the amendment of the charter.

We are particularly concerned in the area of preserving the sovereignty of the United States. As spokesman for the group, I wish to address my remarks to the Senators on this subdivision of the subject.

When the ratification of the United Nations Charter was being debated on the floor of the Senate in 1945, this particular issue was the subject of discussion. A letter from the then Secretary of State, Edward Stettinius, laid special emphasis on the guarantee against interference in our domestic law which is incorporated in article No. 2 (7) of the charter. Californians for the Bricker Amendment have maintained a continuing concern in this area because of statements by prominent Americans which indicate a willingness on their part to surrender this protection of our sovereignty.

In 1950 Secretary of State Dean Acheson declared in State Department document No. 3972 that "There is now no longer any real difference between domestic and foreign affairs." Obviously, that statement nullified the supposed protection we enjoyed (or thought we enjoyed) under article No. 2 (7) of the United Nations Charter. Because of the treaty loophole, that is recent decisions of the Supreme Court have declared that treaties are the supreme law of the land, the American people were faced with the possibility that treaties made under the United Nations Charter could become domestic law. Mr. John Foster Dulles stated this very clearly in a speech in Louisville, Ky. on April 12, 1952 before he became Secretary of State. He said, "The treaty-making power is an extraordinary power liable to abuse. Treaties make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the State and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights."

After uttering this warning, Mr. Dulles reversed himself when he became Secretary of State and refused to support any amendment to the Constitution which would have protected the American people from such encroachment on their sovereignty.

Former Associate Justice Owen J. Roberts stated in a speech in Canada that "national sovereignty is a silly shibboleth." It is pertinent and necessary at this point to remind the Senators conducting this hearing, that under the Constitution of the United States, the individual citizen is sovereign so that Mr. Roberts' statement discards the basic concept of the importance and inviolability of the individual citizen. The Government of the United States is the only one in the world in which this is true but it will only remain true so long as Americans are informed and stand ready to protect their sovereignty. If enough people, including our elected representatives, adopt Mr. Roberts' belief, our sovereignty will be lost. And I should mention that the rights of minorities, even down to a minority of one, to petition the government for a redress of grievances, is contained in the first amendment to the Constitution, guaranteeing the sovereignty of the individual citizen.

Further concern was caused by Dr. Milton Eisenhower's statement in 1949. He said, "One can truly understand UNESCO only if one views it in its historical context and viewed in this way it reveals itself as one more step in our halting, painful, but I think very real progress toward a genuine world government." This was said in a speech in Wichita, Kans. Obviously, the United States cannot embrace world government and at the same time retain United States Constitutional Government. The transition can be made through reinterpretation of the United Nations Charter from a treaty into a Constitution. Again the treaty supremacy could make this possible without Americans having any chance to make their wishes known.

It is our conviction that United States sovereignty has been infringed upon. I shall cite the following instances:

1. Entrance into the Korean conflict without the consent of Congress article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution gives to Congress the power to declare war.
2. Refusal of the United Nations to allow the United States, which bore the brunt of the war in lives and money, to win the war.
3. The execution of 10,000 treaties and/or executive agreements under NATO, none of which have been presented to the Senate for ratification according to Mr. Dulles' own statement.
4. The NATO Status of Forces Treaty which denies to American servicemen the protection of the Constitution. Although they are drafted to defend the United States they are no longer entitled to the protection of the laws of their own country which are defending. The proposed seizure of the steel mills by President Truman. The authority to do this was claimed under the United Nations Charter.
5. The 3,100 million voted to FOA which states that Congress affirms the policy of the United States to achieve international peace and security through the United Nations so that armed force shall not be used except in the common defense.
6. The treaty between Formosa and the United States. Upon proper representations from the United Nations, the treaty may be terminated.

In the area of the specialized agencies of the United Nations there are these developments:

With the admission of the Soviet Union and its satellites, the International Labor Organization is dominated by the Communists, supported by the socialistic governments in which there is no real separation of government-employer-employee relationship. Such a separation was intended to give each group representation.

The Human Rights Commission, which is still working on a covenant of human rights, a vote on March 1954 decided to shelve any provision recognizing the right of the individual to own property and to be secure in its enjoyment against arbitrary seizure by government.

Attempts through wheat, tin, oil and other agreements to tie the United States economy into international socialism through cartels using quotas and price controls.

The drafting of a body of international law based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Genocide Treaty which would establish a World Court

which would try individual citizens outside the boundaries of their own countries, without trial by a jury of their peers as provided by the Constitution of the United States in amendment No. 6.

The Atoms for Peace plan presented to the United Nations by President Eisenhower which would internationalize areas in the United States so that the American people would no longer have any control over them. This could very well destroy existing State boundaries.

Finally, the detention of the Americans in Red China in violation of the Korean truce. The United Nations has been given jurisdiction over these men and it has accomplished just exactly nothing.

In all discussions concerning the transformation of the United Nations into a world federation, the example of the joining of our 48 States into a Federal Union is cited as evidence that this can be accomplished. The authors of this statement never mention an extremely important provision of the United States Constitution, article 4, section 4:

"The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government * * *."

We have seen no suggestion from any proponent of world federation that the nations involved should have a uniform type of government. This constitutional provision seems to us to be the very keystone of the arch of success in preserving this Nation as the United States of America.

In conclusion, I should like to make the following points:

It is manifestly impossible, in a short space of time or in a short written statement to cover all aspects of the invasion of the sovereignty and proposed invasions of the sovereignty of the American people by the United Nations Charter in its present form. I have not even mentioned the role of Alger Hiss not only at the San Francisco Conference which established the United Nations but also at the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks Conferences, which laid the foundation for the United Nations Charter. Hiss has since been convicted of perjury in denying that he gave United States secrets to Soviet Russia. Was he concerned about the best interests of the United States? That area should be thoroughly explored.

Neither have I mentioned the role of the United Nations in the years when International Communism was fastening its tyrannical grip on millions of innocent victims. They have drawn over six hundred million people into their orbit while the United Nations has remained impotent.

Enough, we believe, has been presented, to indicate the seriousness of the situation. It is the firm conviction of the Californians for the Bricker amendment, that we, as citizens of the United States have the finest government ever devised at any time in the history of the world. We are the only citizens protected by a constitution specifically limiting the powers of government so that the God-given privileges of life and liberty are retained by the individual citizen with the government forbidden to enroach on them. The 10th amendment to the Constitution affords us this protection.

Since any or all nations are free to adopt this philosophy of government but none have done so, the entrance of the United States into any form of world government could not possibly afford us the protection of the individual such as we enjoy under our Constitution.

Therefore, we respectfully request that the attention of their elected representatives be focused on protecting and defending the sovereignty of the United States through the protection of the Constitution, as they, in their oaths of office have sworn to do.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Sidney W. Treat, followed by Professor John Merryman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Go right ahead, Mr. Treat.

STATEMENT OF SIDNEY W. TREAT, LOS ALTOS, CALIF.

My name is Sidney W. Treat of Los Altos, Calif. I am a retired engineer and manufacturer.

My interest in world affairs stems from having lived in Europe and travelled in the Orient, in Africa and Middle East, in South and Central America. I speak as an individual, not on behalf of a group.

I believe my remarks are pertinent to the objectives of your committee: I admit the present weakness of the United Nations. I favor strengthening it to the point, but only to the point, where it can stop aggressive war between nations, by establishing enforceable international law. I am not wise enough to state how fast such strengthening of the United Nations should proceed, but I firmly believe that we should immediately declare to the world that nothing less than enforceable world law is our goal and then, over the years and with infinite caution, should proceed with such revision of the charter as will provide for simultaneous and complete disarmament, together with reliable inspection. I believe this can be done without giving up our national sovereignty and propose to elaborate that point.

THE DELUSION OF SOVEREIGNTY

Sovereignty: So often in a discussion involving strengthening the United Nations one meets refusal to consider any form of enforceable international law, the reason given being that "it involves giving up national sovereignty." Your committee must have heard that hundreds of times. Such objectors should be brought to understand that replacing war with enforceable law need not involve surrendering national sovereignty. The action would not be negative, giving up something we already have; what is suggested is positive: creating something we lack—something we have never had—thereby actually increasing our sovereignty. This we would do by setting up as our agent a law-enforcing body in the international area, where no sovereignty has ever existed.

During this century even the most powerful nations could not prevent two ghastly wars, could not say to their peoples "relax, your children are safe, there will be no more wars." Is that sovereignty? Or again, does the United States spend those billions on armaments because it prefers them to peaceful products? Who makes us do it? In the last decade, Germany and Japan; in this decade the Kremlin; 25 years from now maybe some other nation. But right now in 1955, only the Kremlin can reduce our budget. That isn't sovereignty.

In the Middle Ages, sovereignty or divine right of kings was assumed to have been given by God to the sovereign. It was absolute and indivisible. Our Declaration of Independence tells the world that government powers come from the consent of the governed. Only in a dictatorship is the state sovereign; our American sovereignty stems from the individual and, as individuals, we have chosen to give some portions of our sovereignty to our local, State and Federal Governments, to be used for specific purposes. If peace between nations is what we want, then it is our right and duty to add new law and government powers, when the existing law and government fails to give it to us.

LIMITED POWER TO PREVENT AGGRESSIVE WAR

Between the undesirable extreme of (1) no law for world affairs; and (2) an all-absorbing world government for all affairs, there is a safe intermediate: Give the United Nations powers to prevent aggressive war, but leave nations and their peoples sovereign and with exclusive jurisdiction in their domestic affairs. Lincoln's debate with

Douglas was upon state sovereignty under our Federal plan, as distinguished from national sovereignty. Now, I am an engineer, not a lawyer, but surely the principles involved would be the same in determining allocations and divisions of sovereign power in the international field. But, how carefully must those delegations of powers be limited to world affairs, so as never to include the internal sovereignty of any nation! And how carefully must any implication of sovereignty-delegation be guarded against, for fear there be unintentional surrender of internal powers!

The present United Nations Charter very wisely gave only the limited authority by which to start developing world cooperation. The organization was not in 1945, and perhaps is not yet, ready to settle the great problems of a continuing peace, but surely it can begin immediately the long, complicated study of exploring the areas of agreement on how to obtain and enforce better world order—when the world gives signs of being ready for it.

As we look ahead what are our choices of action? (1) We can carry on the arms race till we're bankrupt, lose our democracy and are forced into some fascist pattern. (2) We can start a "preventive" war. (3) Through fear, we might try appeasement. To me the wisest move is first, never let down our guard until unmistakable (however unwilling) cooperation is ensured; second, retaining within each nation the necessary internal police and militia, cautiously and gradually putting teeth into the United Nations by ultimately giving it power to control the arms of the world.

Concluding, I urge your committee to state that, immediately and always, we should tell the rest of the world that nothing less than enforceable international law is the goal of the United States and that to accomplish this we propose making the United Nations our agent to establish international sovereignty, where now only anarchy exists.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Treat.

Senator KNOWLAND?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Mr. ISRAEL. Professor John Henry Merryman, followed by Mr. Chambliss.

Senator SPARKMAN. Professor Merryman, we are glad to have you, sir.

Mr. MERRYMAN. Senator.

STATEMENT OF JOHN HENRY MERRYMAN, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF LAW, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Mr. MERRYMAN. As I see the denouement of the world, it amounts to this: disarmament or disintegration.

Plans exist and have been frequently described to you for amending the charter of the United Nations to establish and maintain a workable system of disarmament without interfering in domestic matters, without changing the rights of individuals, and without loss of sovereignty.

Such plans substitute law and order for the anarchy which presently exists among nations. I favor such plans, and I urge our Senate to support them.

RUSSIAN OPPOSITION TO CHARTER REVIEW NO EXCUSE FOR NOT TRYING

Some argue that since the Soviet Union opposes charter revision, it is futile to advocate such plans. I cannot accept the peculiar reasoning that we should give up without trying because Russia wants us to. Russia cannot veto calling the conference, it cannot veto proposals made at that conference.

Suppose the conference adopts the plan which promises the world peace and security and Russia refuses to ratify it? We have lost nothing, and by advocating such a plan, we will gain stature in the eyes of the world. We will draw closer to us the uncommitted nations Russia is so eagerly wooing, and we will add to the unrest behind the Iron Curtain, especially in the satellite nations which are being drained to build and maintain the Soviet war machine.

Of course, the Russian leaders oppose the conference. They fear it. That is why they are trying to discourage the free nations from favoring it.

We must not play into their hands by giving up without trying.

Some Americans feel that we should not tamper with the U. N., should not try to amend the charter, should not, in their phrase, "rock the boat."

Their thought appears to be that if we do nothing, we cannot make a mistake. Actually, this is not so. If we do nothing, we do not maintain the status quo. The charter, in the words of our Secretary of State, is already preatomic. The world is changing and if the charter does not change with it, it will become obsolete.

There can be no more effective way to kill the United Nations than to oppose revision of its charter to enable it to keep pace with the world.

The tendency away from the reliance on the United Nations in matters of international peace and security is already a strong one, as you Senators know. Unless it is given power to cope with problems of the atomic age, the United Nations will atrophy and die, as the League of Nations died, from disuse.

Those who profess to support the United Nations while crying, "don't rock the boat," are tragically its worst enemies.

WHO IS A REALIST

I would like to say a word on realism. Those who cling to the familiar like to think of themselves as hardheaded, practical realists. In justifying their resistance to change, they call those who advocate it unrealistic, idealistic. Thus the proponents of charter revision are frequently said to ignore the realities of international politics and are accused of advancing visionary schemes.

But what is the program of these realists? It is maintenance of the status quo. It is perpetuation of international anarchy. It is continued reliance on the devices of traditional diplomacy, on balances of power, alliances, defense treaties, Maginot lines, moralizing about good and bad nations, all the tired, old clichés which have never worked. It is, in short, a proposal that we continue as we have done in the past.

This is supposed to be realism. It is not. It is suicide. It is unrealistic to suppose that the conference will not be called.

Other nations which attend that conference will present good ideas, constructive solutions, hopeful proposals. We cannot go to that conference table equipped solely with the paraphernalia of a tired and dissolutioned diplomacy repeating the worn and threadbare truisms of a preatomic approach to world affairs.

Realism requires that we go to the conference with full recognition that we are discussing the fate of the world, knowing that we must play a prominent part in that discussion.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you.

Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Merryman is as follows:)

My name is John Henry Merryman. I am an assistant professor of law at Stanford University, but I do not purport to represent the views of the university or of my colleagues on the law faculty.

Human history is a chronicle of wars. Today the world is engaged in an arms race, politely called a balance of power. This arms race, like those in the past, will end in another war. This time civilization, as we know it, will end with it.

Eighty-five cents of every tax dollar paid by an American goes for past wars and to build our strength and the strength of our friends and allies in preparation for the next one. Perhaps wars, however costly, might be easier to justify if they could be won. But today nobody wins. However the war starts, whoever is to blame, everybody loses. The "winners" of World Wars I and II have had as their chief reward the job of rebuilding the shattered losers. Consider, for example, what we have found ourselves forced to do in Germany, Italy, and Japan.

The next war is going to be something special. Not just atom bombs but "improved" hydrogen bombs, cobalt bombs, and bacteriological weapons will be used. The next war is going to be a very personal one, in the sense that we will all be directly involved in it. Weapons of mass destruction will be used against civilians. Bombs will be dropped on American cities. And we will all lose, just as all the Danes, the French, the Chinese, the Russians, the Poles, the Nigerians, the Brazilians will lose. But since we have more to lose than many other peoples we will lose more.

Only a lunatic would advocate such a war. Certainly few Americans want it. But it is not up to Americans to decide whether we shall go to war. When the equivalent of Pearl Harbor happens we will have to go, whether we want to or not. It is only a question of time until some fanatic somewhere in the world acquires sufficient power to start world war III. When that happens the lights will again go out all over the world. This time they will stay out.

There is an alternative. It requires recognition of the fact, attested by 60 centuries of recorded human history, that as long as people have guns they will shoot at each other. Or in our terms, as long as nations have the means of waging war they will wage war. The problem is to take away the means. This requires disarmament.

We all recognize that life as we know it could not go on without law. We have had our experience in the past with lawlessness and with vigilante government. We have abandoned these at all levels, National, State, and local, in favor of laws enacted by a representative legislature, enforced by a controlled police, interpreted and applied by an impartial judiciary. But above the national level we do not have law and order. We have its only alternative, anarchy. It is the same condition which has existed among nations throughout history. As in the past it can only result in more wars. We delude ourselves with slogans about balances of power, collective security, coexistence, and the like. These are new names for the same old ideas, which have not worked in the past. They will not work now. Nations have been trying to prevent wars through alliances, powerful defenses, moralizing, for 60 centuries. These "solutions" are as inadequate today as they have always been.

If the world is to be at peace, disarmament must be universal and enforceable. In order to become, and stay, universal and enforceable it must be based on laws which are enforced by police and applied by courts. The political authority which

enacts, enforces, and applies these laws must be separate from individual nations. In this way law and order of the sort which exists within nations can be substituted for the anarchy which now exists among them. World law can replace world chaos.

These ideas are not new or original. They are widely held. Most world leaders have expressed them at one time or another, people like Eisenhower, Churchill, Nehru, Romulo, Adenauer, De Gasperi, the Pope, and others. They are repeated here because the world is at a point in history where the mounting need for world law and the opportunity of achieving it are converging. The need and the opportunity are about to meet at a point in space and time; the place is the United Nations, the time 1955.

The United Nations is an excellent organization, as far as it goes, but it is weak where it needs most to be strong. It is unable to maintain international peace and security because it has not been given the power to do so by the nations of the world. The thing to do with a good, but imperfect, organization is to improve it. The United Nations is the nearest thing the world has to a universal international organization and is therefore the logical place to begin working toward enforceable disarmament through world law.

When the charter was drafted at San Francisco the world was still in the pre-atomic age. Secretary of State Dulles has said: "As one who was at San Francisco I can say with confidence that if the delegates there had known that the mysterious and immeasurable power of the atom would be available as a means of mass destruction, the provisions of the charter dealing with disarmament and the regulation of armaments would have been far more emphatic and realistic." This means that today the charter is preatomic. It must be brought up to date.

The nations which drafted the charter in 1945 envisioned the possibility of revision. That is why they provided, in article 109, for a general conference to be called to review the charter in 1955. No nation can veto such a conference being held; all that is needed is a majority vote in the General Assembly and in the Security Council. The United States has officially announced it will favor the calling of the conference. With the exception of the Soviet bloc most other nations will so vote. It seems as nearly certain as is possible in human affairs that the conference will be held.

Plans exist for amending the charter in order to make universal, enforceable disarmament possible. Although they differ in detail they agree that the area within which the United Nations will have expanded powers must be carefully circumscribed to prevent intervention in affairs of strictly national or local interest, or in matters not directly related to disarmament and arms control. They agree that there must be a bill of rights which protects individuals against unauthorized action by the United Nations but which does not attempt to alter in any way the relations of the individual with his own nation. They agree that subject to these limitations the veto must be abolished, the 1-nation, 1-vote principle must be altered to provide for weighted representation of nations according to their actual importance in world affairs, an independent inspectorate and police force must be established, the jurisdiction of the United Nations must be extended to individuals as well as states, and a court, perhaps the International Court of Justice must be given compulsory jurisdiction to hear disputes and render binding decisions. Under this type of political authority it would be possible to halt further arms production and to establish a plan of gradual disarmament which would allow nations to absorb the social and economic shocks involved in converting to a nonmilitary economy.

To date the United Nations has been most successful in its attacks on the economic and social problems of underdeveloped parts of the world. While this work is necessarily slow it goes directly to many of the causes of war and should not only be continued but increased. Meanwhile, however, the burden of armaments and the waste caused by armed destruction are themselves the source of urgent economic and social problems which can be solved by effective charter revision. And at the same time peace, which is impossible without disarmament, becomes possible.

There is opposition to these ideas, both in the United States and in other parts of the world. The Soviet Union and its satellites oppose calling a charter review conference, oppose any attempts to give the United Nations more power, and speak of the "principle of the unanimity of the great powers" (the veto) as fundamental to the continued effective existence of the organization. Since they cannot veto the calling of the conference they are using every propaganda device available to them to persuade other nations to oppose it. However, the Soviet Union will have an effective veto over any specific proposals adopted by

the conference. It is therefore legitimate to ask if it is not futile to speak of charter revision.

The question assumes something that may not be true; it assumes the Russians will veto conference proposals because they now say they will. But we have all had experience with the party line. We know that the Soviet position on questions of this type is not taken with reference to the merits but to the calculated effect that position may have on long-range foreign and domestic objectives.

That position may change at any time, because the part it plays in total Soviet policy necessarily varies. It is conceivable that the loud propaganda against charter revision now emanating from Russia has as its sole objective the persuasion of free peoples to vote against calling the conference—a matter over which the Soviet Union has no veto. But when the conference is called, when the delegates are assembled before the eyes of the world, both within and without the Iron Curtain; when the chips are down and the delegates must be for or against specific proposals designed to prevent man destroying himself; then what will the party line be? What pressures will then be felt within Russia? Within the satellites which are being drained to build and maintain the Soviet war machine? Within the uncommitted part of the world Russia has been so eagerly wooing since World War II?

The point is: If we agree that a good idea should not be advanced at the conference because it might be unacceptable to the Kremlin we kill the good idea, we admit defeat in the battle for the minds of men, we strengthen the Russian position and drive despair deeper into the hearts of the subjugated behind the Iron Curtain. Now, while the world is debating charter revision, we can alter the party line by creating a strong basis in world opinion—in the free world, the uncommitted world, and the Soviet bloc—in favor of it. The best way to do this is to advocate a program which promises the world peace. If enough people throughout the world are persuaded by these ideas, then the party line will have to change. But we must not play into the hands of Soviet propagandists by giving up without trying.

Suppose the conference is held, before all the world. Suppose hopeful solutions are advanced which might promise world peace. Suppose the Soviet Union vetoes them. What have we lost? We have not yet disarmed, or otherwise diminished our strength. We have not given up our alliances, or abandoned our friends. We have not diminished our worldwide war against poverty, disease, illiteracy. We have given up nothing. But have we not gained? Have we not added to the unrest behind the Iron Curtain and at the same time drawn closer to us the uncommitted nations of the world? Of course the Russian leaders oppose the conference. They do not want to have to reach the merits at a charter review conference. They have too much to lose. But we have nothing to lose and much to gain.

Outside the Iron Curtain the strongest opposition to these ideas comes from a variety of organizations in the United States. Of these some are frank isolationists who want to withdraw from all the rest of the world. Others are "conservative" or "patriotic" groups which try to sell isolationism disguised as political conservatism or patriotism. It seems unnecessary to point out that in a world as closely interdependent and shrunken as this one, in which we keep bumping into and tripping over each other, isolation is impossible, even if it were wise.

The significant opposition comes from more responsible people who support the United Nations and who are internationalists in outlook. Their position is that we should not tamper with the United Nations, should not try to alter it by amending the charter, should not "rock the boat." The charter, they say, should be left alone and allowed to develop through interpretation; natural evolution is to them preferable to amendment. They point to the "dangers" involved in attempted revision: that the Soviet Union might withdraw, or that anti-United Nations forces might seize this opportunity to wreck the organization.

The thought appears to be that if we do nothing we cannot make a mistake. Actually this is not true. If we do nothing we do not maintain the status quo. The charter is already preatomic. The world is changing, and if the charter does not change with it it will become obsolete. There can be no more effective way to kill the United Nations than to oppose revision of the charter to enable it to keep pace with the world. The tendency away from reliance on the United Nations in matters of international peace and security is already a strong one. Unless it is given power to deal with the problems of the atomic age the United

Nations will atrophy and die, as the League of Nations died, from disuse. Those who profess to support the United Nations while crying "Don't rock the boat" are, tragically, its most dangerous enemies.

A word on realism. Those who cling to the familiar like to think of themselves as realistic, practical, hardheaded thinkers. In justifying their resistance to change they call those who advocate it impractical and unrealistic. Thus the proponents of charter revision are said to "ignore the realities of international politics" and are accused of advancing "visionary schemes." But what is the program of these realists? It is maintenance of the status quo. It is perpetuation of international anarchy. It is continued reliance on the devices of traditional diplomacy, on balance of power, alliances, defense treaties, Maginot lines, moralizing about "good" and "bad" nations; all the tired old cliches which have never worked. It is, in short, a proposal what we continue as we have done in the past. This is supposed to be realism. It is not. It is suicide.

It is unrealistic to suppose that a charter-review conference will not be called in 1955. Other nations which attend that conference will present good ideas, constructive proposals, hopeful solutions. We cannot go to the conference table equipped with the paraphernalia of a tired and disillusioned diplomacy, repeating the worn and threadbare slogans of a preatomic approach to world affairs. Realism requires that we go to that conference with full recognition that we are discussing the fate of the world, knowing that the United States must play a prominent part in that discussion.

The Charter of the United Nations contains, in its preamble, the following words:

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, * * * to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, * * * have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims."

If these words are to mean what they say the charter must be amended to give the United Nations the authority it requires to cope effectively with the problems of the atomic age. It is to our interest as individuals and as Americans to give it this authority.

Senator SPARKMAN. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Allan Chambliss, followed by Mr. Beam.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come around, Mr. Chambliss. We are very glad to have you, sir.

STATEMENT OF ALLAN McLANE CHAMBLISS, PRESIDENT, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS OF CALIFORNIA, INC., SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Chairman, my name is Allan McLane Chambliss. I am a resident of San Anselmo, Calif.

Since being retired from the regular Navy on physical disability in 1946, I have been employed by the Standard Oil Company of California, where I am assistant to the chief engineer.

I am speaking on behalf of the United World Federalists of California, of which I am president.

IMPORTANCE OF UNIVERSAL DISARMAMENT

This vital necessity of achieving universal disarmament, if we are to achieve our goal of peace, is being increasingly recognized by world leaders, by thinking citizens, and by the press. A recent example, it seems to me, of this increased recognition is an editorial cartoon which appeared quite recently in the Oakland Tribune. It demonstrated and headlined the hope for world peace. It showed a world shedding arms. That highlights the need for disarmament.

At the same time, we Americans are united in our determination to preserve the heritage of liberty. I would like to discuss the relationship between our liberty and disarmament.

It would certainly be folly, it seems to me, for us to disarm if we do not have assurance that all of the nations likewise would lay down their arms. We have learned from the bitter lessons of the past that that is not the course to peace.

But if we are to lay down our arms with assurance, it means that there must be a means for enforcing disarmament. We cannot rely on voluntary compliance. We cannot rely on any nation assuming its obligations. There has to be effective, foolproof enforcement.

I suggest, gentlemen, that this means that the United Nations must be given the power, which it does not now have, to enforce disarmament. But if the United Nations is given such power, would it not endanger our liberties?

NO UNILATERAL DISARMAMENT

It would certainly endanger our liberties to disarm unilaterally. But if the United Nations is given additional power, would that endanger our liberties?

There is that hazard, the United World Federalists believe. If, for example, the United Nations were strengthened, as many patriotic Americans suggest, strengthened by a gradual process, strengthened by interpretation of the existing charter, who could say where that strengthening would end? One could say that it might not go beyond the power necessary to enforce disarmament and prevent aggression. Might it not encroach upon our domestic freedom to run our own affairs?

So that is not the way we believe to achieve enforceable disarmament. Rather the answer is as old as mankind's struggle for freedom. It lies in giving the United Nations authority under law to enforce disarmament. It lies in defining, clearly defining, its powers and limiting those powers to the question of disarmament and the enforcing of disarmament and prevention of aggression.

By so doing, we can approach our goal of enforceable disarmament without letting the United Nations go beyond those powers to the point where it could encroach on our domestic freedom.

President Eisenhower has said that there is no alternative to peace. I suggest, gentlemen, that there is alternative to the most careful consideration by the people of the United States to the means by which the United Nations Charter should and must be revised to give it the power it does not now have and must have.

I suggest that there is no alternative to our thinking the problem through, because unless we convince ourselves of what is needed in this area, how can we hope to convince others? We must think the problem through, decide upon what provisions are needed to give the United Nations power in this area, but power limited to that area.

We must be prepared with constructive proposals to present to a review conference, proposals embodying our ideals under the protection of our domestic freedoms and giving the United Nations the power it needs.

Only thus, I believe, can we meet our obligation of preserving our heritage of liberty and at the same time passing on to our children the blessings of peace.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

ENFORCEMENT OF DISARMAMENT

Senator KNOWLAND. Of course, you recognize that there could not be effective disarmament on a worldwide basis without full and thorough inspection: am I correct?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Yes, sir. That is correct. There must be thorough inspection.

Senator KNOWLAND. You are familiar with the fact that up to date, every proposal for an effective system of armament inspection has been objected to by the Soviet Union?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I am quite aware of that, sir, and I also suggest that if we thought through all the connotations of full inspection, perhaps we would also object, because what I am suggesting is that it is not enough to just say, "We will have inspection." We have to have enforcement. We have to be assured that if we start to disarm, other nations will also disarm.

If we have enforcement, that has implications regarding the veto. It has implications regarding membership, and I cannot go into all those in 5 minutes. But it has these implications which must be thought through.

So I suggest that no feasible proposal for inspection or for enforcement of disarmament has yet been made, and that it is up to the United States to make such a proposal and to take the leadership for finding a solution to the arms race and maintaining our liberties at the same time.

EFFECTIVE USE OF U. N. POWERS

Senator KNOWLAND. Even if the power was there, we would depend upon the willingness of the balance of the nations to exercise the power; is that not correct?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. The power, it seems to me, would have to be given to the United Nations as an organization, and not rely on voluntary compliance by individual nations to exercise the powers.

Senator KNOWLAND. There are certain powers now under the United Nations Charter for use against a violator of the terms of the charter or the provisions of an agreement. There are set out certain sanctions, certain actions short of war, certain military action, which the United Nations might use. Those powers are listed in the charter. But if they are not used, even though listed, they are not effective, are they?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. It seems to me, Senator, that those powers are not effective powers because, as you pointed out a few minutes ago, at the time of Korea, the United Nations had to rely on voluntary compliance by the member nations. I do not believe that we can rely on voluntary compliance if we are to achieve effective, enforceable disarmament. I suggest that additional powers must be given whereby the organization itself can provide effective inspection, effective enforcement, without relying on the voluntary compliance of member nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. We today have at least 15 American prisoners of war admittedly held in violation of the terms of the Korean armistice.

stice. There are certain powers in the United Nations Charter which might be used. Presumably their exercise could be vetoed by the Soviet Union, but up to the moment, at least, the United Nations has not even sought to use the effective power which they have under the charter.

My only point is that the mere stating of the powers does not solve the problem if the organization does not have the will to use the power it is granted.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. That is certainly true, but it has been proven also that the organization, even when it has the will, can be defeated by existing veto power if the Soviet Union or any other nation does not wish to comply. It seems to me that is a far different situation than if, in the area strictly limited in the prevention of aggression to the control of armaments, if the United Nations were given that power. It would be a far different situation. And I, of course, do not suggest that that power could be created over night. It would have to be built over a period of time. But we will never get it built unless we start it.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chambliss.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Chambliss is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF ALLAN McLANE CHAMBLISS, PRESIDENT OF UNITED WORLD
FEDERALISTS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Allan McLane Chambliss, and I am a resident of San Anselmo, Calif. Since being retired in 1946 as a lieutenant commander in the Navy, I have been employed in the engineering department of the Standard Oil Co. of California, where I am now assistant to the chief engineer. I am speaking on behalf of the United World Federalists of California, of which I am president and which has over 2,000 members in the State. United World Federalists is a nonpartisan, nonprofit membership organization for the support and strengthening of the United Nations and for such amendments of its charter as will enable it to achieve universal disarmament enforced under adequate safeguards, thus preventing aggression and making possible a world at peace under law.

The problem of achieving universal disarmament is one which grows in importance with each new development in scientific warfare. At the same time, the problem of maintaining our liberties is one which is close to the heart of every American. Today I would like to discuss the relationship of universal disarmament to the preservation of our American heritage of liberty.

It would be the height of folly for this country to disarm unless all other countries likewise laid down their arms. But how could we be sure that they would do so? It seems obvious to me that we could not rely on voluntary compliance by other nations; the bitter lessons of the past have proven the hazards of such a course. Therefore, any plan for achieving disarmament must provide for effective, foolproof enforcement. This, of course, raises the question: who shall do the enforcing? This would certainly have to be the task of an international organization. It is obvious, however, that the United Nations as now constituted does not have the power to enforce disarmament. Therefore, before disarmament is even started, the United Nations must be given such power. Our liberties here in America would be in grave jeopardy if we proceeded to disarm without assurance that all other nations would disarm simultaneously. To protect our liberty, disarmament must not be started until the United Nations is given the power to enforce it.

I think that we will all agree that if the United Nations is to have the task of enforcing disarmament, it must be strengthened. But if the U. N. is so strengthened, might that endanger our liberties? This is a very vital question for Americans. United World Federalists believe such a hazard exists unless certain fundamental policies are followed in giving the United Nations the power it must have. Let me first give an example of what I consider to be a hazardous approach to strengthening the United Nations.

There are many patriotic Americans who believe that the strengthening of the United Nations should be by a gradual process; a development through interpre-

tation of the existing charter. This would result in a gradual assumption of powers which the United Nations does not now have. It is argued that this is the only feasible means of strengthening the United Nations under existing world conditions. However, gentlemen, I submit that this is a very dangerous procedure. Once this principle were accepted, where would such a gradual growth in power stop? Might it not encroach on our freedoms to handle our own domestic affairs as we see fit? Such an approach to a strengthened United Nations is full of uncharted reefs and shoals.

How then could the U. N. be strengthened and still protect our liberty? The answer is as old as mankind's struggle for freedom and for peace. Authority under law must be the cornerstone on which we build the United Nations' power to enforce disarmament and prevent aggression. Acting under law, the United Nations should have the power—which it does not now have—to maintain the peace of the world. Acting under law, the United Nations should be prohibited from interfering in the domestic affairs of any nation. Acting under law, the U. N. could be given the power it needs without endangering our basic liberties. United World Federalists believes that in strengthening the United Nations, it is essential that its powers be strictly limited to the maintenance of peace. We believe it is essential that these powers be clearly defined; that the scope of United Nations authority be clearly spelled out, so that Americans can know just what changes in this authority are proposed.

I have mentioned that we believe that the U. N. must be given authority under law to enforce disarmament and prevent aggression. It would seem that the logical way to accomplish this would be through appropriate revisions to the United Nations Charter. It is our hope that the United States will take the lead in proposing revisions to the charter—revisions based upon the twin objectives of maintaining our freedoms at home and at the same time giving the United Nations the power it needs to maintain world peace.

If we are to preserve our heritage of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we must find a solution to the arms race. We must find a way to enforce disarmament, and must convince ourselves of what is needed in order to obtain this goal. Until we convince ourselves, we cannot hope to convince others regarding the steps to be taken toward a peaceful world.

President Eisenhower has said that there is no alternative to peace. If we are to preserve our liberties and achieve a peaceful world, I suggest that there is no alternative to careful study of the subject of charter revision by the people of the United States. Are we prepared to support revisions which will give the United Nations the power to enforce disarmament and prevent aggression? Power which is carefully defined and limited to the maintenance of peace? Until we are, we are failing in our obligation to find a solution to the arms race; a solution which can preserve our heritage of liberty while passing on to our children the blessings of peace.

Senator SPARKMAN. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. A. W. Beam, to be followed by Miss Baxter.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come around, Mr. Beam. We are glad to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF A. W. BEAM, ATHERTON, CALIF.

Mr. BEAM. Senator Sparkman, Senator Knowland, thank you for letting me appear before you.

My name is A. W. Beam. I live in Atherton, south of here. I am a designer and builder of apartment houses. I am here because of my concern with the problem of strengthening the United Nations.

To make a beginning. I like the United States the way it is—its institutions, my neighbors, town and State, and the way free enterprise works here.

I have been in other countries enough to know that this is where I prefer to be. I would be willing to fight for these values if they were attacked, and would be sorry to see any great change in the way things are now.

Unfortunately, our diplomats and Armed Forces no longer seem able to protect us in the peaceful enjoyment of our life and country. Aggressive communism abroad nibbles at the borders of the free world and grows stronger. We have put trust in a weapon which has seemed too terrible to use against nibbling, yet we see that the nibbling must be stopped. But one of the aggressors now has the weapon too, and other potential troublemakers may soon have it.

Paul Hoffman wrote "Peace can be won"—and explained that in order to win it, we must plan and work for it. This the United States has done, first through the Marshall plan, point 4 program, and various private and U. N. agencies which aimed at raising the level of life everywhere to a point at which people would have good reason to resist Communist promises; and second, by a system of regional alliances. This dual method has checked the growth of Communist power in Europe. Our current problem is in Asia, where the very low standards of life among huge populations makes the economic effort difficult and slow; and where the memory of colonial oppression alienates possible allies. The solution which worked in Europe does not seem immediately applicable. Meanwhile, the nibbling goes on. What do we do?

PROTECTION IN EXCHANGE FOR THE VETO

The United Nations would seem to be a good agency to deal with this problem, since it cannot be accused of colonial ambitions and has had a good record in dealing with poverty and hunger in other parts of the world. We have one clue to its potential strength; when the Russian delegate walked out of the Security Council in the Korean crisis, he permitted the U. N. to function as it was intended. This was only a lucky accident, but it does point the way to what the U. N. could become. I advocate such amendment of the charter as is necessary to permit similar action against aggression another time. If this involves giving up a preferred position as a Security Council member, it also involves a similar sacrifice by certain other nations. We would give up what we never use—the veto in the U. N., and the right to wage aggressive war; and we would be getting substantial protection in return.

When our country was founded, the statesmen who assembled in Philadelphia had many misgivings about this democracy which they were starting, but they feared division and anarchy even more, and they dared to try a revolutionary solution. This generation has a new problem, and the old solution no longer fits. Cautiously and slowly, giving up only so much of our liberties and wealth as we must in order to clothe the U. N. in enough authority and power to keep the peace between nations, and always retaining the sacred American liberties of the individual, let us create an order to replace international chaos. The need is plain. We have the choice, whether, perhaps, to be corpses without mourners—or to become founding fathers ourselves.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Beam.

Next witness, please.

Mrs. ISRAEL. Miss Leora Baxter, followed by Mrs. Brink.

Senator SPARKMAN. Miss Baxter, we are glad to have you.

Miss BAXTER. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MISS LEORA BAXTER, MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CALIFORNIA CHAPTER, PRO AMERICA

Miss BAXTER. Senator Sparkman, Senator Knowland, I am Leora Baxter of Los Angeles, Calif. I am speaking for the National Association of Pro America.

Pro America is a national independent organization of women who are interested in the field of politics and political education. It is pledged to uphold the Constitution of the United States with its American traditions and ideals and to combat all destructive influences which will imperil the sacred heritage of liberty bequeathed to us by our forefathers. Pro America includes among its many thousand members Republicans, constitutional Democrats, and women who have never been members of any political party. It was founded in 1933 in Seattle, Wash., and dedicated on Washington's birthday by the late Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, who became its first honorary national president.

The executive board of the National Association of Pro America, meeting at the Suburban Hotel, West Orange, N. J., on April 1, 1955, authorized me, Leora A. Baxter, to make the following statement.

NO CHARTER REVISION

Pro America petitions our representatives in the United States Government and in the United Nations that no revision of the United Nations Charter be undertaken now because:

To make specific recommendations at this time for revision in the Charter of the United Nations might imply that such parts as are not recommended for revision are acceptable as they are and that this might constitute a reaffirmation of the charter; and because

The Senate of the United States and those citizens who read the charter in 1945 relied on article 2, section 7, for the protection of our sovereignty. Article 2 says:

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.

However, we find the sovereignty of our Government infringed upon by certain developments through the charter. We believe there is evidence both in the administrative decisions and in statements of certain leaders of the United Nations that the proceedings of the United Nations are moving in a direction opposite to that stated in article 2.

CHARTER CONFLICTS WITH CONSTITUTION

For instance we find the proposal that individual citizens shall become subject to international law and lose the protection of the rights guaranteed by our Constitution. As evidence, we quote Trygve Lie, point 10 of his 20-year program:

If, during the next 20 years, the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice, the International Law Commission and other appropriate organs of the United Nations can proceed systematically in the development of international

law, by the end of that time we may have at least the essential beginnings of a system of enforceable world law directly applicable to individuals as well as governments on all matters essential to the peace and security of mankind.

Also, we find, contrary to article 1 of the United States Constitution which gives our Congress the power to raise and control our military forces, that the United Nations charter is in conflict with this provision and has delegated this power to an international authority. We believe that this change of power provides for tragedies such as that experienced by our men in Korea, serving at the will of an international organization under international command.

Also, we find that the development of the social and humanitarian program through the International Covenant on Human Rights and then Genocide Convention, as examples, is contrary to our whole concept of liberty. Our Constitution does not give rights; it merely protects our God-given rights.

We find that the economy of our country is seriously threatened through article 41 of the charter which provides that measures taken may include:

* * * complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio, and other means of communications.

EFFECT OF CHARTER REVISION ON AMERICAN SYSTEM

Therefore, pro America petitions the Congress of the United States to conduct an analysis of the United Nations Charter and its development since 1945 from the point of view of its effect upon:

(a) The individual citizen of the United States and his inherent rights guaranteed by our Constitution.

(b) The principles of our Constitution and the powers of Congress.

(c) The American system of free-enterprise production.

It also asks that the findings of such a study be made known all over the Nation.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Miss Baxter.

Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. Paul Brink, followed by Mr. Thelen.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come right around, Mrs. Brink.

STATEMENT OF MRS. PAUL BRINK, PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Mrs. BRINK. I am Mrs. Paul Brink. I am a housewife, and I live in Palo Alto.

I would like to testify as a housewife and as the mother of two school-aged children.

Women have a particularly vital stake in the future of the United Nations because war has increasingly become a conflict between machines on the one hand and women, children, and old men on the other hand. It can no longer be said that armies fight to protect women, children, and home. With the nuclear weapons now in possession of the nations, whole cities of people can be blasted, killing off women and children indiscriminately and perhaps affecting generations to come because of the effect of radioactivity on the human genes. This

single development of infinitely destructive weapons has automatically revolutionized relationships among the nations. When the greatest nations can be reduced to rubble, the world we live in has ceased to be the world we used to know. Now, more than in 1945, we need to affirm our determination to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war and to establish conditions under which peace may be maintained.

The United States, through Secretary Dulles, has announced that it would favor the calling of a conference to revise the United Nations Charter and has an opportunity to take the initiative in this direction. The first and most urgent step, it seems to me, is to squarely face the realities of the atomic age and be willing to take the next steps necessary to deal with the problems that plague the nations. If we begin with a firm resolve to this end, it seems to me that we can proceed from there to formulating the provisions necessary to amend the charter.

UNIVERSAL ENFORCEABLE DISARMAMENT URGED

Subject to limitations of purely local or national matters, we can go on record in favor of a plan to amend the charter to make universal, enforceable disarmament possible. We can go on record in favor of abolishing the veto and in favor of the establishment of an independent police force and of giving the International Court of Justice compulsory jurisdiction to hear disputes and to render binding decisions. The security of each nation can result only from the collaboration of all the nations. The law should apply in equal measure to all nations, whether it protects or punishes.

Local affairs should be handled by local governments; national affairs by national governments; and international affairs by the United Nations.

We must search for the truth about peace and its possibilities, regardless of dogmas or fetishes. We must understand quite clearly what peace is and how a peaceful order can be set up. The need for a stable world order was evident before 1914 and is long overdue. The things that divide the world are trivial compared to the things that unite it; and if humanity is to survive, it will be by the recognition that all will lose if we stubbornly adhere to the old ways and fail to take into account the nature of the modern world.

I plead with the members of the subcommittee to consider giving the United Nations the authority it requires so that the people of the world may live in peace and security and so that mothers may raise their children without the dread that is in their hearts today. I ask you to think only of the bright future our children shall never know if the machines of mass destruction are unleashed in what may well be a final war.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to ask 1 or possibly 2 questions of Mrs. Brink.

DANGER OF PEACE-AT-ANY-PRICE DOCTRINE

All people of good will in this country and in the free countries of the world desire to maintain peace with honor, but unfortunately, all people in the world may not have that same objective. Unfortunately,

there have been aggressors over the years of history. Would you consider your statement a peace-at-any-price doctrine, or do you recognize that in the event of aggression, nations might have to defend themselves against aggression? I think it is important that we clarify that matter in this and subsequent testimony.

Mrs. BRINK. Senator, I believe that there is a need in the world today for one nation to take the leadership in this matter. I think that we spent a great deal of time talking about how much better we are, for instance, than the Soviet Union, but it seems to me to be more pertinent to ask ourselves how much better are we than the Soviet Union, granted our greater privileges and our greater opportunities.

I believe in the faith. I believe that we have to have a vision of a better world, a world at peace, because it is a matter of life and death to the peoples of the world today.

Senator KNOWLAND. Of course, I think we all believe in a doctrine of peace under justice and under law. But you could have a peace, of course, in which your children or grandchildren or mine, could lose their freedom, in which they could be enslaved in the salt mines of Siberia, in which they could be liquidated in the cellars of the NKVD. That might be a sort of peace. I think it is important that we recognize that there might come a time when we might have to choose between the peace of enslavement or perhaps the will to resist aggression.

Don't you recognize that there is a point beyond which the free nations of the world might not dare to let themselves be pushed?

MORAL LEADERSHIP AND ALERTNESS TO DANGER

Mrs. BRINK. Yes, Senator, of course I recognize that. But I don't believe that our fear of that should keep us blind to make a constructive approach and to taking the initiative. We don't know what the Soviet Union would do.

Senator KNOWLAND. Well, I will say that both under the last administration and this administration—so I speak in no sense in a partisan way—the Government and the people of the United States have very diligently tried to work out disarmament proposals so that there could be adequate inspection.

President Eisenhower has made the proposal of "atoms for peace." Our officials have sought time and time again to find an honorable basis on which they could meet some of these problems of the world.

I think there is some danger to our survival if we, instead of pursuing quite properly peace with honor under justice, pursue peace at any price. Then the Soviet Union could start nibbling away at the free nations of the world, and no one would ever risk the possibilities of what might be entailed. England and Norway and Denmark and Western Germany and Turkey and Iran and Afghanistan might one by one be taken behind the Iron Curtain until we were the only ones left in a totalitarian world.

I do not think that our children would be benefited by facing up to that prospect, either.

Mrs. BRINK. Yes, Senator, certainly we should take into consideration those possibilities. But I still feel that we should have faith and be willing as a great, free Nation, with many opportunities, to take the leadership in what I believe is the crying need and the crying

wish of all the people of the world today, to live in peace and security with one another.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think we all recognize it. One of the unfortunate things in the world is that the people behind the Iron Curtain, who may have faith and a desire for peace, are deprived of the right to practice their religion and express the faith that the people of the free world have. When you live under the terror of a police state, you have some great problems in making your voices heard.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. Brink, to clarify one thing, I believe you did recommend, did you not, that the United Nations itself be empowered, through an international police force, to meet aggression: is that your idea?

Mrs. BRINK. Yes, I do believe that, Senator Sparkman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

The next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Max Thelen, Jr., followed by Mrs. McLain.

Mr. THELEN. Senator Sparkman, how are you?

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Thelen.

STATEMENT OF MAX THELEN, JR., SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. THELEN. My name is Max Thelen, Jr., and I practice law and reside here in San Francisco. I am appearing here as an individual.

Continuing world peace, free from war and the threat of war, can be established and maintained only if there is in existence an international organization capable of settling peaceably, in accordance with law, and under compulsion if necessary, those disputes arising between nations which constitute or may constitute a breach of the peace.

Now, this is not to say that there are not other devices of settling international disputes of one kind or another, but there is a hard core of disputes which cannot be settled by the traditional devices of arbitration, mediation, and conciliation. And it is at that level that an effective international organization with powers is essential.

Believing in this, our Nation and its wartime allies created the United Nations, toward the latter part of World War II. The Americans believed that unless they did, we stood the chance of losing the fruits of the expected victory over Japan and Germany as we had lost the fruits of victory following World War I.

The United Nations was established in the words of the charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and "to maintain international peace and security." Now, without knowing the technicalities of the charter, I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people felt that the United Nations as constituted was adequate to do this job.

We are not all international lawyers. However, during the last 9 years we have learned that this has not been the case.

NEED FOR LAW AND ORDER

In very broad terms, I submit that the objective of a U. N. Charter review conference would be to produce such amendments as to give the United Nations the powers necessary to carry out its original objective.

Now, international peace can only be secured through the creation of dispute-settling machinery. There are a lot of ways of trying to prevent disputes. Maybe if you eliminate economic sore spots, you prevent or mitigate a dispute. But ultimately disputes do arise, and it is when these disputes arise and cannot be solved by any means that there then must be a method of solving them under law through the aegis of an international organization.

It is law and order and only law and order that can ultimately bring international peace. And law and order will necessarily require an effective international organization.

ENFORCEABLE DISARMAMENT PROPOSED

Now, to obtain law and order, it appears that two fundamentals are required: First, the adoption of a system of enforceable disarmament, because without disarmament, any other proposals would be acting in a very unreal area.

It is idle to talk of disarmament proposals when the armed forces of many of the nations in the world are so large. They have got to be reduced to limits under which solutions peacefully can be proposed, accepted, and carried through. And I would like to make it perfectly clear that any proposals for disarmament which are not fool proof, which do not provide adequate guarantees, should not be given serious consideration by the United States.

I think there is a great danger that we may be worn down by the Russians. We have been making very bona fide proposals for disarmament over a period of the last 9 years, and the Russians have been consistently saying "No."

We should not be worn down. We should stick to our original proposals and strengthen them and make them better so that they are the kind of things that will do the job, and we should not finally conclude that we can wait no longer and therefore will accept nothing less than what we know in our hearts are necessary.

COMPULSORY SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES ADVOCATED

I think it should also be clear that the second thing that we need is a system of compulsory settlement of disputes which arise between nations and threaten world peace. This requires enforcement machinery capable of carrying out the decisions of the United Nations in this field.

I think also we should stress the fact that the strengthening of the United Nations is only in the area of armaments and peace. There are specialized agencies of the United Nations which act in many fields. They act voluntarily in those fields, and that should remain so. There is no need for compulsory powers to be given any of the U. N. agencies outside the area of war and peace.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Thelen is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MAX THELEN, JR.

My name is Max Thelen, Jr. I reside at 835 Lake Street, San Francisco, Calif., and practice law in that city. When a lawyer considers the question of U. N. Charter review, two striking facts appear:

(1) The actual process of rewriting provisions of the U. N. Charter is a task which will require the special skills of trained international lawyers and statesmen:

(2) The lawyers and statesmen cannot attempt to revise the charter until the American public, speaking to and through our Government, has decided what charter changes we consider to be in our best interests.

This subcommittee is here concerned with determining how Americans want to revise the charter. Within the limits of time and space now available, a detailed analysis of the charter, article by article, and proposed changes thereto, is not possible. Therefore, I will speak in broad terms of the kind of U. N. organization which will best serve American foreign policy.

Continuing world peace, free from war and the threat of war, can be established and maintained only if there is in existence an international organization capable of settling peaceably, in accordance with law, and under compulsion if necessary, those disputes arising between nations which constitute or may constitute a breach of the peace. Believing in this, our Nation and its wartime allies created the United Nations in the latter days of World War II. Americans believed that unless such an organization were established we might well lose the fruits of the expected victory over Japan and Germany as we had lost the fruits of victory following World War I.

The United Nations was established in the words of the charter, "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and "to maintain international peace and security." Now, without knowing the technicalities of the charter, the overwhelming majority of the American public believed that the U. N. had been constituted with sufficient powers to enable it to accomplish its noble objective. During the last 10 years we have learned that this was not the case.

The U. N. has, of course, accomplished much in the pacific settlement of disputes between nations, and has notable accomplishments to its credit in other fields, but it has fallen short of its principal objective—to maintain international peace and security. In very broad terms I submit that the objective of a U. N. Charter review conference is to produce such changes in the charter as will enable the United Nations to accomplish the objective for which it was created.

It is imperative that the charter be so amended because there are certain international disputes constituting a breach of the peace which cannot peacefully be resolved by any alternative means now or ever known to man, and if not resolved, these disputes in time bring war. I believe firmly that the charter can be amended so as to give the U. N. the powers it needs to preserve the peace.

Domestic tranquility, that is, peace within a community such as San Francisco, does not result because we are a "group of nice people all of whom think about alike and agree to abide by certain prescribed rules of conduct." On the contrary, we have peace in this community—which we call law and order—despite the existence of groups of people with many conflicting ideas and desires, because we are joined together into a political body and our conduct in certain areas is regulated or ordered by laws adopted by a legislative organ, interpreted by a judiciary, and enforced by an executive, including a police force. These processes we call government, and we rely upon them as a means of settling disputes between individuals.

Similarly, international peace can only be secured through the creation of dispute settling machinery which will produce law and order on the international level. Law and order, and only law and order will bring international peace. Law and order necessarily requires an effective international organization, a strengthened United Nations. At the present time in international affairs we have anarchy which is the opposite of law and order. Anarchy in the domestic field leads to the uncontrolled use of force by individuals—the commission of crimes; in the international field anarchy leads to the use of force by nations—which is war.

In the past there have been international tribunals offering mediation, conciliation and arbitration—these procedures, which are all purely voluntary, have solved certain international disputes. Similarly, the League of Nations and the U. N. have machinery for the pacific settlement of disputes. Using such powers as it has, the U. N. has settled various disputes between smaller nations constituting a breach of the peace. This is all to the good. In each of these in-

stances, successful U. N. action required concurrence of all five of the powers possessing the veto.

Unfortunately, in those cases in which the veto is used, the U. N. is powerless to force a pacific settlement of a dispute. This gives the key to the changes in the U. N. Charter which we should support—namely, the U. N. Charter should be strengthened so that it has power to bring about pacific settlement of disputes in accordance with law even between major nations. Basically, this requires two things:

(1) The adoption of a system of enforceable disarmament—under adequate safeguards so that violations can be readily detected by inspection teams;

(2) The establishment of a compulsory system for the adjudication of disputes constituting a breach of the peace arising between nations, including enforcement machinery capable of carrying out decisions of the U. N. in this field.

It should be made clear at this point that the increased powers of the U. N. which I advocate—are powers limited to the field of armaments, breaches of the peace and the prevention of war. I do not believe that the United States has anything to gain by giving the U. N. powers of compulsion in other international areas—such as world trade. Specialized agencies now exist under the U. N. in many different international fields—participation by the various nations in these agencies and their work is purely voluntary and should so remain.

To accomplish the two previously mentioned objectives will require substantial comprehensive changes in the U. N. Charter.

(1) The jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice must be made compulsory, it must have jurisdiction over individuals, trustee territories, protectorates, etc., as well as nations and it must have jurisdiction to decide all problems involving a breach of peace;

(2) The big power veto must be eliminated; this necessarily will require a change in the method of voting—1 vote for United States and 1 vote for Costa Rica is not a fair system in an organization which would have substantial compulsory powers;

(3) The U. N. executive arm must be strengthened—it will be necessary for the U. N. to have an inspection force free to move throughout the world, and a police force of sufficient strength to enforce U. N. decisions;

(4) The U. N. must have a dependable system of revenues to support its increased functions;

(5) A program of disarmament step by step over a period of perhaps 5 to 10 years must be agreed upon with adequate inspection and safeguards at each step so that all of the nations will know that every other nation in the world is complying with the disarmament agreement.

Such a United Nations would from time to time make decisions which we would not like, but with which we would be bound to comply. This is not ideal, but it is a small price to pay for a peaceful world. At the present time decisions are made almost daily in international affairs, which we have no part in making, do not like and are powerless to prevent. It should be remembered that our batting average of victories over Russia in the U. N. is far greater than our batting average with the Russians in any other area of conflict. There is no reason to believe that this will change.

The proposals for changes in the U. N. Charter briefly outlined above are substantial departures from the traditional methods of diplomacy. Such departures are essential to a solution of the grave problems which our country faces, for nothing is surer than that reliance upon methods for the prevention of war which have uniformly failed in the past, will inevitably produce failure in the present and in the future. As Gen. Douglas MacArthur said recently in Los Angeles in viewing the problem, "we must break out of the straitjacket of the past."

The task which this subcommittee faces in making recommendations to the United States Senate will call for not only the best efforts of each member and staff assistant, but for an almost superhuman effort which "breaks out of the straitjacket of the past" with the help of divine providence which has so richly blessed our country throughout its existence. The chance which we now have to amend the U. N. Charter so that it can do the job which the peoples of the world believed it was initially created to do may well be the last chance which our civilization will have to avoid the third world war, which if it comes will assuredly be the last of this era of western civilization.

Senator SPARKMAN. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. F. L. McLain, followed by Mrs. Ryan.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mrs. McLain, we are glad to have you with us.

STATEMENT OF MRS. FRANK L. McLAIN, CHAIRMAN, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, CALIFORNIA STATE DIVISION, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN

Mrs. McLAIN. By way of introduction, I am Margaret McLain, of Redding, Calif., State chairman for international relations of the California State division of the American Association of University Women, representing 90 branches with 18,000 members, the largest membership of any State. As you already know through statements given by others of our association across the country, we here in California represent a part of our American association, comprising over 131,000 university trained women in over 1,296 branches throughout our 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and the District of Columbia. We were organized in 1882 as a practical educational group who through their education and training accept a responsibility for and a desire to share in the democratic process of solving community, national, and international problems by a study-action program.

We have long had an interest in international relations, our national association being affiliated with the International Association of University Women which has at present an American serving president. Through our fellowship and international study grants, we have had long experience in intercultural education.

We feel a warm personal interest in the United Nations since one of our distinguished AAUW members, Virginia Gildersleeve, then dean at Barnard College, was associated with the U. N. through its planning period and was one of our country's official delegates who assisted in the creation of its charter.

SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

AAUW has supported the United Nations wholeheartedly since its inception and at our most recent national convention in 1953 again overwhelmingly reasserted its support by adopting the following resolution:

Recognizing the responsibilities attached to the position of the United States as a great power, we reaffirm our faith in international cooperation as the best means for the preservation of the free world. We will support the United Nations and its affiliated agencies and will study ways of making their functioning more effective.

In the field of legislation AAUW adopted unanimously the item: support of measures for effective participation in and strengthening of the United Nations and its affiliated agencies.

AAUW ACTIVITIES REGARDING THE U. N.

Our organization implements this support by:

1. Maintaining an AAUW observer at the U. N. in New York and an association member on advisory groups such as the United States National Commission for UNESCO, the United States National Committee for UNICEF, United States Advisory Commission for FAO, and in various citizen's groups concerned with improving the status and understanding of the U. N. in the United States.

2. Promoting study programs in the State divisions which serve the educational purpose of enlightening our entire membership and developing informed public opinion about the activities and accomplishments of the U. N.

3. Publishing factual material about the U. N. in our National AAUW Journal, general director's letters and in other reports distributed to our study groups throughout the Nation. One of these reports on the recent Montevideo Conference on UNESCO in November and December 1954 finds this organization least well understood in the United States which leaves much work for us to do in the study and interpretative fields.

Another recent report on FAO showed one of its greatest drawbacks to be uncertainty of funds under the U. N. expanded technical assistance program. Our Government was unable to make a pledge regarding a contribution for 1955 because Congress had not authorized the President to do so.

Since UNETAP's entire budget was only \$20 million, the other pledging countries could not understand why we as the leader in this program were unwilling to contribute in the amount of a nickel per capita so that important projects in the fields of nutrition and social economic welfare among free peoples could be completed in order that they become more able to help themselves in the future. AAUW National, State, and local branch international relations chairmen wrote the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate last month urging this appropriation.

EDUCATING THE PEOPLE ABOUT THE U. N.

Our study program throughout California this year stressed our place in the U. N. as a part of our foreign policy. We feel that now is no time for disillusionment or despair but a time for positive support of the U. N. Communitywide observance of U. N. Week was urged with heartening results. We "took the U. N. to the people" in an educational way, cooperating with other organizations supporting the U. N. We supplied inspiration and leadership on a communitywide basis through each branch with the cooperation of the schools, theaters, churches, service clubs, merchants, and others. In one community, local speaking groups "carried the ball," admitting they had to study considerably.

AAUW kept them supplied with factual material, and with full coverage in the local press, there was scarcely a person in that community who didn't learn something new about the U. N.

Community observance of U. N. week is becoming accepted throughout California, each city using its available resources in its own creative way, indicating grassroots democracy at work.

Some cities have held U. N. Charter review seminars. AAUW is still in the study stage in regard to charter review. We commend your staff study series and part I of the hearings dated January 18 and March 3 containing Secretary Dulles' and Ambassador Lodge's statements. It is felt that the initiative for proposals should come from U. N. experts and the delegation at U. N. headquarters or from your Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

A review conference to explore creative ways of working within the charter's present framework and to support and strengthen its effectiveness would have our approval.

There has been a good deal of misunderstanding of the U. N., which can only be cleared through thorough study. The U. N. represents one world, our world, with peoples living together, working together and helping each other in mutual respect. It is a world forum where our ideological opponents can be kept out in the open, under cynosure of the eyes of the world and where we can refute their propaganda with words of truth on the same day.

The President has spoken of the United Nations as a "sheer necessity," our Secretary of State has stated we would be drafting a charter right now if we hadn't one already.

The horrifying effects of atomic fission have forced us to choose between living together or perishing together. By the vision, courage, wisdom and creative capacities of the leaders of our Nation within the family of nations will the peace be kept.

I quote the words of Ambassador Lodge when he appeared before you on March 3, 1954:

While charter review is important and could do a great deal to make the U. N. more effective, we should never lose sight of the fact, and I say this with all the conviction I have, that the success of the U. N. in the last analysis will always depend on the extent to which its members support it when the going gets rough.

AAUW pledges this support.

We thank you for the privilege of appearing before you.

U. N. PUBLICITY BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to ask just one question.

Keeping in mind that the U. N. furnishes a rather wide forum for discussion of world problems among whatever other duties and responsibilities it might have, do you not believe that there would be considerable advantage in seeking to assure facilities behind the Iron Curtain so that the point of view of the free world might get as wide a circulation behind the Iron Curtain as the Communist view gets in the free countries of the world?

For instance, when the late Mr. Vishinsky or the other representatives of the Soviet Union made their talks before the U. N. General Assembly in New York, under our free radio and free television we had widespread coverage of the entire text, many times, of the speeches of the Soviet Union's representative. But unfortunately the point of view of the free world does not have that same access to television, radio and press in the controlled facilities of the Communist world.

Have you or has your organization given thought to the free world perhaps asking for a quid pro quo? If they have the facilities of getting their point of view to the free world, the free world should have equal facilities for getting their point of view behind the Iron Curtain.

Mrs. McLAIN. I believe our Nation—and I speak now as an individual, Senator Knowland—our Nation through its Voice of America program is becoming more and more effective, if what I read in the press is correct. I also have here, which I will leave with you in time:

It is a world forum—

this is the U. N., now—

where our ideological opponents can be kept out in the open cynosure of the eyes of the world and where we can refute their propaganda with words of truth in the same day.

Ambassador Lodge has said that he always manages to refute their propaganda at any time.

Senator KNOWLAND. I think it is a very real problem. We do have the Voice of America. But, of course, we have some figures—I happen to serve as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, also—which show that the Soviet Union is spending as much or maybe more in blocking and trying to interrupt and interfere with the Voice of America broadcasts as we spend in doing the broadcasting.

What I had in mind was that if a nation becomes a member of the United Nations, if it subscribes to the charter, and if it wants to make use of the United Nations as a forum which has full coverage of the debates which take place in the free world, shouldn't that nation, if it is to get the advantages of that forum, have an equal obligation in seeing to it that those debates get behind the Iron Curtain uninterrupted, uninterfered with, as they are in the United States, for instance?

Mrs. McLAIN. Yes, perhaps so, in order to be just.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Mrs. McLAIN. Thank you for the opportunity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Senator SPARKMAN. Before the next witness is called, let me break in here just briefly. We have some staff members who are helping us, and I thought this might be a very good time to present them. It might be well if all of you would stand for just a moment, and get a little relaxation while I am presenting them.

First I should like to present Dr. Carl Marcy, who is a member of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate; Miss Morella Hansen, down at the desk, who is a member of the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee; and our reporter, Mr. Williams, is likewise from Washington.

There are some gentlemen from the junior chamber of commerce that I should like to acknowledge at this time, too, who have been quite helpful to us:

Mr. Chuck Gilbert: Mr. Gilbert is the man that has been calling the time on the witnesses, as well as manipulating those microphones and the sound effects.

Mr. Ted Israel: Mr. Israel is the one who has been calling the witnesses.

Mr. Frank Takeuchi, over at the door.

I am very glad to acknowledge the help that these people have given us, and also at this time I should like to take the opportunity of thanking Mr. Robert Dolan and Miss Osborne of the mayor's office for the help that they have given us. They are not here, but I wanted to acknowledge them publicly.

Thank you very much. Will you be seated, and the next witness will come around.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. John J. Ryan, to be followed by Mr. Happell.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come around, Mrs. Ryan.

Mrs. RYAN. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JOHN J. RYAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CATHOLIC WOMEN

Senator SPARKMAN. You may proceed.

Mrs. RYAN. Let me congratulate the subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee—

Senator SPARKMAN. Foreign Relations in the Senate. It is Foreign Affairs in the House.

Mrs. RYAN. Foreign Relations, yes.

Senator SPARKMAN. I don't know why.

Mrs. RYAN (continuing). On using this democratic process in getting at the grassroots. It gives us a new faith in our Government, in our democracy, and is a hope for the nations of the world.

I am Mrs. John J. Ryan, representing the National Council of Catholic Women, of the archdiocese of San Francisco. We are a federation of 317 affiliations and approximately 40,000 women.

The Charter of the United Nations is predicated upon the principle of the natural law that man has an innate desire for peace, so that he may exercise to the fullest extent, in his political, economic, and social life, the dignity which is inherently his as a member of the society of mankind.

The charter promises, furthermore, to provide the institutional means of accomplishing this objective, and makes provision for the process of amendment, whereby these means may be further implemented, as weakness in the charter is revealed by experience, and as modifications and revisions are demanded by the exigencies of the times.

Peace is the tranquillity of order, and is attained through the operation of justice; it is, therefore, necessarily founded upon basic principles of equity, in the social, economic, and political spheres, and in the national and international orders.

REVISIONS PROPOSED

We, accordingly, believe that the security of individuals and nations everywhere would be strengthened, and the tensions existing in today's world lessened, by utilizing the amendment processes of the charter in the following areas:

I. In that of sovereignty, by recognition of the basic principle that no state is absolutely or unqualifiedly sovereign and that in the moral law the common good takes precedence over self-interested nationalism.

II. In that of disarmament, by making this, so far as possible, universal and compulsory, with full international control of atomic-nuclear weapons; with effective methods of inspection and the power to impose sanctions upon offenders.

III. In that of international law, by investing the General Assembly of the United Nations with power to legislate in this field, beginning with specific categories of special moment.

IV. In that of justice, by granting to the International Court mandatory jurisdiction, together with appropriate means to enforce its decisions.

V. In that of the veto power, by providing for its limitation, especially with regard to such vital questions as the charter amendments, admission of new members, the peaceable settlement of disputes, and the imposition of sanctions.

The above recommendations represent, basically and generally, the position of our organization in reference to charter review, and follow, in each instance, from our conviction that permanent and honorable peace can be attained only through a sincere recognition of the mutual interdependence of all peoples, under the universal sovereignty of God.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Ryan.

Mrs. RYAN. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Leon Happell, followed by Mr. Horton.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come around, Mr. Happell. We are glad to have you, sir.

Mr. HAPPELL. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF LEON HAPPELL, VICE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION, AMERICAN LEGION

Mr. HAPPELL. Mr. Chairman and Senator Knowland, it is a real pleasure to have the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee to express the opinions of our organization.

I am the vice chairman of the national foreign relations commission of the American Legion.

We have standing committees that make constant studies of many problems with relation to foreign affairs, of which the United Nations, we consider, is a very important part.

The statements made here this morning have been very similar in many respects, and I hope not to repeat them. However, I would like to state the Legion's position on 1 or 2 of what I consider very important phases of the subject before you, and I hope that I stay closely to the subject, and that is with respect to revision of the Charter of the United Nations.

LEGION SUPPORT FOR THE CHARTER

We do not have any idea that we should withdraw from the United Nations at this time. And I pick that remark up from one of the previous witnesses. I think that it is like a businessman that has a going concern, and even though business may be a little bad in spots and at times, the overall picture is good, and there is no advantage in discarding something that is certainly bringing fruit in some fields.

The American Legion, if I may state, believes now as it has in the past, that the United Nations is indispensable. What the future may bring forth is anybody's guess.

But before going directly into our recommendations of what we think should be the amendments to the charter, I think it is only fair to say that the United Nations has done some wonderful work. The organizations that are formed within the framework—and I have in mind the World Health Organization and the other international groups that are operating—have done some wonderful work.

UNESCO itself is a controversial subject within our national organization, although in the department of California of the American Legion they are opposed to UNESCO and the use of its materials in the public schools.

REGIONAL COLLECTIVE DEFENSE ARRANGEMENTS

Article 51 of the charter has provided one of the great things that has happened, and I think that is the organization of NATO. It has given the freedom-loving people the opportunity of organizing themselves for their mutual security, and has provided for a united effort, something that has never been known before on the Continent of Europe.

In 1949, at the Philadelphia convention, we recommended a similar pact for southeast Asia, and at that time were told by the spokesmen in the State Department at a briefing session that it just was not time for it, or at least it was inopportune.

But I notice since that time that we have such an organization now in existence, and for our American Legion, I wish to say that we are very pleased to see it.

Speaking directly now on what we think should be the revision of the charter, I think that the Security Council—I am speaking now for our organization—and by resolution which was passed in 1946, just 1 year after the United Nations Charter was adopted here in San Francisco, these things have happened.

ENLARGEMENT OF SECURITY COUNCIL

We believe the Security Council should be enlarged to 10 members; that the veto should be abolished in matters of aggression and preparation for aggression; that a vote of 6 out of 10 members should control all of the other things that come before the Security Council; to reorganize the International Court of Justice; to give special thinking to the development of an Atomic Energy Authority, because surely the delegates in San Francisco 10 years ago did not know the future development of nuclear weapons.

We are opposed to any form of world government and we hope that the United Nations will not become topheavy with so many side issues that they will forget the original purpose for which they were formed, to promote peace and good will on earth.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you, Mr. Happell.

Your entire statement, which you did not get to complete, will be placed in the record.

Mr. HAPPELL. Thank you, sir. This is an eight-page statement that covers our position entirely.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes. I read it.

Mr. HAPPELL. Thank you.

(The prepared statement by Mr. Happell is as follows:)

AMERICAN LEGION VIEWS WITH REGARD TO REVISION OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS, BY LEON HAPPELL, VICE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMISSION

First, may I state that the Legion believes now, as it has in the past, that the United Nations is indispensable. What the future may bring forth is anybody's guess.

This is the second time in our generation, and each time following a world conflict, that nations have bound themselves together for the purpose of maintaining a universal peace. We all know about the failure of the League of Nations and the many events that caused its downfall. Notable among these were Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia, the invasion of Manchuria by Japan, and interference in the Spanish Revolution by many so-called neutral nations. These acts of aggression, of course, were followed by the most devastating war the world has experienced. Nobody knows how much of this might have been prevented had the League of Nations been allowed to continue.

Now we have a second great organization, the United Nations, which has its 10th birthday this year. Certainly, there is much to be done to make the United Nations serve the purpose for which it was organized more fully. However, before stating the American Legion position in this regard, I think it is only fair to review the accomplishments of the United Nations over the 10 years of its existence.

Defeat of Communist aggression in Iran and the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Tremendous moral, financial, and material aid rendered to Greece while under communistic attack.

The United Nations negotiated and concluded the armistice between Israel and the Arab States.

Creation of the free states of Libya and Indonesia.

Formation of the Republic of Korea and the subsequent aid in men, money, and material for the defense of the new Republic while they were defending themselves against Communist attack. While it is true that the United States carried most of the load in this effort, let us not forget that some 46 nations contributed to the best of their ability in this joint effort. This has never happened before in the history of the world.

Undoubtedly, one of the greatest accomplishments of the United Nations was to assist in sounding the death knell of colonialism. This was not a direct effort of the organization, but it has lent a guiding hand in the peaceful transition from colonialism to independence and self-government. Let us not forget that we, ourselves, set the pattern by our own Declaration of Independence.

Aside from these political and military achievements, the United Nations has offered a means of benefiting mankind in many other ways. The World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, International Civil Aviation Organization, and many other groups set up within the framework of the charter are now doing a splendid job.

UNESCO is a controversial subject within our national organization. At the present time we have a special committee which is making a study of this and other features of the United Nations. Until this report is official and is accepted or rejected by the legion, I will withhold comment. However, the Department of California, American Legion, has opposed UNESCO and the use of its material in our public schools.

From a military standpoint, the results of the efforts of the United Nations have been good and bad. The United Nations has no policing force or troops of its own. As a result, it has been necessary for the nations who have the wherewithal to assist in this effort. Korea is perhaps the best example of this.

The American Legion passed a resolution at its convention in Miami in 1948 which provided in part: " * * * to strengthen the United Nations through charter revision * * * by the creation of an adequate, active, independent world police force under the control of a vitalized Security Council, together with a reserve force of national contingents."

We believe that this is necessary now more than ever for the United Nations does not have an enforcement arm to back up its decisions and those of the International Court of Justice.

From the standpoint of mutual security, the charter has been most helpful. NATO was born under article 51 which recognizes the right of nations to join for this purpose. NATO has been a huge success, having brought together the fighting forces of many nations with the single purpose in mind of defending

themselves against all aggressors. Much more could be said about NATO, but suffice it here to observe that the United Nations was the instrument through which it came into being. The American Legion endorsed this group defense project at the Philadelphia convention in 1949—fully a year before it was consummated. Also at Philadelphia in 1949, 6 years ago, the Legion took the following position by resolution.

"We particularly urge our Government to lend its aid in forming a regional pact, under article 51 of the United Nations, composed of those freedom-loving countries of the Pacific and far eastern area who, through self-help and mutual aid, desire to guarantee their mutual defense and to preserve individual liberties."

We were told by the State Department at a briefing session in Washington, D. C., in 1949 that such a movement was not in the cards at that time. However, subsequent events have demonstrated the necessity, and we are pleased to note that this pact is now a reality.

The American Legion's position with reference to the United Nations and charter revision has been consistent through the years. The language may be different, but the thinking is the same. Therefore, I submit to your committee the following resolution adopted by the national executive committee of our organization in 1946, 1 years after the United Nations Charter was adopted:

"Resolved, That the national executive committee of the American Legion, meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., November 21, 22, and 23, 1946, urgently recommends the immediate strengthening of the United Nations Organization by the adoption of three amendments to the United Nations Charter to provide for—

"1. Reorganization of the United Nations Security Council and the World Court with a more effective representation of the nations, and a final decision by majority vote in all matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression. Also the abolishment of the veto power in all matters involving aggression or preparation for aggression only, while retaining it elsewhere. Suggested details would include:

"(a) To reorganize the Security Council to consist of 10 members, 2 each from the United States, Britain, and Russia; each from France and China; and 2 selected collectively by the remaining member states.

"(b) To abolish the present veto right in cases of aggression or preparation for aggression. In all such cases, decisions of the Security Council shall be made by a majority of 6 out of 10. In other matters, the present veto right of the five major powers to be retained.

"(c) To define in the United Nations Charter aggression and preparation for aggression. Aggression, or aggressive war, shall include an attack with weapons of violence by the government of a sovereign state, or by its citizens with its acquiescence, against the territory or citizens of another sovereign state. Preparation for aggression shall include production of weapons beyond previously agreed quotas, or refusal to submit to authorized inspection, or the massing of excessive bodies of troops at another nation's border.

"(d) To reorganize the International Court of Justice or World Court, with power to interpret the revised U. N. Charter and to determine when preparation for aggression exists. Its composition shall be similar to that of the reorganized Security Council, except that its members will serve for life or for a substantial term. Its decisions shall be by majority vote and shall, within the scope of its authority, be binding upon governments, corporations, and individuals.

"2. Delegation to the Security Council of adequate powers to suppress aggression and prevent preparation for aggression. Suggested details would include:

"(a) To establish an Atomic Development Authority responsible to the reorganized Security Council for the rigid control of atomic weapons with proper safeguards. The same or a similar authority to have like responsibility as to biological, chemical, and other means of mass destruction existing or hereafter developed, with like safeguards.

"(b) In the case of other heavy armament, such as warplanes, warships, rockets and heavy artillery, the Security Council to be empowered and directed to limit the total quantity to be produced in the world annually, and to allot to each of the five major powers an individual production quota, which it may not exceed, and to allot to the remaining member states a collective production quota which shall be produced within their territories solely by a nonprofit armament authority to be operated under the Security Council; these production quotas preferably to be specified in the United Nations Charter after they have been arrived at by previous agreement. Such production quotas might be: United States, Britain, and Russia, 20 percent each; France and China, 10 percent each;

the smaller member states through the armament authority, a collective quota of 20 percent. In event of actual invasion, the invaded state may exceed its quota and take all other steps to resist.

"(c) To delegate to the Security Council the power and responsibility of enforcing all the provisions of these amendments. The Security Council to maintain staffs of inspectors and establish branches of the Atomic Development Authority throughout the world. The inspectors shall have full access to all sources of raw material, plants, and research centers within the scope of their authority, and to full information as to any substantial concentration or training of armed forces. Refusal by the government of a member state to submit to inspection or to recognize the authority of the Security Council and World Court shall constitute an act of preparation for aggression.

"(d) Effective provisions which this committee does not attempt to elaborate, shall be considered and made effective as to nonmember states to the end that they may acquire no advantage by nonmembership.

"3. Establishment of a strong world police force organized and equipped to support impartially and effectively the powers of the Security Council. Suggested details would include:

"(a) The world police force to consist of one active international contingent, and 5 national contingents ready to operate as reserves whenever needed.

"(b) The Security Council shall establish and maintain under its direct control the active international contingent, composed of volunteers from the smaller member states only, recruited in national units; this to constitute a professional army, highly paid and highly trained and disciplined. They shall owe their allegiance to the Security Council only, and shall be equipped with the collective heavy weapons produced by the armament authority in the smaller member states, namely, 20 percent of the world's production, or equal to that assigned to the United States, Britain, or Russia, respectively.

"(c) The Security Council shall cause the international contingent to move against any state found guilty by the World Court of preparation for aggression. In event of actual aggression the international contingent shall move immediately to resist the aggressor. The international contingent may be stationed temporarily in Germany or any other occupied enemy territory as troops of occupation.

"(d) The national contingents shall consist of the national armed forces of the five major powers and shall be equipped with the heavy weapons allotted to them in their respective quotas. These shall help and reenforce the international contingent whenever needed, and such need shall be determined by majority vote of the Security Council. In case the national contingents shall not suffice to repel the aggression, further national contingents may be called out but only with the consent of their respective governments.

"Further resolved, That we recommend to the President and the Congress that the United States shall initiate the adoption of the foregoing plan: Provided, however, That until such time as the above measures, or similar ones, go into effect, the Armed Forces of the United States and its weapons of every nature, shall be maintained at wholly adequate levels."

With reference to section B under article 1 of the resolution, it can be said that there is nothing wrong with the veto power as such. Rather, it is the abuse of the veto which causes us concern.

Some 54 times Russia has used the veto and usually to keep some nation friendly to the West from being admitted. In fact, any proposition submitted to the Security Council that does not fit their pattern of world domination is promptly vetoed. Austria, Cambodia, Ceylon, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Japan, Finland, Italy, Eire, Jordan, Laos, Nepal, and Vietnam have all been refused admission to the United Nations because of the Soviet veto.

The development of nuclear weapons and atomic energy has brought about such a threat to the survival of the human race that this could well be a subject of special consideration when discussing revision of the charter. In 1946, the Legion had no idea of this enormous development and we are sure the delegates to the first General Assembly did not anticipate it.

I trust I have made the Legion's position clear upon the matter of charter revision, the purpose for which this meeting was held.

The American Legion strenuously opposes any participation by the United States in a world government, world federalism, or any similar group by whatever name, for the reason that such participation would be impossible without the surrender of our sovereignty.

In conclusion, ~~may~~ I say that we have consistently supported the United Nations. We retain our faith but with a word of admonition. The United Nations organization must never develop so many sidelines that the purpose for which it was formed will be forgotten, that is, to maintain peace and good will on earth.

Senator SPARKMAN. The next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. P. A. Horton, followed by Mr. Seaver.

Senator SPARKMAN. All right, Mr. Horton. We are glad to have you.

STATEMENT OF P. A. HORTON, MEMBER, NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMITTEE AND STATE CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SOJOURNERS, INC.

Mr. HORTON. Senator Sparkman, Senator Knowland, my name is P. A. Horton. I am here from Los Angeles and a member of the national Americanism committee of the National Sojourners, a non-profit organization composed of commissioned officers of the services, past and present, who are Master Masons.

We have set forth in our written statement our opposition to world government, limiting our sovereignty, granting U. N. powers to tax, the Genocide Convention, the Convention on Human Rights, and UNESCO.

We believe that since the world war, Russia has been the one and only root of war in the world. No decision affecting peace can be made with Russian objection. This is a condition that is truly fantastic. No unity can be obtained with the enemy sitting right in the middle with the power to veto every move. This condition has resulted in the triumph of the Godless communism.

FAILURES OF THE U. N.

Ten years ago there were less than 200 million people under the iron heel of Soviet dictatorship. Today they control the lives of nearly 900 million, with the hordes of India rapidly sinking under their influence.

This is no time for free men to surrender any portion of their sovereignty under any pretext whatever. It should be strengthened rather than weakened. Loopholes now discovered should be repaired.

Article VI of our Constitution should be immediately amended to prevent further bypassing of our laws by treaty or agreement.

The United Nations has proven to be a plan by which the free world, with their high ideals of morality, honesty, and integrity, have been subjected to betrayal by Godless, ruthless Socialists, who have demanded and received an appeasement price for every concession for peace.

We have war and threats of war constantly since the formation of this world organization for peace. They sanctioned the uprooting of millions of people in the Arab world and created continuous hostilities there. The war in Korea was a Russian project; yet Russia is a member of this peace organization.

Our lukewarm allies permitted us to carry the burden of 90 percent of the cost of men and materials to prosecute that war; yet their influence in the United Nations apparently presented our winning it.

The United Nations, instead of being the instrument of glorious accomplishment we hoped it to be, has proven to be an evil thing. It is the sounding board of the Communist world. They have infiltrated into every branch of the whole structure and into many delegations, and very definitely into our own. Those who dominate the staff seem determined to form a supergovernment, a one-world government, and that one world is the Socialist world.

We looked upon the Indochina incident and its following Geneva Conference as a blank page in the history of freemen. The forced severance of this country by Russian equipped troops follows the pattern of Korea.

It is evident to those who study the record that any weakening of our national security or surrender of our sovereignty will result in this pattern being used for our entrapment.

PROPOSED LINE OF ACTION

We of the National Sojourners sincerely appreciate the great responsibility of tremendous importance of the findings of this committee and are grateful to you for the privilege of presenting our views and considered action. In our desire to be helpful, we suggest that a revision of the United Nations Charter include a study of:

(1) Expel Russia for persistently violating the principles of the charter;

(2) If the present charter, article 5, cannot be effective in this because of the veto, article 5 should be revised;

(3) Withdraw all financial support of United Nations and all its agencies until such time as Russia either withdraws or is expelled;

(4) Provisions to prevent the use of propaganda materials of UNESCO in the public schools or other brainwashing or mindmoulding materials that tend to or attempt to subordinate our country to a superstate, or to weaken the loyalty of our children to our country and flag.

In accordance with our patriotic purposes and our studied opposition to any form of world or supergovernment, we urge the rejection of any plan that would alter the United Nations Charter and would weaken, restrict, or abolish the independence and/or sovereignty of the United States.

Such plans are opposed by most of the larger patriotic groups including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Order of World Wars, the Daughters of the Revolution, and Sons of the Revolution, and, we believe, the vast majority of the citizens of this, our country, founded on faith, who pray for your guidance in the revision of a charter that attempts to unite men of faith and atheists, and freemen and slaves.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, one of the requests I made this morning was that we not show approval or disapproval. It is not our desire to squelch applause, but for the sake of trying to get these hearings finished. We made that request of you, and I hope that you will remember it and abide by it from now on.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Horton is as follows:)

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, and the honorable members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Relations, my name is P. A. Horton; I am in the insurance business and live in Los Angeles, Calif. I am a member of the National Americanism Committee and State chairman of National Sojourners, Inc. Accompanying me at this meeting are Adm. Sigval B. Johnson, USCG, retired, and Lt. Col. Wm. E. R. Basch, USMC, retired, both of whom are members of our national committee of 33.

Purposes of National Sojourner: The National Sojourner, Inc. was founded in 1919. It is a nationwide nonprofit patriotic organization composed of commissioned officers of the armed services past and present, who are Master Masons. Chapters are located in the States, larger cities, and in centers throughout the world where our Armed Forces are stationed.

The two principal objectives of the National Sojourner are to develop true patriotism and Americanism throughout the Nation and to oppose any influence whatsoever calculated to weaken the national security.

II. OPPOSED TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

In our national convention in 1952, and again in 1953, and reaffirmed in 1954, we stated our strong opposition to World Government, Atlantic Union, or any form of supergovernment, and urged continuing and vigorous action on the part of the members of our order and other patriotic Americans to strengthen and preserve the national security and to combat the forces which wittingly or unwittingly would destroy our sovereignty, weaken or abrogate the Constitution of the United States, undermine the traditions and loyalties of our citizens and rob us of our freedoms.

III. REVISION OF CHARTER

Paragraph 3 of article 109 of the United Nations Charter provides for the conference for a revision of their charter on the vote of seven or more members at the 10th annual session of the General Assembly. That is in 1955.

We subscribe to the noble purposes and principles expressed in the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations, and particularly to the maintenance of international peace and security, to develop friendly relations among nations, and to promote international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian fields and for the solution of disputes by peaceful means.

We must face the facts. With 10 years to guide us, we find less and less unity. At the end of his term as President, Dr. Louis Padella Nervo made an address in which he said: "In the field of political accomplishment the credit side of this year is not very heartening." All activities are directed by a fear of the future, all of the great questions pending before us have either become alarmingly more acute or they have fallen hopeless of immediate solution into inexplicable labyrinths."

This does not appear to be international cooperation as outlined in the charter: We talk of the solution of disputes by peaceful means and then prepare for war.

The noble purposes expressed in the preamble of the United Nations Charter appear to be only words.

IV. OPPOSE LIMITING OUR SOVEREIGNTY

Based on conclusions on the part of some, that anticipated accomplishments of the United Nations have failed of achievement, because that organization under the present charter lacks the powers of fiat and sanction to carry out its determinations, it may be expected that the sanctions granting of some such powers will be considered at such conference; and

That abuse in the use of the veto power in the United Nations has resulted in the conviction, in some quarters, that such power should be limited or eliminated; and

Whereas our leaders may be importuned to stand for other matters of vital concern to the United States which may be expected to be considered at such conference including, among others, the question of admission to membership in the United Nations of all nations, regardless of the principles under which they are governed; the establishment of a so-called world law, enforceable by world courts upon nations and directly upon individuals; the vesting in the United Nations of the power to tax; and the power to establish, maintain, and use military forces to enforce world law and the enactment of the United Na-

tions, coupled with a prohibition of the right of maintaining such forces by sovereign states, except for police forces; and

Whereas the vesting of the described or other governmental powers in the United Nations or the placing of any limitations upon or the elimination of the veto power would result in a sacrifice of or limitation upon the sovereignty and independence of the United States and would endanger its national defense and security; and

Whereas it is a matter of public knowledge that certain individuals and organizations fully plan to seize upon the coming conference in 1955 as an opportunity to enlarge the scope and powers of the United Nations so as to change it to a real world government: Now, therefore, it was

Resolved, by National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in the 34th annual convention at Chicago, Ill., May 21, 1954, That, notwithstanding our appreciation of the essential necessity to achieve and maintain peace throughout the world through international understanding, and in view of the deep conviction that such proposed modifications in the United Nations Charter would, in practice, retard rather than advance this essential objective and would tend to bring about war rather than to preserve peace, National Sojourners emphatically opposes any amendment of the United Nations Charter which would, to any degree whatever, vest governmental power in the United Nations or which would limit in any way the sovereign right of the United States to veto any decision of the United Nations which it considers to be detrimental to the independence and security of the United States and its citizens;

National Sojourners opposes any amendment of the United Nations Charter which would vest in the United Nations authority to employ Armed Forces of the United States without consent; or which would empower the United Nations to raise, maintain, or establish a world military force; or which would prohibit sovereign nations from maintaining national military forces of their own.

National Sojourners opposes any amendment of the United Nations Charter limiting the right of the United States to veto the admission of any nation into the United Nations or to veto determinations with respect to international control of atomic energy with which it is not in agreement.

National Sojourners opposes the vesting in the United Nations of any power to tax.

National Sojourners opposes the vesting in the United Nations of any power to make laws or to establish courts to try offenders against such laws.

National Sojourners opposes any amendment of the United Nations Charter which would tend toward development of the United Nations into a world government or supergovernment or which would tend otherwise toward the establishment of a world government or other forms of supergovernment.

National Sojourners urges the rejection by our Government of the various proposals outlined in this resolution and any others which may be brought forward which would alter the United Nations Charter so as to abolish or restrict the sovereignty and independence of the United States or the rights of our citizens.

V. RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The President of the United States sent to the United States Senate on July 16, 1949, a proposed treaty or convention entitled "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide," with a recommendation for ratification; and

Whereas genocide is defined in the proposed treaty as "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such:

"(a) Killing members of the group;

"(b) Causing serious bodily and mental harm to members of the group;

"(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

"(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group"; and

Whereas article VI, clause 2, of our Federal Constitution provides that all treaties made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding; and

Whereas the Genocide Convention undertakes to create a whole category of new crimes as above indicated, most of which are unknown and repugnant to American jurisprudence, for the violation of which it is proposed that public

officials as well as private citizens shall be tried and punished by international courts located presumably beyond the territorial limits of the United States, presided over by judges for the most part not citizens of the United States, not bound by the Constitution and statutory laws of the United States, and not required to grant to citizens of the United States all or any of the rights and immunities guaranteed them in the constitutional Bill of Rights; and

Whereas the Genocide Convention would expose citizens of the United States to criminal prosecution for offenses not recognized or denounced as crimes by the Constitution and statutory laws of the United States, would deprive them of important constitutional rights, and would cause them to be tried by a court other than that of the United States, thus constituting an abandonment by the United States of its duties to its citizens; and

Whereas the United States can be kept strong only by continuing to follow the present form of government, based on the Constitution, inclusive of the Bill of Rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in the Thirty-second Annual Convention, at Baltimore, Md., on May 23, 1952. That notwithstanding the sympathy of National Sojourners with the broad objectives sought to be accomplished by the Genocide Convention in suppressing activities that are immoral and shocking to the conscience of all decent mankind, it is the considered opinion of this body that, not only is the detailed definition of "genocide" as stated in the Convention susceptible to serious abuse and extension far beyond the meaning of the word as commonly conceived by the American public, but the criminal procedure prescribed for enforcement and punishment is un-American and entirely unacceptable; therefore, be it further

Resolved, That this organization reaffirms its unqualified opposition, set forth by resolution adopted at its annual convention at St. Louis, Mo., in May 1951, to the ratification of the convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, now before the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

VI. OPPOSING THE ADOPTION OF A TREATY, CONVENTION, OR AGREEMENT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Whereas there exists in the United Nations organization the Commission on Human Rights, on which the United States has representation; and

Whereas there was adopted by the Commission on Human Rights, in 1948, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; and

Whereas the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations has asked the Commission on Human Rights to complete the drafting of proposed covenants on Human Rights; and

Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights includes matter socialistic in character and repugnant to our mode of life, purporting to declare rights not now covered in our Bill of Rights, and fails to include rights guaranteed to our citizens in our Bill of Rights; and

Whereas the adoption of any treaty, convention or agreement on human rights would undoubtedly in many respects establish standards lower than those in our Bill of Rights and in other respects would impose obligations upon the United States different from and greater than those for which it is now responsible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in the 34th Annual Convention at Chicago, Ill., May 21, 1954. That this organization is unalterably opposed to the adoption of any international treaty, convention or agreement purporting to define or declare the existence of any human right or rights containing any provisions which differs in any respect whatsoever from the precise phraseology of the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States, unless the proposed language shall first have been adopted by the people of the United States as an amendment of the Constitution; and be it further

Resolved, That this organization, fully recognizing our national obligation to make the Bill of Rights of our Constitution effective with respect to those to whom it now applies, opposes the adoption of any treaty, convention or agreement which purports to define or declare the existence of any human right or rights, even though precisely consistent with the Bill of Rights in the Constitution of the United States, if such treaty, convention or agreement creates in any way any obligation upon the United States for the carrying out or enforcement of any such right or rights among other people or nations anywhere in the world.

VII. RESOLUTION OPPOSING UNESCO PAMPHLETS—TOWARD WORLD UNDERSTANDING

Whereas the series of pamphlets, *Toward World Understanding*, published by UNESCO (United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization), an agency of the United Nations and supported largely by the American taxpayer, is apparently designed to poison the minds of our youth, beginning at the earliest period, in kindergarten or infant school; to insidiously belittle and undermine love and pride of country, its ideals and traditions, on the part of the school children of America; and to secure the internationalizing of education and the teaching of ideas in the classroom to educate the child to be a citizen of the world, in preparation for world government; and

Whereas these pamphlets are being circulated among public school teachers and for use in public libraries; and

Whereas the purposes of the said pamphlets are diametrically opposed to the position of National Sojourners with respect to world government and to the purposes of National Sojourners of developing true patriotism and Americanism and of opposing any influence to weaken our national security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by National Sojourners, Inc., assembled in the 32d Annual Convention, at Baltimore, Md., on May 23, 1952, That it is the sense of this body that the UNESCO pamphlets, *Toward World Understanding*, are seriously harmful as being destructive of good citizenship and the inculcation and maintenance of the high ideals and traditions of America among the school children of the land, and this organization therefore condemns and strongly opposes the use of such pamphlets in the public schools and their distribution in the public libraries; and be it further

Resolved, That the national president of National Sojourners be directed to urge upon the individual chapters and members to be alert in their respective States and communities to vigorously oppose the use of said UNESCO pamphlets in the schools and libraries, and to communicate to their State and national legislators their opposition to such pamphlets, with the request for appropriate remedial action against the publication by UNESCO of said or similar pamphlets or literature and against the distribution and use thereof in the schools and libraries of the country.

The above resolutions were passed at duly constituted conventions by elected delegates, many of whom had spent a good part of their service in foreign lands and acquired international experience through their travel and duty.

Russia since World War II has been the one and only root of war in the world. No decision affecting peace can be made with Russian objection.

This is a condition that is truly fantastic. No unity can be attained with the enemy sitting right in the middle with the power to veto every move. This condition has resulted in the triumph of godless communism. Ten years ago there were less than 200 million people under the iron heel of Soviet dictatorship. Today they control the lives of nearly 900 million with the hordes of India (who owes so much to us and the free world) rapidly sinking under their influence.

This is no time for freemen to surrender any portion of their sovereignty under any pretext whatever. It should be strengthened rather than weakened. Loopholes now discovered should be repaired. Article 6 of our Constitution should be immediately amended to prevent further bypassing of our laws by treaty or agreement.

The United Nations has proven to be a plan by which the free world with their higher ideals of morality, honesty and integrity have been subjected to betrayal by the godless, ruthless socialists who have demanded and received an appeasement price for every concession for peace. We have had wars and threats of wars constantly since the formation of this world organization for peace. They sanctioned the uprooting of millions of people in the Arab world and created continuous hostilities there. The war in Korea was a Russian project, yet Russia is a member of this peace organization. Our lukewarm Allies permitted us to carry the burden of 90 percent of the cost of men and materials to prosecute that war, yet their influence apparently prevented our winning it.

The United Nations instead of being the instrument of glorious accomplishment we hoped it to be has proven to be an evil thing; it is the sounding board of the Communist world. They have infiltrated into every branch of the whole structure and into many delegations and very definitely into our own. Those who dominate the staff seem determined to form a supergovernment, a 1-world government and that 1-world a socialist world.

We look upon the Indochina incident and subsequent Geneva Conference as a black page in the history of free men. The forced severance of this country by Russian equipped troops follows the pattern of Korea.

It is evident to those who study the record that any weakening of our national security or surrender of our sovereignty will result in this pattern being used for our entrapment.

We of the National Sojourners sincerely appreciate the great responsibility and tremendous importance of the findings of this committee and are grateful to you for the privilege of presenting our views and considered action. In our desire to be helpful we suggest that any revision of the United Nations Charter include a study of:

1. Expel Russia for persistently violating the principles of the charter.
2. If the present charter article 5 cannot be effective in this because of the veto, article 5 should be revised.
3. Withdraw all financial support of the United Nations and all its agencies until such time as Russia either withdraws or is expelled.
4. Provisions to prevent the propaganda of UNESCO and other brainwashing and mind-molding materials, and individuals in our public schools, that tend to or attempt to subordinate our country to a superstate, or to weaken the loyalty of our children to our country and flag.

In accordance with our patriotic purposes and our studied opposition to any form of world or supergovernment we urge the rejection of any plan that would alter the United Nations Charter and would weaken, restrict, or abolish the independence and/or sovereignty of the United States.

Such plans are opposed by most of the larger patriotic groups including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Military Order of World Wars, the Daughters of the Revolution, the Sons of the American Revolution, and we believe the vast majority of the citizens of this, our country, founded on faith, who pray for your guidance in the revision of a charter that attempts to unit men of faith and atheist, and free men and slaves.

Senator SPARKMAN. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Benjamin Seaver, followed by Mrs. Wasserman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come around, Mr. Seaver. We are glad to have you.

Mr. SEAVER. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN SEAVER, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA BRANCH, FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Mr. SEAVER. Chairman Sparkman and Senator Knowland, my name is Benjamin Seaver. I am testifying for the Friends Committee on Legislation, the Northern California Branch of the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

The problem of war and peace is the central problem of our time. Unless we solve it, nothing we accomplish will have a very long or a very bright future. By its very nature, international peace cannot be attained or maintained by the independent action of any one nation.

International peace can only result from continual international cooperation, and this indicates the need for an international organization as the instrument of that cooperation.

SUPPORT AND STRENGTHEN THE U. N.

Therefore, it ought to be a fundamental objective of our foreign policy to support and strengthen the U. N., to make it capable of carrying out its purposes.

According to its charter, the U. N. has three major functions: First, to end aggression and the use of war to settle international disputes; second, to offer facilities for negotiation and mediation and conciliation of conflicts between nations; and third, to organize international cooperation to raise the standard of living of the poor and underprivileged peoples of the world.

It is obvious that these three purposes are interdependent, but it is essential to realize that the first purpose is primary and neither of the other two can be worked for effectively so long as war remains as an instrument of foreign policy.

SURRENDER OF MILITARY POWER URGED

In today's world, military power is the paramount concern of all nations, and military power is a viciously competitive business. One's own power is increased not only by additions to it, but by subtractions from the power of the opponent. Moreover, national survival may depend on the outcome of that competition.

All relationships between nations are affected by this constant jockeying for a favorable position in case of war. And considerations of justice and human welfare take a subordinate position to this overriding importance placed on the military security.

If the U. N. is to carry out its purposes, world order and security must rest on other foundations than national armament.

As the U. N. is now constituted, war is supposed to be eliminated by a collective security arrangement.

The record seems to indicate that this does not work. But whether it does or not, the fact that collective security requires each nation to keep armed to the teeth, ostensibly to deter any possible aggressor, creates the very emphasis on armed might which thwarts the other purposes of the U. N.

What we need is just the opposite. The first requirement for world order and security is that each nation shall give up not only the right but the power to go to war, vesting in the U. N. the authority to enforce this agreement. This would mean an agreement for universal disarmament of all nations down to the levels necessary for internal policing, supervised and enforced by the U. N. under laws applicable to individuals.

Once this fundamental decision is taken, it will indicate the other necessary changes in the functions and structure of the charter, such as universality of membership. You must have that if you are going to have universal disarmament; such as the elimination of the veto, and so on.

These changes are not offered as easy of accomplishment, but with a firm conviction that nothing less fundamental will serve our purpose.

As General Carlos Romulo said at the opening of the last session of the U. N. Assembly:

In the present context of human affairs, any revision of the United Nations Charter would be less than practical unless it attempts wisely and courageously to bridge the gap between what is possible and what is necessary. The yardstick should not be what seems possible in the context of the present international situation, but rather what is necessary to enable mankind to avoid atomic destruction. To cope with the atomic revolution we need a political revolution of at least equal the imagination and magnitude.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Seaver is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF BENJAMIN SEAVER ON BEHALF OF THE FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
LEGISLATION OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO

NO ALTERNATIVE TO PEACE

In an interdependent world made small by our science and technology, in a world in which our power to destroy one another is now approaching totality, and in which it is generally recognized that another major war would be suicidal, "there is no alternative to peace," as President Eisenhower has said. No national government, even the most powerful, can maintain international peace by independent action. International peace requires continuous international cooperation and this indicates the need for an international organization as the instrument of that purpose. It is for this reason that the U. N. ought to be the cornerstone of our foreign policy. A fundamental object of that policy should be to support and strengthen the U. N. to enable it to carry out the purposes for which it was created.

MAJOR FUNCTIONS

According to its charter the U. N. has three major functions: First, to end aggression and the use of war to settle international disputes; second, to offer facilities for negotiation and the mediation and conciliation of conflicts between nations; and third, to organize international cooperation to raise the standard of living of the poor and underprivileged peoples of the world.

PEACE MAKING IS PRIMARY

It is obvious that these three purposes are interdependent but it is essential to realize that the first purpose is primary and neither of the other two can be worked for effectively so long as war remains as an instrument of foreign policy. So long as a resort to war is possible all attempts at mediation and conciliation are carried on under a fatal handicap. Settlements arrived at in the presence of the threat of war are apt to be largely conditioned by the relative power of the disputing nations and to last only so long as the power situation remains unchanged. Such settlements, instead of lessening international tension, increase it. Each nation in order to negotiate from strength is impelled to build up its armed might, enter into military alliances with its friends and supporters, and reach out for military bases to defend its homeland. It is for this reason that the U. N.'s mediation of disputes in Palestine, in the Kashmir, in Indonesia and elsewhere, has been accompanied by an accelerated arms race and a general worsening of the international situation.

MILITARY CONSIDERATION VS. INTERNATIONAL WELFARE

Similarly, international cooperation for economic and social progress has been thwarted by the central importance of military power. The world can't spend more than \$100 billion a year on war and have the energy and resources left for a mutual aid program on a scale commensurate with the need. An even greater difficulty arises from the fact that an increase in a people's welfare increases their military potential also, and no government willingly adds to the power of a possible enemy. So long as military considerations dictate economic relationships, international cooperation in this field will be hamstrung. This explains why we reluctantly contribute a few millions to the U. N. technical assistance program while we spend billions to help our military allies, and also why economic aid tends to be justified for military reasons. Considering the existing international tensions, it is a miracle that the U. N. special agencies have been able to do all the fine things they have done.

FAILURE OF "COLLECTIVE SECURITY"

If this is true, then a successful system for the mediation of disputes between nations and an effective worldwide mutual aid program can only come into being after war has been eliminated. As the U. N. is now constituted this is supposed to be accomplished by a system of collective security. The record seems to indicate that this arrangement cannot prevent war. Whether it can or not, under a collective security agreement each nation remains armed to the teeth, ostensibly to deter any possible aggressor, and as we have already seen, it is this emphasis on armed might that has such a blighting effect on the other purposes of the

U. N. If the U. N. is to be effective we must find some better way to keep the peace.

UNIVERSAL DISARMAMENT UNDER LAW

What we need is a U. N. that can prevent aggression by stopping it before the aggression itself takes place. There is one sure sign of aggressive intent and that is the massing of armaments and the mobilization of armed forces. No aggression can take place without such preparation. But in a world armed to the teeth all nations are potential aggressors and the problem becomes insoluble. On the other hand, in a world in which all nations were disarmed down to the levels necessary for internal policing, the problem would be a relatively simple one. For then any nation which broke the disarmament agreement and proceeded to rearm would by so doing be giving the signal of its aggressive intent. Therefore, if we want a U. N. capable of preventing aggression, the first requirement is an agreement for universal disarmament down to the levels necessary for internal policing supervised and enforced by the U. N.

How will the U. N. enforce the disarmament agreement? Suppose one nation decides to rearm. Is the U. N.'s only recourse to urge all the other nations to rearm quickly so that they can go to war with and punish the aggressor? If it is, then we are right back where we started from and we have not solved our problem.

The solution lies in the fact that nations and governments are abstract entities and abstract entities don't break treaties or commit crimes. Human beings do. Moreover, abstract entities cannot be haled into court and made to answer for their misdeeds. Human beings can. Therefore, the U. N. must be given the power to make laws in the field of disarmament and military security—laws enforceable on individuals. Then if any nation tries to rearm, the individuals responsible can be arrested by U. N. police and tried in U. N. courts without visiting on the innocent and guilty alike the indiscriminate punishment of war.

FUTHER CHANGES IMPLIED BY UNIVERSAL DISARMAMENT

Once the decision is made to give the U. N. this task and the power to carry it out, this fundamental step will indicate other necessary changes in the functions and structure of the U. N.:

1. U. N. COURTS

For instance, if nations are no longer to be allowed to settle their differences by war, then we must have U. N. courts with compulsory jurisdiction in all international disputes involving legal principles and courts of arbitration to deal with nonjuridical disputes.

2. UNIVERSALITY OF MEMBERSHIP

If the universal disarmament and U. N. security system under law is to be effective, then at least all major nations must be included and universality of membership becomes our logical aim.

3. ELIMINATION OF GREAT POWER VETO

If all nations disarm then the great power veto in the charter, which was the symbol of the actual veto the great powers had in their armed forces—this symbol loses much of its meaning and will be more easily relinquished.

4. CHANGE FORMULA OF REPRESENTATION

If the U. N. has this great responsibility and the power to carry it out, then each nation will want to be represented in accordance with its share in the responsibility for a united world and the present formula of 1 nation, 1 vote, will have to be changed.

CAN WE MEET THIS CHALLENGE?

The proposals presented here are not offered as something to be easily accomplished. But they are offered with the conviction that nothing less fundamental will serve our purpose. It will be objected that no such agreement is possible with Russia and that if they did agree to it we could not trust them to keep their word. We can only reply that we are not enjoined to trust the Russians. We are told to love them and to trust God. And this love is no soft sentimental-

ity but a clear realization that we are all "members one of another," all one human family, and if we want to safeguard the future of our children, we must take equal care to safeguard the future of all the world's children.

Men have found many ways to express this common human concern. One way is through the instrumentality of government set up to guarantee a peaceful and just order. Men have created these governed communities on a local, state, and national level. The time has now come to apply the same principles on a worldwide scale. The first step to world order requires each nation to give up both the right and the power to make war, vesting in the U. N. the authority to enforce this agreement under law. Once considerations of military power are no longer central to national governments, disputes between them will be more amenable to judicial and arbitral settlement and humanity will be free to express its common concerns for human welfare.

Senator SPARKMAN. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. William J. Wasserman, followed by Mr. Frank.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mrs. Wasserman.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM J. WASSERMAN, ARCATA, CALIF.

Mrs. WASSERMAN. Mr. Chairman, Senator Knowland, my name is Charlotte K. Wasserman. My address is 722 Patrick Court, Arcata, Calif., and I am a housewife.

I speak for no one but myself, and I do so because I am vitally concerned, as an individual, with the success of the United Nations Organization.

When I first learned of these hearings, I thought that laymen would be of little use here. Then I read one of Dr. Lapp's articles on the problems and dangers of fallout from hydrogen bomb explosions and changed my mind. Laymen—ordinary people like housewives—must trouble themselves with the whole problem of existing in a world which can destroy itself. I think none of us agree with Mr. Molotov's statement that, in a general war, only one portion of civilization would be destroyed. All civilization—all society—would be the loser in such a war. Even those of us fortunate enough to survive would find no victory in that survival.

I cannot make detailed proposals for provisions to be included in a revised United Nations Charter, as I am neither a statesman nor a lawyer. I can only add my voice to those who wish to strengthen the charter, and give my support to those who wish to make the United Nations into a truly effective world organization for peace.

It would seem to me that international peace can be achieved only one way—through international law and order. The internal peacefulness of our country is achieved through law at city, State, and Federal levels. Only by expanding the system of law can nations live in peace with one another. Without some system of enforcible international law there is only anarchy—or a Pax Romana, imposed by brute strength. Neither anarchy nor force alone can bring peace; we have learned this lesson from all history.

PROPOSALS FOR STRENGTHENING

Here are broad proposals for revision of the United Nations Charter which would tend toward the creation of such a system of international law, order, and peace.

1. The abolition of the veto in the Security Council to allow that body to take effective and rapid action against aggression. While the Acheson resolution permits questions of collective security to go before

the General Assembly when the veto is used in the Security Council, such action is necessarily slow.

2. The establishment of a United Nations police force, as provided for in the present charter (Arts. 43 and 45). Such a police force should be truly international in character, with members from every nation, and a limitation on the number of individuals from any one country. This force should be as small as the demands upon it allow.

3. All national armies would be completely abolished once a United Nations police force was actually in existence. Naturally, civilian police would be maintained in each country. All arms, conventional and atomic, except those required by the civilian police force, should be turned over to the United Nations for disposal.

Such a plan would, of course, require continuous, compulsory inspection by United Nations teams.

4. No system of law is complete without a judicial arm, so an international court would have to be established. Such a court would have jurisdiction only in cases involving offenses against the United Nations Charter, and would not interfere in any way with present internal law in any member country. Such a court would not adjudicate between individuals, but only between nations.

5. A limited power of taxation would have to be extended to such an organization. I feel such taxation should be as direct as possible so that each of us can knowingly pay our fair share toward buying peace. In 1952, the United States contributed 10.7 cents per capita to the United Nations. This amount, of course, would be increased any time under this proposal. However, the expenses of our own Government, and thus our internal taxes, should decrease even more.

6. Membership in the United Nations would be open to any country willing to live under the charter. Election to the organization would be by majority vote of the General Assembly. The abolition of the veto would permit such action.

Such a plan, I think, can and must succeed. If any nation did not agree, it would find itself excluded from the rest of the world. The so-called neutral nations want peace as desperately as any of us, and would undoubtedly be willing to share in its cost and making. No nation could live for long outside the community of nations, just as no individual can survive for long excluded from a society of individuals. The entire world—the free peoples as well as those held captive, the undernourished and the well fed—is waiting for leadership away from mushroom clouds and atomic fallout toward that day and place when each man may sit under his own vine and fig tree, and there is none to make him afraid.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Wasserman.

Mrs. WASSERMAN. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Herbert L. Frank, followed by Mr. Busterud.

STATEMENT OF HERBERT L. FRANK, CHAIRMAN, EAST BAY CHAPTER, ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE

Mr. FRANK. Mr. Chairman and our distinguished Senator Knowland, my name is Herbert L. Frank. I am a public school teacher and graduate student of the University of California and member of the Atlantic Union Committee, chairman of the East Bay Chapter.

ADDITIONAL PERMANENT MEMBERS FOR SECURITY COUNCIL

We need to take further steps in the organization for peace with freedom. There is a trend in world thought which feels that the United Nations, due to its prestige and power, could hinder the development of a peaceful world society rather than to promote it. This trend, right or wrong, is dangerous and should not be dismissed summarily on holier-than-thou grounds. To reverse this trend and to secure a firm grip on the initiative and the orderly development of society, I respectfully suggest that the United States approach most especially the United Kingdom and secondarily France as fellow members of the Security Council, with the suggestion that an amendment to the Charter of the United Nations be sponsored increasing the size of the Security Council in such manner as to make permanent seats for, and to seat therein, the additional states of India, West Germany, Italy, the People's Republic of China, Pakistan, Japan, and Brazil.

In sponsoring such a move the United States and its allies would enhance their prestige and power by being the first to sponsor adequate representation in the Security Council for important areas of the world which are not now adequately represented. The United States and its allies would be the first to champion the right of six important nations—none of which is Communist—to a veto seat on the Security Council. It can be anticipated that all of these powers will eventually demand such seats. India, Pakistan, and Japan would be effective counterweights to Communist China. In giving representation to great states of the Far East and Middle East, which are going to be discontented until they get the representation which they feel is their due, important legal and religious as well as social systems would be properly recognized. How much better statesmanship it is to give enough on time than to give too little too late.

It may be recalled that Germany, Italy, and Japan were represented on the Executive Council of the League of Nations, a body with as many as 16 members which functioned just as effectively as has the Security Council with only 5 permanent members. To leave South America unrepresented would be shortsighted.

EFFECT OF RED CHINA INCLUSION ON SECURITY COUNCIL

To give Red China another veto would not increase Communist influence in the world. Her voice would be less strident within that body than it is penetrating now outside of it. Her blatant aggressive tactics would lose the force of righteous indignation which they now carry in the ears of many who regard her as an outcast. Two vetos are no more effective than 1; and 2 voices among 12 are much less effective than 1 among 5; to say nothing of the 2 among 5 which is the prospect before us if we give too little too late.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ADVANTAGE OF PROPOSAL

To sponsor these seven peoples for places in the Security Council might produce considerable consternation and division of thought in the hierarchy in the Kremlin. The hierarchy could not well oppose the admission of Communist China. Opposition to India would be dangerous for it; and opposition to Japan might well frustrate present

attempts to cozen the Japanese. To oppose the admission of these states would cause Moscow to run the risk of Titoism in China and a further loss of prestige and influence in all other areas of the world. To accept would greatly strengthen the free forces in the United Nations and enormously enhance that body's ability to fulfill its mission of the pacific settlement of disputes.

The present deadlock over Red China tends to diminish United States prestige; any deadlock developing out of the above proposal would diminish Russian prestige.

FEDERAL UNION OF FREE NATIONS

Yet, I think that the United Nations should not be so enlarged unless going along with it there is a policy to increase the ability of the free world to hold together and speak with one voice. It is my firm belief that the cold war will be won by the side which first perfects its organization. In order for us to have our cake and eat it too, the free world must be strengthened. Here we should explore carefully a technique which has always been effective in bringing strength when applied among free peoples; I refer to federal union. The greatest free societies of today are based on the principles of law, democracy, republicanism, and federal union. The proper application of these principles has carried our civilization to its highest peak of peace and order; yet no single free people is adequate to meet the force of the great drive for world dominion being staged by the forces of Communist tyranny today. For this reason, free peoples must use their accumulated political wisdom to apply those principles which have been most effective, as stated above, to perfect their organization that they may survive in this jet-propelled atomic-hydrogen age.

Thank you very much, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

ADMISSION OF RED CHINA DISCUSSED

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Frank, in your remarks you advocated membership in the United Nations for Communist China, despite the fact that it has violated the terms of the Korean armistice and is known to hold at least 15 American airmen and perhaps several hundred other American prisoners of war as well, in violation of that armistice?

Mr. FRANK. Only with the admission of these other six states in the Security Council. Otherwise, no. I am unqualifiedly opposed to the admission of Communist China as matters are today, but I do——

Senator KNOWLAND. But with or without its compliance with the terms of the armistice?

Mr. FRANK. With or without, I am opposed, in any event, until such time as we may get something which I think would be of enough value to permit them to enter.

I think if we would bring in these other six states, we would so grasp the initiative in world affairs, we would strengthen the free world much more than we would the Communist world, and might very well be driving a split into the Communist world which we could exploit. I think there are many good arguments for saying that we can exploit divisions in the Communist world much better with China in than with her out.

I am opposed to her coming in unless we can get adequate quid pro quo, and I also wish to direct your attention most specifically to the second part of the proposal, which is that the free would be strengthened along with it, by applying proper organizational techniques.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

Senator KNOWLAND. Is your point of view and that of the Atlantic Union, that the U. N. should have a universal membership regardless of the willingness of a member to abide by the precepts and terms of the charter?

Mr. FRANK. Absolutely not.

Senator KNOWLAND. In other words, if a nation did not comply with the terms of the charter, it should not be admitted, or if it violated the terms of the charter, it should be subject to expulsion?

Mr. FRANK. I think the provisions of the United Nations Charter are now adequate in that regard. If we mobilized world opinion sufficiently, I think it might be well that we could make those effective. I realize they are dead letters pretty much at the present time.

Senator KNOWLAND. You would not say that the mere de facto control of power would in itself justify a government being admitted to the United Nations?

Mr. FRANK. No; I certainly do not.

Senator KNOWLAND. Would you say that the people of a country that had been deprived of their liberty should at least have the assurances of a free election supervised by the United Nations, for example, before its puppet government is entitled to membership in the organization?

Mr. FRANK. I certainly would.

Senator KNOWLAND. To take a past example, and get a little more historic perspective, the Nazi armies overran France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Denmark and had established, by force of arms, Nazi governments in each of those countries. The mere fact that they exercised de facto power would entitle them to admission into the United Nations organization; do you think?

Mr. FRANK. I certainly do not. I think that the prevailing world opinion is perhaps, outside the United States, that they should be, but I don't agree with it. I am opposed to it.

Senator KNOWLAND. So that by the same token, the use of military power to gain Communist control over countries would not in and of itself entitle those countries to representation in the United Nations?

Mr. FRANK. Certainly not.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Then may I ask, do you speak for the Atlantic Union?

Mr. FRANK. For the East Bay chapter of the Atlantic Union.

Senator SPARKMAN. The East Bay chapter. That is just a local group?

Mr. FRANK. Yes, a local group, East Bay.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Frank is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HERBERT L. FRANK

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, we need to take further steps in the field of organization for peace with freedom. The development of a planned order for the preservation of freedom is our only hope of survival. Thus, we should look with distaste upon the views of the vocal minority which sees in every change a loss of rights rather than the development of orderly processes to share responsibility in a world in which time and space have been virtually annihilated.

It is foolhardy to close our minds to change, but it would be equally foolish for us not to hold tenaciously to the gains already made. The United Nations has weathered some severe tests in the brief decade of its existence. It has become such an integral part of human society that measures which might disrupt its orderly development should be critically examined.

Summarizing the position of the Department of State in the Senate hearings (Rept. No. 2501) held on the revision of the United Nations Charter in July of 1950, Dean Rusk said,¹ "There is danger that a * * * search for procedural means to relieve East-West tension may destroy or render impotent the effective organization we have in the United Nations."

These dangers have been pointed out often, but perhaps nowhere more lucidly and succinctly than by Mr. Ernest Gross in an article entitled "Revising the Charter" in the January 1954 issue of the quarterly review *Foreign Affairs*. For the people of the United States to permit their representatives to enter a review conference without a clear knowledge of what they expect to get out of the conference and what price they expect to pay for it is liable to lead to public disillusionment and loss of faith in the efficacy of the United Nations. For the representatives of the United States to enter such a conference without first reaching definite agreement on such matters as domestic jurisdiction, Chinese representation in the Security Council, the defense of Formosa and related areas, etc., with our principal allies and friends, of the free world, will, as Mr. Gross pointed out, but give the shrewd Communist negotiators an easy opportunity to exploit the Communist dictum: "The national movements for the freeing of the oppressed countries from the imperialist yoke contain unexhausted revolutionary possibilities."

It is of the greatest urgency that the free world set its own house in order and maintain that order by making only such proposals, at a review conference, as are virtually certain to bring greater unity to that part of the world yet free. It is equally important that freemen seize the initiative in standing for principles likely to make the so-called neutralist or independent powers of the world look with favor upon the program advanced by the principal free peoples.

Aware that the United States is committed to the support of a resolution to hold such a conference, I wish to put forward for the consideration of United States policy makers three propositions.

These three propositions recognize that the United Nations has as its basic aims two ends which are often found to be so antagonistic that a policy which would appear to promote the one may well appear to frustrate the other. These two ends are the pacific settlement of disputes and the enforcement of law and order through the collective action of like-minded peace-loving peoples. They are summarized in the preamble to the charter in the words, "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security * * *"

It is generally, and I think correctly, believed that pacific settlement is promoted as membership in the United Nations approaches universality. Universal representation provides at hand the machinery for negotiation on any situation which may threaten peace and security; but, the enforcement of collective measures demands the organization of such peoples as are able and willing to join forces in an active and determined way to frustrate the would-be aggressor. Collective security cannot tolerate the existence of a force in its midst which is strategically located in such a way as to block collective action at such time as it can be effective or delay it to the point where it is ineffective. The resolution of this dilemma of the need for the membership of the principal peoples of the world, on the one hand, and the necessity for like-minded peace-loving peoples to be able to act effectively, on the other, will determine whether the United Nations lives or dies.

¹ S. Rept. No. 2501 : 81st Cong., 2d sess., p. 48.

It is obvious, I think, that if we are to avoid world war III we are going to have to live with the Communists, not forever, but for some years to come. This may or may not be what has been termed "coexistence," but it is the realization of this hard fact which causes so many of our principal allies to feel that it is unrealistic to keep the Chinese Communist regime out of the United Nations. Whether the American attitude on this matter is right or wrong there can be little doubt but that it has caused much world opinion to feel that the United States is using its prestige and power to hinder the development of a peaceful world society rather than to promote it. This trend in world thought, right or wrong, is dangerous and should not be dismissed summarily on holier-than-thou grounds.

To reverse this trend and to secure a firm grip upon the initiative in the orderly development of society, I respectfully suggest that the United States approach, most especially, the United Kingdom, and, secondarily, France, as fellow members of the Security Council, and perhaps consulting with other smaller but no less important free nations, with the suggestion that an amendment to the Charter of the United Nations be sponsored increasing the size of the Security Council in such manner as to make permanent seats for and to seat therein the additional states of India, West Germany, Italy, the People's Republic of China, Pakistan, Japan, and Brazil.

In sponsoring such a move the United States and its allies would enhance their prestige and power by being the first to sponsor adequate representation in the Security Council for important areas of the world which are not now adequately represented. The United States and its allies would be the first to champion the right of six important nations—none of which is Communist—to a veto seat on the Security Council. It can be anticipated that all of these powers will eventually demand such seats. India, Pakistan, and Japan would be effective counterweights to Communist China. In giving representation to great states of the Far East and Middle East, which are going to be discontented until they get the representation which they feel is their due, important legal and religious as well as social systems would be properly recognized. How much better statesmanship it is to give enough on time than to give too little too late!

It may be recalled that Germany, Italy, and Japan were represented on the Executive Council of the League of Nations, a body with as many as 16 members which functioned just as effectively as has the Security Council with only 5 permanent members. To leave South America unrepresented would be short-sighted.

To give Red China another veto would not increase Communist influence in the world. Her voice would be less strident within that body than it is penetrating now outside of it. Her blatant aggressive tactics would lose the force of righteous indignation which they now carry in the ears of many who regard her as an outcast. Two vetos are no more effective than 1 and 2 voices among 12 are much less effective than 1 among 5, to say nothing of the 2 among 5 which is the prospect before us if we give too little too late.

To sponsor these seven peoples for places in the Security Council might produce considerable consternation and division of thought in the hierarchy in the Kremlin. The hierarchy could not well oppose the admission of Communist China. Opposition to India would be dangerous for it; and opposition to Japan might well frustrate present attempts to cozen the Japanese. To oppose the admission of these states would cause Moscow to run the risk of Titoism in China and a further loss of prestige and influence in all other areas of the world. To accept would greatly strengthen the free forces in the United Nations and enormously enhance that body's ability to fulfill its mission of the pacific settlement of disputes.

The present deadlock over Red China tends to diminish United States prestige; any deadlock developing out of the above proposal would diminish Russian prestige.

Yet, I think that the United Nations should not be so enlarged unless going along with it there is a policy to increase the ability of the free world to hold together and speak with one voice. It is my firm belief that the cold war will be won by the side which first perfects its organization. In order for us to have our cake and eat it too, the free world must be strengthened. Here we should explore carefully a technique which has always been effective in bringing strength when applied among free peoples; I refer to federal union. The greatest free societies of today are based on the principles of law, democracy, repub-

licanism, and federal union. The proper application of these principles has carried our civilization to its highest peak of peace and order; yet no single free people is adequate to meet the force of the great drive for world dominion being staged by the forces of Communist tyranny today. For this reason, free peoples must use their accumulated political wisdom to apply those principles which have been most effective, as stated above, to perfect their organization that they may survive in this jet-propelled atomic-hydrogen age.

Article 52 of the United Nations Charter makes ample provision justifying the United States in calling for an exploratory conference to see if it is not possible to establish a system within the free world which will satisfy all its participants that they are adequately and fairly represented and that they will be able to count, without fear of failure, upon the other free members of society to support them with all their force in case of need.

Should these two proposals as outlined be fruitful, the United States and her principal allies in the Security Council might well propose that all other historic states, including those now satellites of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, but excluding those like North Korea and North Vietnam which are creatures of the Communist world, be admitted to membership in the United Nations upon application.

Taken together those steps might well make the United Nations the universal organization desired by the idealists and those who would serve the end of the pacific settlement of disputes, and, at the same time, a cloak for an organization of free peoples which would make the free world secure from fear of Communist attack.

There is a way for us to have our cake and eat it, too, as there ever has been for courageous freemen, but it does require imagination and courage in our people and our policymakers. It requires the recognition that mankind is not limited to the inhabitants of any one great state no matter how great it may be. The whole is greater than any of its parts. Thus the great struggle between the principles of freedom and tyranny should be resolved within the organized human community, not outside of it. Yet the forces of freedom must, at the same time, be so organized that they can engage in the kind of infighting which will prevent their destruction by the all too-human proclivities for division and weakness, qualities which are the chief hope of those who would destroy us.

Senator SPARKMAN. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. John A. Busterud, followed by Mr. Monaco.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, sir. Proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF JOHN A. BUSTERUD, STATE PRESIDENT, YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. BUSTERUD. Mr. Chairman and Senator Knowland, first of all, I should like to welcome both of you distinguished gentlemen to the fine State of California on behalf of the California Young Republican organization. I know that Senator Sparkman in some respects may disagree with our platform, but you are welcome nevertheless.

Senator SPARKMAN. I am always glad to meet with young Republicans. They are a promising lot.

Mr. BUSTERUD. We do not intend to promise any more than we actually perform, though.

In any event, my name is John Busterud, and I am the State president of the Young Republicans of California, and am a practicing attorney here in San Francisco. Our group has a membership of some 6,500 young people between the ages of 18 and 40 in California, and nationally we have an organization better than 50,000 young people, who are interested in improving good government locally and on a national level.

Many of our members served in the Armed Forces during World War II and during Korea, and, indeed, many of our members failed

to return from those wars. Therefore, I think we are all keenly aware of the responsibilities of our subcommittee in making its determination as to how and whether we should amend the United Nations Charter to more effectively guarantee peace and justice in the world.

First let me say that the great majority of our membership wholeheartedly endorses the efforts that have been made thus far by the Eisenhower administration to guarantee that peace with justice, and particularly his atoms for peace proposal which was only recently promulgated in the United Nations.

The Young Republicans of California have consistently endorsed the efforts of the United Nations to obtain world peace. We feel that although the United Nations has been disappointing in some respects, and many of these respects have been mentioned here this morning, it nevertheless offers us the only real hope for a just and lasting peace in the world.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND BENEFITS OF THE U. N.

Actually, we feel the United Nations has accomplished a great deal despite its limitations and weaknesses. It helped, I know, to prevent Communist aggression in Korea, despite the fact again that the United States played a far more important part in that conflict than many of us would have had it do.

It established the Republic of Korea. It concluded a permanent armistice between Israel and the Arab States, and it achieved the withdrawal of Soviet force from Iran shortly after World War II.

Perhaps even more important, the General Assembly in 1950 adopted the uniting for peace resolution, which has enabled the General Assembly to enforce peace in the world even though the Security Council is bound by veto on the part of the Soviet Union or any other members.

In addition, we feel the United Nations has served the world and the United States well as a forum for public opinion. We feel again that that is one battle at least that the free nations of the world have been winning.

YOUNG REPUBLICAN RESOLUTION

At the last Young Republican National Federation Convention in 1953, the question of charter revision was specifically considered. The platform which was adopted at that time provides in part:

Peace cannot be lastingly achieved in isolation, but only by effective cooperation with the community of nations. Regional alliances are only supplemental to the basic collective purposes of the United Nations, for we know that global peace cannot be attained in a piecemeal fashion. Recognizing the inability of the United Nations as presently constituted to preserve the peace, we believe that the United States should prepare specific proposals for United Nations Charter revision, defining and limiting the United Nations jurisdiction to the prevention of war and armament control. The United Nations' specialized agencies should continue to function in an advisory and consultative status with assurances that these agencies shall have no jurisdiction over the internal affairs of any of the sovereign member states.

Thus I think the Young Republicans are clearly and firmly on record as favoring United Nations' jurisdiction over the prevention of war and armament control. We feel that steps should be taken to strengthen the charter in this respect, although we have not actually proposed any specific changes. But we know that our views will be considered in any change the Senate will propose.

At the same time, we would amend the charter to provide more clearly that none of the specialized agencies that I mentioned, such as UNESCO, WHO, or ILO, shall have any jurisdiction over the internal affairs of member nations. Thus we feel that we can effectively preserve our own Bill of Rights here at home and yet strengthen the ability of the United Nations to enforce a just and enduring peace.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to appear.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

I like the statement, too, but I asked you not to applaud, if you please.

Senator SPARKMAN. Call the next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Daniel J. Monaco.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Monaco.

STATEMENT OF DANIEL J. MONACO, THE PENINSULA COMMITTEE FOR UNESCO

Mr. MONACO. Mr. Chairman, members of the United States Foreign Relations Committee, my name is Daniel J. Monaco. I am an attorney at law. My residence is in Redwood City and my office in San Mateo, Calif.

On behalf of the Peninsula Committee for UNESCO, and myself, I would first like to thank this committee for permitting me this opportunity.

The organization I represent is the Peninsula Committee for UNESCO. It is a private organization with no official connection with the U. N., State Department, national or international commissions for UNESCO. Its membership consists of approximately 50 organizations and well over 100 individuals.

The board of directors has adopted as their official view the written statement heretofore submitted to your committee, which I request be incorporated into the record.

Senator SPARKMAN. That will be done.

Mr. MONACO. Thank you very much.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

THE PENINSULA COMMITTEE FOR UNESCO.

San Francisco, Calif., April 9, 1955.

To: The Honorable Senator Walter F. George, Chairman, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate.

From: The Peninsula Committee for UNESCO (Edwin Feldman, president).

Re: United Nations Charter Revision.

In the opinion of the Peninsula Committee for UNESCO the United Nations has accomplished much, both in maintaining the peace and in reducing the tensions of war.

That the U. N. has certain inadequacies fully to cope with world problems as they now exist is also our opinion. This, we believe, is because the U. N. is predicated upon suppositions which have never been realized. These were—

That the war alliance would continue as a peace alliance, and

That armaments would still be of the conventional type rather than nuclear.

Worldwide problems can only be resolved, without the risk of war, by a competent world political body which we believe the United Nations can become. This must be based on world law which embraces the principle that no nation has the right to use arms against another nation, and on a force under which no nation has the ability to wage such a war.

The only way nations can achieve a maximum in the development of their national lives is to take away their "right" and power to wage war. As Secretary of State Dulles has put it, we need "to develop international order to shield national life."

Therefore, we urge the adoption of the following recommendations:

1. That a general conference of the members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present charter be held as provided by article 109 of the charter.

2. That the U. N. be strengthened through revision of the charter at that conference.

3. That whatever the revision may be, the charter be brief and simple as to be resilient.

4. That the amendment process be modified by eliminating any veto in this regard, and at the same time adding safeguards to give the charter stability.

5. That the voting procedure be changed so as to strengthen control by the U. N. over strictly international matters.

6. That membership on the Security Council be changed so as to give all nations fairer representation.

7. That the International Court of Justice be given compulsory jurisdiction over all international matters, both civil and criminal.

8. That there be a codification of international law and the adoption of an international criminal code.

9. That a world disarmament conference be held concurrently with the U. N. Charter Review Conference.

10. That an effective international police force be established with the adoption of the revised charter.

11. That the U. N.'s legislative branch have power to pass laws which are strictly international and which are binding on all nations.

12. That the membership of the U. N. be open to all nations, with no state having the right to withdraw, once admitted.

13. That the scope and power of the specialized agencies of the U. N. be enlarged.

Respectfully submitted.

DANIEL J. MONACO,
ELINOR FALVEY,

Cochairmen U. N. Charter Revision Committee, the Peninsula Committee for UNESCO.

Mr. MONACO. In the opinion of the Peninsula Committee for UNESCO the United Nations has accomplished much, both in maintaining the peace and in reducing the tensions of war.

That the U. N. has certain inadequacies fully to cope with world problems as they now exist is also our opinion. This, we believe, is because the U. N. is predicated upon suppositions which have never been realized. These were:

- (1) That the war alliance would continue as a peace alliance, and
- (2) That armaments would still be of the conventional type rather than nuclear.

SURRENDER OF RIGHT TO USE ARMS ADVOCATED

Worldwide problems can only be resolved, without the risk of war, by a competent world political body which we believe the United Nations can become. This must be based on world law which embraces the principle that no nation has the right to use arms against another nation, and on a force under which no nation has the ability to wage such a war.

The only way nations can achieve a maximum in the development of their national lives is to take away their "right" and power to wage war. As Secretary of State Dulles has put it, we need "to develop international order to shield national life."

We feel that the nation state has a very definite contribution to make to the world. Positive, good action is an asset. We do not believe that peace is possible only after all humanity speaks the same language or

has the same religion, cultural, or political system. Conformity of this kind results in stagnation.

We believe that the different cultures and systems should develop themselves to the maximum, competing with one another and sharing the best they have produced with one another. This is true progress, and it can only be achieved by diverting the energies of the people from war to concentrating their efforts to the maximum development of true nationalism.

We further believe that the nation states must remain sovereign in purely internal affairs. A modern war would destroy the nation state and therefore, sovereignty.

To preserve that sovereignty, we must therefore agree that no state has an inherent right to wage war. We must also agree that no state shall have the ability to wage war.

REVISION URGED

Therefore, we feel the charter needs basic revision, not just tinkering. There are groups and officials who feel the charter should be amended only in a few minor instances. To follow this through, we should use the amendment process of article 108 of the charter, which was specifically inserted for that purpose.

The United States must go to the Conference with a positive and bold program asking for more than we hope to get, sparking the imagination of everyone, so that Russia's possible counterproposal may be in line with what we really want. In other words, I think we need some good horse traders at this general convention.

They should not go to this convention relying on slogans such as bigoted isolationism or fuzzy one-worldism.

I think we should delve a little into the study of semantics in this regard. In short, we cannot wait for an evolutionary process to convert the U. N. into an effective war deterrent. If 10 short years have brought us from conventional arms to atomic and hydrogen bombs, what will the next 10 years impose? We cannot wait for education to educate men's minds. Time has already won out. As Secretary Dulles said, and I quote again, a world war depends in the long run not upon men but upon law, law which embodies eternal principles of justice and morality.

SPECIFIC PROPOSALS LISTED

Specific proposals were then adopted by our board of directors:

First of all, that we should have a general conference of the members of the United Nations for the purpose of charter review;

Secondly, that the United States should be strengthened through revision of the charter at that time;

Thirdly, that whatever the revision may be, the charter be brief and simple, as our own Constitution, so as to be resilient;

4. That the amendment process be modified by eliminating the veto in this particular regard, and at the same time adding safeguards to give the charter stability.

The other recommendations are in the written statement:

5. That the voting procedure be changed so as to strengthen control by the U. N. over strictly international matters.

6. That membership on the Security Council be changed so as to give all nations fairer representation.

7. That the International Court of Justice be given compulsory jurisdiction over all international matters, both civil and criminal.

8. That there be a codification of international law and the adoption of an international criminal code.

9. That a world disarmament conference be held concurrently with the U. N. Charter Review Conference.

10. That an effective international police force be established with the adoption of the revised charter.

11. That the U. N.'s legislative branch have power to pass laws which are strictly international and which are binding on all nations.

12. That the membership of the U. N. be open to all nations, with no state having the right to withdraw, once admitted.

13. That the scope and power of the specialized agencies of the U. N. be enlarged.

Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. Have you any questions, Senator?

MAKEUP OF PROPOSED U. N. LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to ask some more about that point 11, "That the U. N.'s legislative branch have power to pass laws which are strictly international and which are binding on all nations."

What do you or your organization perceive representation to be in that international legislative branch, the U. N. legislative branch?

Mr. MONACO. Well, the details we have not gone into, because I think it is a question of draftsmanship, negotiating at a conference, and a lot of other particulars. But we do believe that ultimately any world organization must be open to all without the right to withdraw once they are in. It has to be rigid.

Senator KNOWLAND. You are making this recommendation and some attention must be given to it. Would this universal body be based on the equality of member states? We now have 60 members of the United Nations. So say we expanded that to include 15 or 20 more that might not now be members, and we had 80 members. Would they all sit with equality in this legislative body, or would it be on the basis of population, as an example? That is a very basic question.

Mr. MONACO. Yes, I understand that. I do not think that we can give each nation an equal vote, nor can we base it on population. It may be on the basis of several factors: Wealth, population, individual state, and so forth. It may be a type of weighted vote. That is a detail which again I think the draftmen in negotiations and so forth would have to enter into.

Senator KNOWLAND. Would the legislative body you contemplate be the one that would establish so-called international criminal codes, such as you mentioned in section 8? Who would establish that international criminal code?

Mr. MONACO. It would either be the legislative branch or the Charter Review Conference itself, and insert it into the charter and specify in detail.

WHAT WOULD PREVAIL IN A CONFLICT OF LAWS

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, supposing that the international criminal code ran counter to certain of the freedoms of speech and press guaranteed under the American Bill of Rights. Which, then, would be superior in your judgment in the United States?

Mr. MONACO. I think since we do have the veto ultimately in the final drafting of any revisionary charter, I think definitely the Bill of Rights should be supreme, and I think we have an adequate check and adequate safeguards should be permitted. I do not believe in any watering down, definitely.

Senator KNOWLAND. All right. In other words, you believe the veto should still be retained and not abolished?

Mr. MONACO. No. Ultimately—I believe that at the present time, since we do have a veto, we do have a check on the ultimate final draft of any revised charter within which there would be safeguards, and our statesmen would have to see to that, and if the safeguards—

Senator KNOWLAND. You also proposed that the right of withdrawal be eliminated. You propose to set up a legislative body, without specifying in its constitution whether representation would be by states, by population or by some other combination, and to give that legislative body the power to enact criminal law which apparently would apply internally in all of the member states, because otherwise it could not be effective if it did not apply internally?

Mr. MONACO. No. By “criminal code”, we meant an international criminal code, which would govern only international crimes, such as the violation of some basic clause within the charter, such as violating the armistice provisions, or violating possibly, the provision outlawing war, such as our Kellogg-Briand Pact did, which laid the foundation for the Nuremberg trial. Rather than saying that it was *ex post facto*, at least we know in advance what it is. I had in mind here, and we had in mind, strictly international criminal matters and civil matters, and not internal.

Senator KNOWLAND. Of course, the Soviet view of what internal matters would be might be quite different from ours under the circumstances.

Mr. MONACO. Oh, yes, definitely, that is true.

Senator KNOWLAND. And their ideas on a free press or free discussion are quite different from ours under the Constitution.

Mr. MONACO. That is correct.

Senator KNOWLAND. We are getting to the point where this committee is going to have to make some recommendations, and the American Government is going to have to take a policy position. We want to get specific information as to just what is meant by some of the recommendations that are coming to us. It is in that spirit that I am trying to explore just what your organization had in mind in the recommendations that you are making to us today.

Mr. MONACO. Yes. And again, strictly international, with adequate safeguards, so that there would be no interference with internal sovereignty.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

The next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. Mary L. Sisson, followed by Mr. Scott.

Senator SPARKMAN. Come around, Mrs. Sisson. And Mr. Scott, will you be ready when Mrs. Sisson finishes?

Mrs. Sisson, we are glad to have you. Proceed in your own way.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. L. SISSON, CALIFORNIA STATE CHAIRMAN,
WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM**

Mrs. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, Senator Knowland, I am Mrs. Mary L. Sisson of Berkeley, representing the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the California branch, with a State membership of 350.

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom throughout the 40 years of its existence, has stood for a strong international organization functioning democratically within the framework of law as essential to lasting peace. The United Nations, representing a stage of such an organization, is given full support by the league. An accredited consultant and U. N. observer for the league constantly attends sessions as representative of its principles and objectives.

REVIEW, NOT REVISION, ADVOCATED

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom believes that the United Nations, in its present stage, supplies machinery and organs as channels of international cooperation. These channels might be impaired if charter revision were undertaken at this time. The charter is recognized to have been a compromise document—the conditions responsible for such compromise still exist. Charter review, however, is essential.

The league believes that the primary responsibility of the United Nations, as outlined in the charter, is to operate as an instrument of mediation, negotiation, conciliation, and judicial review in resolving world tensions and settling international disputes. Under the present charter, the United Nations, if confidently supported by every member nation, can so operate.

MEMBER NATION SUPPORT OF CHARTER URGED

The league believes that the United Nations can function adequately only if all the peoples of the world are included as members of the United Nations and are represented by their de facto governments. This, too, is implicit in the charter.

The league urges the governments represented in the United Nations to use the facilities of the International Court of Justice, rather than military might, for the settlement of disputes.

The league further urges the governments to give greater support to the Economic and Social Council and the special agencies which serve not only to raise the standards of living and health of mankind, but also to provide valuable experience in international cooperation.

The league believes that disarmament is a necessary means toward the security of all nations and peoples. If nations agree to disarm, their collective efforts may then be directed toward recognition of the dignity and worth of the human person and toward meeting material needs basic to the good life. Herein lies the real security.

The league supports the continuing efforts of the United Nations to promote human rights by all nonviolent means. It desires that the United States should ratify the Genocide Convention and should work, with other member states, to eradicate discrimination, abolish capital punishment, and uphold the principles essential to human rights and freedoms.

With regard to the anticipated debate on revision of the Charter of the United Nations, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom wishes to stress that in its point of view, nothing in the present charter prevents the achievement of the aims of the United Nations. It urges that steps be taken to make the principle of universality of membership a reality. It considers it to be of the utmost importance that all members work for genuine collective security to guarantee lasting peace for mankind.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

QUESTION OF EXPULSION OF VIOLATORS RAISED

Senator KNOWLAND. One question. I would like to ask, since you believe in universal membership, if a member should violate the terms of the charter, would you or your organization advocate the expulsion of that member?

Mrs. Sisson. I don't know what answer the organization would make to that question. We shall have an annual meeting of the United States section at Mills College in July, and a great deal of intensive study will be given to the details of the program of the United Nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. Of course, we may have to make our decision before July. I was wondering if you would care to express a personal opinion as to whether a nation which did not comply with the terms of the charter after admission, should be subject to expulsion.

Mrs. Sisson. My feeling would be that it is better to have all members inside the United Nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. Even if they are sabotaging it and being subversive?

Mrs. Sisson. Well, those are special terms, Senator Knowland. I think that with the nations belonging to the United Nations, they can appear and be dealt with together.

Senator KNOWLAND. Specifically, the Soviet Union did not comply with the request for assistance in Korea; and publicly admitted it had supplied the planes, the tanks, the guns, and the ammunition for making war upon the United Nations as it carried out its responsibilities. Under those circumstances do you think it should not be subject to expulsion?

Mrs. Sisson. I understand that many great students of international affairs feel that we are much better off with Russia in the United Nations than outside the United Nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. That is all.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Scott.

Mr. ISRAEL. To be followed by Mr. Robinson.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Scott, we are glad to have you.

Mr. SCOTT. It is a pleasure to be here.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. SCOTT, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Mr. Scott. Senator Sparkman, Senator Knowland. I am Richard F. Scott, Oakland lawyer, lecturer in political science at the University of California.

I firmly believe that the United Nations is indispensable and I believe that it should be modified in certain respects with a view toward making the organization more effective.

But as a technical matter, because of the impediments to formal amendment of the document, I believe that the other available means of change should be preferred.

We all know, the United Nations was created in 1945 principally to enforce these and for other purposes set out in the preamble in article 1. In 1955, as we consider revising the charter, the same goals are before us, in part realized during the 10 years of the United Nations, in part still wanting of fulfillment.

RECOMMENDED CHANGES LISTED

In order to further realize its goals, the following changes in the United Nations seem to be indicated:

First, the growing powers of the general assembly should be expanded;

Second, the veto should be removed from membership in specific settlement matters;

Third, participation in foreign affairs and a measure of stability should become the principal tests for membership and representation.

These and other changes would seem to conform with the objectives of American foreign policy.

DANGERS OF FORMAL AMENDMENT PROCESS POINTED OUT

In selecting the means, in each instance we shall wish to know which procedure, under all the circumstances, will best effectuate the desired change and leave undisturbed the other values we seek to protect. On this basis, one may doubt the wisdom of resorting to the formal amendment process.

Given the veto power and the negative orientation of the U. S. S. R., it would appear that none of the proposals likely to emanate from the free world would be ratified in accordance with the provisions of article 109. By pressing the Soviet into the position where it feels compelled to veto our proposals, we would doubtless enjoy a moral victory and perhaps a momentary propaganda advantage. But this would not accomplish the business at hand. It would only risk the loosening of those existing ties which still bind the U. S. S. R. to the Western concepts of life embodied in the charter. In turn the U. S. S. R. could offer amendments calculated to embarrass the West. Whatever the immediate result, an East-West contest for short-range tactical purposes would only intensify the already troublesome disunity. It would only make the task of the United Nations more difficult. It would only aggravate those unhappy world conditions which the United Nations and the United States seek to cure. This is definitely beyond the pale of the ultimate American and United Nations goals.

CHANGES BY INTERPRETATION AND PRACTICE URGED

There is, however, little, if any reason why most of the desirable changes cannot be realized through practice and interpretation of the unamended charter. It is well settled that the specific powers of the United Nations' organs are controlled by the general purposes of the United Nations set forth in the preamble and article 1. If the ambiguities in the charter are properly resolved in favor of the stated purposes of maintaining international peace and security, bringing about the peaceful settlement of disputes, developing friendly relations among nations, and achieving international cooperation in the economics, social, cultural, and humanitarian spheres, then the familiar problems of the veto, General Assembly powers, membership, disarmament, and so forth can probably be resolved to our satisfaction.

Geared to the gradual increase in the capacity of the world community to accept more far-reaching regulation, the gradual process of interpretation and practice has another advantage. It can be used to absorb the political changes and extend the competence of the United Nations as this becomes practicable as well as useful. This has already developed as an acceptable practice in the United Nations.

SUPPLEMENTARY AGREEMENTS PROPOSED

The conclusion of supplementary agreements on a universal or regional basis is also a preferable means of changing the members' relations under the charter. The expansion, for example, of the security functions of the United Nations can be realized by agreement on a universal basis as proposed in the Thomas-Douglas resolution (S. Con. Res. 52, 81st Cong., 1st sess). Strengthened and encouraged by the teeth of the Thomas-Douglas plan, the United Nations could prevent hostilities for the most part, and effectively fight aggression when that becomes necessary. This can be done without the consent of the U. S. S. R. and in the absence of the many difficulties associated with the formal amendment of the charter. The use of subordinate agreements thus commends itself as a worthy and workable alternative to the amendment process.

In conclusion, we should perhaps be reminded that the selection of means is sometimes as important as the ends sought to be achieved.

The real problem of revision is much broader than formal amendment of the charter. The amendment technique should be avoided where the Soviet veto can reasonably be anticipated. Particularly is this true where other, more efficacious techniques are available.

Let us then carry out our proposals through use of the more trustworthy techniques of interpretation and practice and subordinate agreement. If this entire matter is accordingly approached with considerable caution, it appears much more likely that our goals may be realized through the United Nations. Then we may realize our ultimate goal of subjecting the proper portion of international relations to the sound regime of law.

Thank you, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Any questions?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Scott is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF RICHARD F. SCOTT, AN OAKLAND LAWYER, APPEARING AS AN INTERESTED CITIZEN BEFORE THE UNITED STATES SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVIEW

The Charter of the United Nations is law. Like most law, it is only a means to an end. To the extent it tends to bring about desirable conditions or relationships in our world affairs, it is satisfactory and free from the need of revision. Only to the extent that it fails to bring about desirable conditions or itself creates troublesome situations does charter revision become pertinent. This approach to charter revision actually begins in reverse. Not until we have first looked searchingly at international life generally, should we reexamine the charter with a view toward its revision.

We are naturally concerned about the problem of achieving permanent peace and security in fact. We desire, as part of the problem of peace, and as independent objectives, the satisfactory and regular adjustment of controversies, the full performance of international obligations, the reduction of armaments consistent with our overall security objectives, the establishment of at least a minimum level of economic and social welfare and human rights, and finally, perhaps, the more orderly regulation of international affairs under law generally. As a means of achieving these objectives, the United Nations was created in 1945. In 1955, as we consider revising the charter, the same goals are before us, in part realized during the 10 years of the United Nations, in part still wanting of fulfillment. Thinking about revision should accordingly take as its point of departure the aim of providing the United Nations with the means to more perfectly achieve these generally accepted but as yet unfulfilled goals.

SOME SPECIFIC PROPOSALS

In order to permit the United Nations to achieve the goals suggested above, it can reasonably be argued that the security functions of the United Nations should be concretized. Following the lead of the Uniting for Peace Resolution, we should attempt to confirm and expand the General Assembly's growing powers in the security field, perhaps even to that point where the General Assembly could command compliance with its resolutions. The de facto power of a General Assembly resolution should be further developed through the work of the Collective Measures Committee or new structures created for that purpose. As a means of advancing the pacific settlement of disputes we might revoke the veto power with regard to the procedure for handling those controversies that reach the Security Council for settlement. The mere participation in world affairs by a state or government more or less stable would probably be the better test for membership or representation. In order to realize the aim of universality of membership and thus to spread the burdens as well as the benefits of the organization, the veto should probably be removed from membership matters.

All of these modifications would conform generally to the Vandenberg resolution or the spirit of Secretary Dulles' remarks before this subcommittee. I entertain little doubt that they would also tend to further the broad objectives of American foreign policy and the United Nations.

THE CHOICE OF THE INSTRUMENTALITY OF CHANGE

It remains then to examine the various means by which these changes could be realized. As a practical matter they could be realized through interpretation and practice under the present structure, subordinate agreements essentially consistent with the charter, or by formal amendment of the document. In selecting the means, in each instance we shall wish to know which procedure, under all the circumstances, will best effectuate the desired change and leave undisturbed the other values we seek to protect. On this basis, one may doubt the wisdom of resorting to the formal amendment process.

Given the veto power and the negative orientation of the U. S. S. R., it would appear that none of the proposals likely to emanate from the free world would be ratified in accordance with the provisions of article 109. By pressing the Soviet into the position where it feels compelled to veto our proposals, we would doubtless enjoy a moral victory and perhaps a momentary propaganda advantage. But this would not accomplish the business at hand. It would only risk the loosening of those existing ties which still bind the U. S. S. R. to

the Western concepts of life embodied in the charter. In turn the U. S. S. R. could offer amendments calculated to embarrass the West. Whatever the immediate result, an East-West contest for short-range tactical purposes would only intensify the already troublesome disunity. It would only make the task of the United Nations more difficult. It would only aggravate those unhappy world conditions which the United Nations and the United States seek to cure. This is definitely beyond the pale of the ultimate American and United Nations goals.

There is, however, little, if any, reason why most of the desirable changes cannot be realized through practice and interpretation of the unamended charter. It is well settled that the specific powers of the United Nations organs are controlled by the general purposes of the United Nations set forth in the preamble and article 1. If the ambiguities in the charter are properly resolved in favor of the stated purposes of maintaining international peace and security, bringing about the peaceful settlement of disputes, developing friendly relations among nations, and achieving international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian spheres, then the familiar problems of the veto, General Assembly powers, membership, disarmament, and so forth, can probably be resolved to our satisfaction. Geared to the gradual increase in the capacity of the world community to accept more far-reaching regulation, the gradual process of interpretation and practice has another advantage. It can be used to absorb the political changes and extend the competence of the United Nations as this becomes practicable as well as useful. This has already developed as an acceptable practice in the United Nations.

The conclusion of supplementary agreements on a universal or regional basis is also a preferable means of changing the members' relations under the charter. The expansion, for example, of the security functions of the United Nations can be realized by agreement on a universal basis as proposed in the Thomas-Douglas Resolution (S. Con. Res. 52, 81st Cong., 1st sess.). Strengthened and encouraged by the teeth of the Thomas-Douglas plan, the United Nations could prevent hostilities for the most part, and effectively fight aggression when that becomes necessary. This can be done without the consent of the U. S. S. R. and in the absence of the many difficulties associated with formal amendment of the charter. The use of subordinate agreements thus commends itself as a worthy and workable alternative to the amendment process.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we should perhaps be reminded that the selection of means is sometimes as important as the ends sought to be achieved. The real problem of revision is much broader than formal amendment of the charter. The amendment technique should be avoided where the Soviet veto can reasonably be anticipated. Particularly is this true where other, more efficacious techniques are available. Let us then carry out our proposals through use of the more trustworthy techniques of interpretation and practice and subordinate agreement. If this entire matter is accordingly approached with considerable caution, it appears much more likely that our goals may be realized through the United Nations. Then we may realize our ultimate goal of subjecting the proper portion of international relations to the sound regime of law.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. John K. Robinson.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you, Mr. Robinson.

STATEMENT OF JOHN K. ROBINSON, CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. ROBINSON. Senator Sparkman, Senator Knowland, I am John Robinson, a representative of the Building Service Employees International Union, the Hospital Employees Union of the American Federation of Labor of this city, and speak this morning on behalf of the Central Labor Council of San Francisco.

Since its inception in this city in 1945, the United Nations has received the firm, continuous, and official support of the California State Federation of Labor, both from the local councils and throughout the

entire State. Our local labor council, concurring in State actions yearly, takes this opportunity to state the current opinion regarding United States policy in the United Nations.

CALIFORNIA A. F. OF L. SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

Labor's deep conviction as to the stake of all American workingmen, and all American citizens, in the achievement of basic United Nations goals is best reflected by the following statement of policy adopted by the 1954 California A. F. of L. convention held in Santa Barbara:

International affairs: Section 1b. Support of the United Nations is a cornerstone of United States foreign policy. The goals of the United Nations—(1) to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace; (2) to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace; (3) to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and (4) to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends—are also the ideals of the American people.

Where the United Nations falls short of these aims, it is the obligation of the United States, as leader of the free world, to help build the United Nations into a more powerful force for preserving peace and promoting human well-being. To do otherwise, to withdraw, would be to destroy the United Nations and shatter man's best hope for world peace.

We feel it is most regretable that some statesmen see in the United Nations only an instrument of the cold war. Enhancement of the United Nations as a force for enduring peace is based upon the knowledge that the alternative is wide-scale destruction of modern civilization by unilateral means of atomic and hydrogen warfare. We further endorse the utilization of the United Nations by the United States Government in the future to a greater degree than it has in the past.

We endorse the following charter revision proposals, among others, which were made by the national A. F. of L. convention of 1954.

HUMAN RIGHTS OBSERVATION COMMITTEE PROPOSED

(1) Revision of the charter so as to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Commission of the Preservation and Promotion of Human Rights. This Commission to be empowered to designate United Nations Human Rights Observation Committees charged with the same rights, powers, and duties (investigations, surveillance, reports, et cetera) in respect to the threat against and the need for the preservation of fundamental human rights which the present United Nations Peace Observation Commissions now have in regard to meeting and developing measures to thwart the threat against world peace.

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL FREEDOM URGED

(2) To provide for the permanent Commission on National Freedom which shall be charged with the task of mobilizing the moral and material resources of the United Nations for the purpose of aiding the peoples of economically underdeveloped countries and colonial peoples striving to achieve national freedom. Their conditions of life and labor; the evolution of self-governments; and the peaceful growth of

national freedom would be the basis upon which this Commission would report to the Security Council periodically.

In closing, we reaffirm our support of the United Nations and call on the United States Government to help build it into a more powerful force for preserving peace and promoting human well-being.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

Let me now thank all of those participating this morning. I think it has been a very fine hearing.

At the afternoon session, I shall ask Senator Knowland to wield the gavel. I shall be here, but shall ask him to preside.

The committee will stand in recess now until 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 1:15 p. m., the subcommittee recessed to reconvene at 2 p. m., the same day.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The subcommittee reconvened at 2 p. m.)

Senator KNOWLAND (presiding). The committee will come to order.

For the benefit of those that were not at the morning session, I wish to announce that we have 74 witnesses on the list for this afternoon. Under the committee rules, the oral statement will be limited to not to exceed 5 minutes. If the witnesses are unable to finish their written statements in that time, they will nevertheless be printed in our record in full.

Now, it is quite possible that those who have not yet testified and are scheduled to testify this afternoon may, as a result of the morning hearings, have decided that there would be considerable duplication between their testimony and that of prior witnesses. If any of the witnesses would care to come forward and ask that their statement be printed in the record, they are entirely free to do so.

Senator Sparkman and I are prepared to stay here so that all the witnesses may have an opportunity to present their statements, but we would, because of limitations of time, request cooperation so that we might get through this afternoon. We had 28 witnesses this morning, and we have 74 scheduled for this afternoon. So you can see, we have quite a program.

I might also say that we have been informed that the television cameras will terminate their activities here at 4 o'clock.

Now, first of all, the committee has a number of statements of those who were not able to be present. I would suggest that you might at this point read the names and offer the statements for inclusion in the record.

Mr. MARCY. I have statements here by Justus E. Wyman; Mr. Richard Short; Mr. Wuichet, of Los Angeles; Charles H. Epperson; Bella N. Zilberman; Roger Kent; Melissa Sparks; Hazel Nickerson; G. Spencer Wice; Mrs. Glenn M. MacHovec; and Frances M. Bacon. (The statements referred to are as follows:)

UNITED NATIONS COMMITTEE OF SACRAMENTO,
Sacramento, Calif., April 8, 1955.

We, the United Nations Committee of Sacramento, wish to express our appreciation for the worthy cause your committee has undertaken. We feel, however, that a formal revision of the entire charter of the United Nations would be impractical at this time. Due to the current status of world affairs, we

believe that that a greater degree of success can be achieved through the natural evolution of the charter, as was experienced at the beginning of the Korean war and the 1954 resolution of the General Assembly.

JUSTUS E. WYMAN,

Chairman, U. N. Committee of Sacramento.

NOTE.—Each member of the 20 member committee represents a different organization such as League of Women Voters, World Affairs Council, YMCA, etc.

APRIL 6, 1955.

COMMITTEE OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,

United States Senate,

Per San Francisco City Hall

DEAR SIRs: This is in response to a request for grass-roots opinions concerning possible changes in the Charter of the United Nations that would be in the interests of the United States and world peace generally.

The charter of the United Nations reads as follows:

Article 47, paragraph 1:

"There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments and possible disarmament."

It is interesting to note that the Secretary of Security Council Affairs has always been a Russian. Three men have held this office. They are A. A. Sobolev (1946-49), Constantia E. Zinchenko (1950-53), and Ilya S. Tchrymchev (1953—).

All orders transmitted to troops in the field (including American troops in Korea) must pass through the Security Council and come to the attention of its Soviet Secretary. For the United Nations Charter further stipulates: article 47, paragraph 3: "The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible through the Security Council for the strategic directions of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council."

This does not mean that the Security Council merely receives reports from commanders in the field. It means that the Security Council through its Military Staff Committee originates strategy and that its secretary (a Soviet citizen) has knowledge of this strategy before it is transmitted to commanders on the battlefronts.

This is not to say that reports from the fighting fronts did not pass over the desk of the Secretary for the Department of Security Council Affairs, for the book "Everyman's United Nations," published by the United Nations Department of Public Information has this to say (p. 43), "Under the July 7, (1950) resolution, the United States was asked to provide the Council with reports on the course of action under the United Command (in Korea). The first such report was communicated to the Council on July 25, and subsequent reports have covered semimonthly periods. In addition, the many communiques issued by the Command on day-to-day operations have been transmitted to the Council."

From this it will be seen that the Secretary of the Department of Security Council Affairs, a Soviet citizen, had access both to the orders being issued to the field commanders, and the reports received from them. This Soviet Secretary had his fingers on the pulse of the war.

On December 14, 1952, Fulton Lewis, Jr., reported in his column that the important office held by Sobolev, Zinchenko, etc., had been awarded to the Russians by a deal made between Alger Hiss and Molotov in London, 1945-46. This also was reported in the American Mercury magazine (November 1952) (p. 41).

The continued presence of a Soviet citizen in the office of Secretary to the powerful Council is alarming enough. But it should be kept in mind that high ranking Soviet officers are members of the Military Staff Committee that makes United Nations strategy, and always will be.

The United Nations Charter reads, article 47, paragraph 2: "The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives."

Russia is a permanent member of the Security Council, so her officers participate in and are aware of all decisions.

According to the latest United Nations Yearbook (September 1953) Russia's members on the Military Staff Committee were Maj. Gen. Ivan A. Sklizrov (for the Red army) and Lt. Gen. A. R. Sharov (for the Red air force).

I believe that if we cannot change these rules, then we had better get out of the U. N., or get Russia out of this organization. We could, if Russia were out, reorganize the U. N. as a bloc against her. At any rate, it means the murder of millions of our fighting men to fight under these conditions, and certain defeat for America.

Yours truly,

RICHARD F. SHORT,
Salesman, West Sacramento, Calif.

LOS ALTOS, CALIF., April 7, 1955.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, United States Senate Subcommittee on U. N. Charter,
City Hall, San Francisco:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, uncertain at the moment of my ability to attend the hearings on Saturday April 9, same but short and the docket likely already filled, the writer begs to submit his personal studies on the subject of charter review, and respectfully requests that they be incorporated into the printed report of the hearings, as brought forth herein..

The articles of the charter seem to resemble the cards of a well shuffled deck of ordinary playing cards, each article alone seemingly harmless and of noble purpose. But as in a deck of cards laid out in "pairs" or "flushes," the articles arranged in groups take on a new light of threatening dimensions.

Reviewing such a group arranged in convenient sequence, article 2, clause 7, first appeared as sufficient blanket protection against infringement by the United Nations upon the internal affairs of any nation, and without it our Senate most certainly would not have ratified the charter as a treaty, the same reading:

"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 * * *

The remaining articles of such group, however, nullify the widely accepted protection of this article, through the device of setting up agencies authorized to investigate the simplest of matters of civil and domestic life throughout the nations, to draw up draft conventions and treaties designed to in their minds correct these matters, for acceptance by the General Assembly, ratification by the states or nations, binding member nations to give every assistance in the achievement of the expressed purposes of the charter as further developed by such treaties including internal legislation by the states when necessary (through not clearly stated), and empowering the organization to enforce compliance upon members, and upon nonmembers alike. Study of this group of articles should confirm this interpretation, and verify that we already may have world government, thus:

Article 7—1: "There are established as the principal organs of the United Nations: * * * an Economic and Social Council (Unesco) * * *

Article 13—1: "The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of: * * * (b) promoting international cooperation in the economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields * * * assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms * * *

Article 55: "With a view * * * the United Nations shall promote:

(a) higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

(b) solutions of the international economic, social, health, and related problems; and the international cultural and educational cooperation;

(c) universal * * * observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms * * *

Article 57—1: "The varied specialized agencies, * * * having wide international responsibilities, * * * in economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related fields, shall be brought into relationship with the United Nations * * *

Article 62—1: "The Economic and Social Council may take or initiate studies and reports with respect to the international economic, social, cultural, educational, health, and related matters and may make recommendations * * *

Article 62—3: "It may prepare draft conventions (*treaties*) for submission to the General Assembly * * *

Article 64—1: "It may make arrangements with Members of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies to obtain reports of the steps taken (or not taken) to give effect to its own recommendations * * *

Article 56: "All members *pledge themselves to take joint and separate action * * ** for the *achievement* of the purposes set forth in article 55."

Article 2—2: "All Members * * * *shall fulfill* in good faith the *obligations* assumed by them in accordance with the *present charter*."

—5 "All Members *shall give* the United Nations *every assistance* in *any action it takes* * * *"

—6: "The organization *shall insure* that states which are *not* members (or withdraw) * * * *act in accordance* * * *"

[All emphasis added.]

Neither student nor parliamentarian, but otherwise a layman of perhaps average intelligence, factual world government evident in the wording of the original charter, this witness asks just why the ever present cry to "strengthen the United Nations," if not to conceal the fact that we already have world government? Why the present costly study on the part of our Senate envisioned to gather opinion as to just what changes in the charter might benefit the Republic of the United States of America, the purpose of the present hearings?

It would seem that knowledge of existing fact, and answers to these questions, have already been too long delayed. Other pertinent questions bearing on the subject as a whole might start with: Just why do men in and out of Government, and the press and other communications persist in stressing the dangers of communism from beyond our shores, when it seems most apparent from Communist sources that world communism is to be accomplished by peaceful means, quite likely through the vehicle of world government? Accustomed to a representative elected government, Americans have perhaps missed a point in their judgment of the United Nations, due also perhaps in some measure to their idealism and natural good will toward all people. They have missed the point that there is no elective representation of the people of the world in the United Nations body. The delegates rather are appointive, and represent not the people, but the Socialist-Collectivist-Communist power-governments of the world, as the case may be.

As for the planned peaceful accomplishment of world communism, to verify we have but to refer to quotes in a Chicago address February 12 by Hon. Kit Clardy, former Congressman from the sovereign State of Michigan, which appears on page A1890 of the Congressional Record of March 21. These quotes as repeated below come respectively from: (1) Lenin's writings of 1922, and (2) facts told those attending the Lenin School of Political Warfare, over 20 years ago. Thus:

(1) "First we will take Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. *We will not have to attack*; it will fall like over-ripe fruit in our hands. We must secure the good will of teachers and professors in schools and universities, of liberal ministers of religion, and of the pacifists and reformers of the world in order to create a mental barrage in the minds of capitalistic youth, which shall forever bar them from participating in a carnal conflict with the Communist order."

(2) " * * * To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, *stupid and decadent*, will rejoice to *cooperate in their own destruction*. * * *"

[All emphasis added.]

Just how far this Nation and the world has already progressed toward world government should be quite evident from what has now been read from the original and present charter, to any thinking person. Likewise, the disastrous position of this country with respect to engulfment by world communism should be as apparent. The question before the subcommittee should without question be confined to just what changes in the charter would improve and secure the position of the United States in the pattern of freedom and justice and individual effort as designed so wisely by our forefathers so many years ago in our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, our Bill of Rights.

The task of preserving this Nation and our way of life rests upon the judgment and action of this subcommittee, and upon our elective representatives in Congress. It represents at this time a grave responsibility, and to be borne in mind in their judgment and action, whether in respect to the United Nations or otherwise, should ever be the words of Webster:

"We live under the only government that ever existed which was framed by the unrestrained and deliberate consultations of the people. Miracles do not

cluster. That which has happened but once in 6,000 years cannot be expected to happen often. Such a government once gone, might leave a void to be filled for ages with revolution and tumult, riot and despotism."

Respectfully submitted.

WEST WUICHET.

STOCKTON, CALIF., April 8, 1955.

HON. SENATOR GEORGE,
In care of City Hall Chambers,
City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been fighting communism through the American Legion since it was organized in 1919. I am at present chairman of Americanism for this district. This letter, however, is written strictly in my private capacity.

In my opinion, no action in regard to the United Nations would be adequate for American needs unless the questions raised by Senator Bricker in his address of March 6 before the Twentieth Century Club of Pittsburgh, Pa., are properly met. I enclose copy of that release herewith, though I suppose you have received several of them from other sources. I hope you can attach it to your report, or incorporate it in your work.

Yours truly,

CHAS. H. EPPERSON.

**TEN QUESTIONS ABOUT THE UNITED NATIONS AND AMERICAN SOVEREIGNTY—
ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHN W. BRICKER BEFORE THE TWENTIETH CENTURY
CLUB—PITTSBURGH, PA., MARCH 6, 1955**

When Abraham Lincoln entered the White House, America was torn by a great constitutional issue. The question was: Shall the American Union be preserved? The Constitution provided no clear-cut answer on the asserted right of States to secede. Accordingly, it became necessary to settle on the battlefield the constitutional issue involved.

After a decade of participation in the United Nations, we face a constitutional issue just as explosive. It is: Shall the Union be kept American? Now is the time to settle this question by constitutional procedures.

Is disintegration of the American Union into its component parts any worse than submerging the Union in some world or regional superstate? I think not. The advocate of secession and the proponent of world government or Atlantic Union have this in common. Each would pledge loyalty to some political entity smaller or larger than the American Union which the War Between the States was fought to preserve.

Many influential organizations, public officials, and private citizens contend that the United Nations is a government; that its charter is a world constitution; that sovereign powers of the United States have been surrendered to the U. N. by treaty and by less formal international agreements and understandings. Adherents to this point of view are increasingly reluctant to admit that the United States has a right to withdraw from the U. N. Remember that on this vital question the charter is silent. Today, the United States has the power to withdraw from the United Nations, just as the Southern States, in 1800 for example, had the power to withdraw from the Union. But "power" and "right" are not synonymous. Unless our relationship with the United Nations is clarified within the reasonably near future, we shall bequeath to our children and grandchildren almost certain civil strife.

The minority leader of the Senate, Senator Knowland, of California, is a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on U. N. Charter Revision. This subcommittee is now considering what amendments to the U. N. Charter should be supported by the United States at a charter review conference expected to be held in 1956 or 1957. Senator Knowland has called for a realistic appraisal of the role which the U. N. is qualified to play. In this appraisal, Senator Knowland deserves the wholehearted cooperation and support of all patriotic Americans. In particular, you should read Senator Knowland's speech of February 18, 1955, in San Francisco in which he said:

"As for me, as long as I have a voice or a vote in the Senate of the United States, I shall never consent to permitting the guaranties of freedom under our Constitution being diluted or modified directly or indirectly by any organization having in powerful policy positions nations which have no appreciation of or respect for free institutions."

And then, Senator Knowland made this suggestion :

"Lest we be gradually edged into such a world state before we learn too late wherein we have been taken, I believe that every candidate for public office—executive, legislative, or judicial—should be asked to give a forthright view upon this great public issue."

No more important question can be asked. It should be put to candidates for every public office from the lowest in the country up to and including the office of President. In addition, I would like to suggest 10 specific questions, the answers to which will show how public officials and candidates for public office feel about the United States gradually being edged into a world state.

Question No. 1: "Should the United States have the right to withdraw from the U. N. and should the U. N. Charter expressly so provide?" My answer is "Yes."

When the United Nations Charter was being considered by the Senate, we were given repeated assurances that U. N. members had a right to withdraw from the organization. However, in the decade following ratification of the charter, I do not recall hearing a President, a Secretary of State, or other high official mention this important right. Surely we are entitled to some reaffirmation of the right to withdraw when the existence of such a right was one of the official arguments employed in support of U. N. participation.

Question No. 2: "Is the U. N. Charter a world constitution?" My answer is "No."

All advocates of world government hold one view in common. They believe that the United Nations Charter is, or should become, a world constitution. Some proponents of world government seek an amendment to the American Constitution; others propose to seek the advice and consent of the Senate; others would bypass both the Senate and the American people in their zeal to attain world government. All recognize, however, that a contract among sovereign nations cannot serve as the organic law for a world community.

The word "constitution" is generally defined as the fundamental organic law of a particular community. "Organic" refers to the law by virtue of which a government exists. I do not agree with Senator Wiley's conclusion that the United Nations Charter is an "organic instrument." The United Nations is not, and was never intended to be, a government. Throughout the charter, the United Nations is described as an organization. To recognize the United Nations Charter as a constitutional document would place American independence and the liberty of American citizens in grave jeopardy.

There is a crucial difference between a treaty or contract on the one hand and a constitution on the other. A constitution is regarded by the American people as intended to endure for the ages. Accordingly, they have never consented for themselves or for their children to be bound in perpetuity by an organic law enacted by ordinary legislative or treaty-making processes. Before entering into any solemn constitutional compact, they have demanded and received a more direct voice in its formulation and approval. Nothing is more contrary to the American tradition of government than the suggestion that the President and the Senate in 1945 executed for the American people, and without their knowledge and consent, a constitutional document.

Who contends that the United Nations is a government and its charter a potential constitution for world government? In his book, "War or Peace," published in 1950, Mr. John Foster Dulles said he had never seen any proposal for world government "which could not be carried out either by the United Nations or under the United Nations Charter."

A study made by the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year concluded that "in some respects the Charter of the United Nations is much like the Constitution." According to this staff study:

"We are by no means studying the charter that was drafted in San Francisco in 1945. We are examining the charter of 1954 as it has been amplified by custom and usage, resolutions of various U. N. organs, and treaties * * *"

Liberty in America will be lost unless we insist, in accordance with the facts and representations made at the time the charter was ratified, that the President and the Senate made a contract, the terms of which cannot be changed without the consent of the President and the Senate. In addition, we must make sure that not even the President and the Senate can make changes in that contract that conflict with the Constitution of the United States. The President and the Senate can assume or alter the contractual obligations of treaties. Only the American people should have the right to make or alter the constitutions under which they live.

Question No. 3: "Should the United Nations Charter be amended without the advice and consent of the Senate?" My answer is, "No."

On the premise that the U. N. Charter is a constitution, many rabid internationalists contend that the charter should be amended informally for the purpose of making the U. N. a world government. A more reactionary theory has never come to my attention.

Who contends that the U. N. Charter should be amended without the advice and consent of the Senate? Mr. Ernest A. Gross, formerly United States Ambassador to the U. N., wrote in the January 1954 issue of "Foreign Affairs": "Flexibility is the life blood that sustains and perpetuates constitutions." This, he said, "underlines the advisability of letting the United Nations Charter evolve, little by little, case by case." Mr. Gross prefers this "constitutional" evolution of the charter to formal charter amendments. He expressed a fear that formal amendments to the Charter might raise in the Senate or in the United Nations embarrassing issues connected with my proposed constitutional amendment designed to prevent treaties from overriding our Constitution.

The American Association for the United Nations, through its executive director, Clark Eichelberger, recommended to a Senate committee in 1950 that evolution of the U. N. into a world government be achieved by a "liberal interpretation of the charter."

Dr. Philip C. Jessup in *A Modern Law of Nations*, published in 1948, swept aside as obsolete the traditional rule of international law that treaties can be amended only with the consent of the parties thereto.

Mr. Benjamin Cohen, writing in the October 1954 issue of the *Journal of the American Association of University Women* warned against pressing for controversial amendments at the proposed U. N. Charter Revision Conference. He concluded that "the same purposes can be achieved through the normal evolutionary processes projected in the charter," without, of course, the consent of the American people and their elected representatives.

Since when has it been proper to deny to the American people the right to choose under what form of government they shall live? The doctrine that the U. N. charter can be amended without the consent of the President and the Senate is a blueprint for tyranny. The people of the United States are not even represented in the U. N. General Assembly. The President's representative in that body has only 1 vote out of 60. A majority of those 60 delegates represent Communist, Socialist, Fascist, or feudal governments. I think it is wrong—morally, politically, and legally wrong—to regard the United Nations as a government. If by fanciful interpretation of its charter the U. N. acquires governmental power, that power is certainly not derived from the consent of the governed. We are going to have a showdown on this issue next year when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee makes its report to the Senate.

Question No. 4: "Are the constitutional rights of American citizens appropriate subjects for U. N. treaty negotiation?" My answer is, "No."

Article 2 (7) is the domestic jurisdiction clause of the charter. In 1945, the Senate was assured that this clause adequately protected our domestic jurisdiction from U. N. interference. Unfortunately, the protection that article 2 (7) was intended to provide has been whittled away by informal amendments to the charter. Article 2 (7) provides in part:

"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 * * *."

That language seems clear enough on its face. However, the United Nations circumvented that restriction on its power in three ways. The first was the argument that there is no longer any real difference between foreign and domestic affairs, thus making article 2 (7) a dead letter. The second method of evasion was to say that the vague terminology of articles 55 and 56 internationalized fundamental human rights, thereby lifting them from the area of domestic jurisdiction. And finally, the United Nations adopted the view that subjects ceased to be matters of domestic concern when dealt with in a United Nations treaty or resolution of the General Assembly.

Article 2, paragraph 7, must be amended to make it clear that the United Nations has no authority to draft international agreements or resolutions on subjects that are essentially domestic in character. Pending the adoption of an adequate treaty-control amendment, the American people are entitled to that protection in the U. N. Charter. The American people can never give their

wholehearted support to any international organization or to any government that exercises undelegated and doubtful powers. They can never be satisfied with any international organization or with any government that claims the right to alter the instrument of its creation.

Question No. 5: "Is it desirable to create a system of world law through the United Nations or NATO applicable to individuals?" My answer is, "No."

There are only two ways in which the United States can be brought under the domination of a world or regional superstate. The first is by military conquest. I have no fear of that. The real danger lies in the voluntary surrender of national sovereignty to the U. N. or to some other international organization which possesses legislative, executive, or judicial power directly applicable to the individual. So long as legislative, executive, and judicial power is applied to the American people only by their national and State governments, the United States of America will continue to be a sovereign, independent nation. That is the primary test of national sovereignty.

Americans would be no better off if they were brought under the executive, legislative, and judicial power of an Atlantic Union superstate. Under the Atlantic Union proposal the United States would become a vassal province in a regional superstate evolving out of NATO. We have good reason to be alarmed when 14 Senators led by Senator Kefauver and 16 Representatives call for exploration of the desirability of junking the American Declaration of Independence.

Question No. 6: "Should the Genocide Convention be ratified by the United States prior to the adoption of a constitutional amendment making any treaty provision in conflict with the Constitution null and void?" My answer is, "No."

Genocide is a newly coined word to describe mass killing such as that practiced by Hitler in Germany. It is hardly necessary to observe that all Americans are opposed to genocide—or that genocide in the United States is prohibited by Federal and State constitutions.

Unfortunately, the United Nations Convention on Genocide is actually a homicide convention. The treaty definition of genocide is not limited to the mass murder of national, racial, ethnical, and religious groups. The killing of one American by another under certain conditions would satisfy the treaty definition of genocide. In fact, no killing is required at all. The treaty defines genocide to include the infliction of "mental harm."

Therefore, if we should ratify the Genocide Convention before plugging the loophole in our Constitution, we would be making mere homicide, libel, and slander international crimes. Moreover, the Genocide Convention envisions trial in an International Criminal Court. The U. N. is now working on a draft statute for an International Criminal Court. However, that document contains no provision for ratification by U. N. member nations in accordance with their constitutional processes. It has been suggested that the International Criminal Court might be created by resolution of the U. N. General Assembly.

I shall never cast my vote to repudiate a principle for which the American Revolution was fought. Our forefathers condemned George III for transporting them beyond the seas for the trial of pretended offenses. It is infinitely worse to send Americans abroad for trial before one or more Communist judges and without the protection of the Bill of Rights.

The grim irony in all the discussions about the Genocide Convention is that it does not cover the type of genocide practiced in the Soviet Union. Because the Genocide Convention does not cover extermination of political groups, Communist Russia was able to ratify the treaty. Originally, our State Department insisted that mass murder of political groups be prohibited; that if it were not, the treaty would be a cruel hoax. After being outvoted on this fundamental point, the Acheson State Department became a vociferous advocate of the Genocide Convention. What the position of the Dulles State Department is, nobody knows. Certainly the American people are entitled to know. All we know is that the State Department is not pressing for ratification at this time. It would be most unwise to consider ratification of the Genocide Convention prior to the adoption of a treaty-control amendment, but that can hardly be the reason why the State Department is not now pressing for ratification.

Question No. 7: "Should freedom of religion and other civil and political freedoms be restricted in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations draft covenants on human rights?" My answer is, "No."

The U. N. covenants on human rights would give to government the power to limit freedom of religion under the pretext of protecting the public safety, order, health, and morals. Freedom of speech, press, assembly, and the right to a public

trial are subject to the same restrictions. In addition, those basic rights could be withdrawn during any public emergency "which is officially proclaimed." The right to own property is not mentioned in the draft covenants because most U. N. members do not regard it as a fundamental human right.

My proposed constitutional amendment would keep the inalienable rights of the American people in the spiritual realm; beyond the power of government to alienate by treaty or executive agreement. The United Nations to the contrary notwithstanding, the divinely bestowed rights of the individual are not proper subjects of barter at international conference tables. As you witness efforts by the United Nations to control freedom of worship, recall what James Madison said in 1785 in his famous Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments:

"The religion then of every man must be left to the conviction and conscience of every man; and it is the right of every man to exercise it as these may dictate. This right is in its nature an unalienable right * * * We maintain therefore that in matters of religion, no man's right is abridged by the institution of civil society, and that religion is wholly exempt from its cognizance."

Question No. 8: "Should economic freedom be restricted in accordance with the provisions of the universal declaration of human rights and as provided in numerous economic treaties proposed by the U. N. and its specialized agencies?" My answer is, "No."

Blind worshippers of the U. N. often say that the Communist bloc is consistently outvoted on all important issues arising in the United Nations and its specialized agencies. That is not true. The United States is usually in the minority on economic issues. And, no wonder. Very few members of the United Nations have a free, competitive enterprise system. Most of the economic treaties and resolutions kicking around in the U. N. faithfully reflect basic Marxist tenets. In fact, when Dr. Charles Malik of Lebanon headed the U. N. Human Rights Commission, he observed that various amendments to the economic part of human rights covenants were Communist inspired.

Question No. 9: "Is the United Nations an effective collective security agency?" My answer is, "No."

We should have learned from the tragic experience in Korea that collective security through the United Nations provides neither safety nor a fair sharing of the burden. It is the height of folly to rely on the divided counsels of the U. N. either to punish the Communist aggressors in its midst or those aggressors which it seeks to admit to the family circle.

The United Nations does have an important role to play. It serves as a world forum for the airing and possible settlement of international disputes. However, the U. N. cannot act simultaneously as an effective mediator and as the world's policeman. Our U. N. Ambassador, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., was right when he denied that the U. N. is a "world government," a "federation," a "government," an "alliance," or a "society." He described it, quite accurately in my judgment, as an "arena," a "device," a "contrivance," and a "forum."

I am no opponent of the principle of collective security. I have voted for every one of the regional defense treaties and mutual security pacts that have been presented to the Senate in the postwar years. These treaties include NATO, ANZUS, SEATO, the protocols admitting Greece and Turkey to NATO, and mutual defense treaties with Japan, Korea, and Free China. It is on this network of mutual defense alliances, and not on the United Nations, that the United States must rely for collective security.

Question No. 10: "Should any President or Senate have the power to scuttle by treaty or otherwise the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States?" My answer is, "No."

The constitutional amendment for which I have been working would establish the following principles:

1. No treaty or other international agreement in conflict with the Constitution shall be of any force or effect; and
2. No treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States except by valid legislation duly enacted by the elected representatives of the American people.

The Supreme Court has held, or strongly implied, and Mr. Dulles has declared, that treaties can take powers from the States and from the Congress and give them to the President or to some international body. Here is a special list of questions for those who oppose any limitation on the power to make treaties and executive agreements:

1. What powers do you want to take from the States and give to the President or to the United Nations?

2. What powers do you want to take from the Congress and give to the President, to the U. N., to NATO, or some other international body?

3. What laws for the people of the United States should be made by executive agreement not approved by either House of Congress?

The American people are beginning to ask questions and that is good. They are beginning to wonder how many of their public servants agree with former Justice Owen Roberts when he said, "we must not stand on the silly shibboleth of national sovereignty," and that "sovereignty must be surrendered to some higher authority, call it what you will."

As Senator Knowland has suggested, you should ask every candidate for public office how he stands on the issue of American participation in a world or regional superstate. The 10 specific questions I have suggested will help you determine whether a candidate is for America, or whether he seeks to submerge the Union which Lincoln labored so diligently to maintain as the supreme political authority for all Americans.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., April 9, 1955.

United States Senators WILLIAM KNOWLAND and JOHN SPARKMAN,

U. N. Public Hearing Charter Committee,

City Hall, San Francisco.

As author and originator of the New Deal I advise U. N. continue service more strongly than before. Subdue the wild and woolly expressions of our general United States press. Good luck to U. N. success for peace.

BELLA N. ZILBERMAN.

CRIMMINS, KENT, DRAPER & BRADLEY,

San Francisco 8, Calif., April 8, 1955.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,

In care of KRON-TV, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I regret very much that I will be unable to appear personally before your committee when it hears testimony in San Francisco but hope you will permit me to file this letter. The amendment of the United Nations Charter which seems to me to be of overriding importance concerns membership on the Security Council.

I take it that the following facts are almost uniformly accepted:

1. The Security Council must be composed of five of the most important world powers.

2. Nationalist China is no longer an important world power.

3. There would appear to be little or no chance that the Nationalist Chinese will again become the government of China on the mainland.

4. It would be tremendously disadvantageous to the United States should Red China be seated as a member of the Security Council.

5. The East and Middle East are areas of the world which are of tremendous and growing importance because of large populations in ferment and because of their enormous natural resources. They must be represented on the Security Council.

It therefore seems to me that the United States should advocate a revision of the charter which would result in seating some Far East or Middle East power other than Nationalist China or Red China on the Security Council. The choice would seem to lie between India and Pakistan. Pakistan may be a better friend and ally of the United States than India but there seems to be no question but that India is of greater world importance. A nomination by the United States of India would also produce a dilemma for the Russians, in my opinion. Can they afford to oppose the seating of India? Will they favor it?

India has done things that we object to, but so have France and England. India is presently non-Communist and it is my belief that recognition of India's importance in the world by a seat on the Security Council (under our sponsorship) will help to keep her that way.

I strongly recommend that the United States take the position that India should replace Nationalist China as a member of the Security Council.

I am chairman of the Democratic State Central Committee for Northern California but these views are my own and the proposal I make has never been taken up by the Democratic State Central Committee. I was general counsel of the Defense Department from March 1952 to May 1953.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER KENT.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Hon. Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: I believe the United States can best serve its own interests and that of world peace by withdrawing from the United Nations. The dream that the United Nations was to be a "parliament of nations" and "a federation of the world" did not survive the first United Nations year. The American offer to internationalize atomic energy by a system of controls and inspection was given the runaround by Russia. Russia saw to it that the whole atomic issue became bogged down in technicalities so that she could have time to catch up in perfecting her own A-bomb and H-bomb. This issue is still unsolved before the General Atomic Energy Commission, proving that the United Nations machinery was useful in advancing the interests of communism, not those of the free world. How can we expect the free countries to think that we are their leader for a peaceful world?

We cannot hope to benefit by continued membership in the United Nations because it is an atheistic organization. Faith in God is woven into our government from the very early days when the Constitutional Congress met in Philadelphia. Benjamin Franklin led these men in a prayer meeting out of which emerged the immortal Constitution of the United States. We have coins which read "In God We Trust," and we have Bibles in American courtrooms. Some of our early educational institutions founded in the interest of religious education were Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Dartmouth. How can we be sincere in our leadership of Christian nations when we subscribe to paying the greatest part of a bill which allows an atheistic organization to function?

The Korean war was convincing proof that we can never hope to win a police action or a peace settlement within the military framework of the United Nations. A Soviet citizen has always been Secretary of the Department of Security Council Affairs. Also high-ranking Soviet officers are members of the Military Staff Committee that makes United Nations strategy and always will be. The United Nations Charter reads:

Article 47, paragraph 2: "The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives."

Russia is a permanent member of the Security Council so her officers participate in and are aware of all decisions. The Freeman, September 21, 1953, quoted Secretary of State John Foster Dulles: "We have set up an organization for the alleged purpose of preventing war and aggression and have included in its inner command the power that is carrying on perpetual war and aggression. We have put the top criminal on the Police Commission."

Can the American people possibly believe that other free nations will fight with us again under the United Nations flag after shameful "Korea"?

The United Nations Commission on Human Rights has held over 400 meetings, refusing to approve for the so-called draft of the so-called International Covenant on Human Rights, a provision recognizing the right to own private property and to be secure in its enjoyment against the arbitrary seizure by government. The basis of the ideological conflict between Communists and the free world is the concept of property and its ownership. Doesn't this show a dominating Soviet influence on the part of the Human Rights Commission? How can the free countries of the world believe that we are their strong leader when such proceedings occur?

When the majority of the American people know the real meaning of the United Nations Charter provisions, they will reject internationalism in this form and return to a nationalistic policy. Then we shall be able to take great strides as a leader among free nations for a peaceful world.

MELLISA SPARKS.

LOS ANGELES 5, CALIF.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE,
Care of Richard Dolan, City Hall,
San Francisco.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Please accept my expression of great interest in your forthcoming hearings. I wish to state my personal views to you, as being wholeheartedly in sympathy with a charter revision that will give the U. N. power to legislate against war.

Naturally I do not wish to see any of the great accomplishments of the U. N. hampered, but it seems necessary for the wisest heads of various governments to act through the U. N. It would seem to be a much more delayed process if peoples are to reach a friendly relationship before war is outlawed.

I can think of no better example than that taken by the Supreme Court of the United States in the matter of segregation. Someone must take the lead and give encouragement to the less-informed peoples of the world.

Most sincerely,

HAZEL NICKERSON.

VALLEY 57TH DISTRICT REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY,
LOS ANGELES COUNTY REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY,
Studio City, Calif., April 6, 1955.

THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, U. N. CHARTER REVISION SUBCOMMITTEE,
United States Senate.

GENTLEMEN: The following resolution was passed unanimously this evening by our Valley 57th District Republican Assembly, with the request that it be inserted in the official hearings of your committee:

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations was so written, and ratified by the United States Senate, as to provide for the unanimous approval of all permanent members of the Security Council in order to make valid any revision of this charter; and

"Whereas this gives the Soviet a veto over any revision of this charter; and

"Whereas this constitutes a Soviet veto over international law, as provided in any such revisions of that charter; and

"Whereas that charter, as a treaty, is the law of the United States of America; and

"Whereas this situation also gives the same veto to the Soviet as regards the law of the land in this instance; and

"Whereas neither the people of this Nation, the Congress, nor the Senate will ever have an opportunity to act upon any revision unless it has already been approved by the Soviet: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That no revision of the United Nations Charter be attempted, entered into, instigated, or completed by the Government of the United States or any representative of the United States at this time."

Passed unanimously in regular assembly meeting, this 6th day of April 1955.

Very truly yours,

G. SPENCER WICE,
Corresponding Secretary.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., April 6, 1955.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS
COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
*City Hall, Chambers of Board of Supervisors,
San Francisco, Calif.*

GENTLEMEN: It is our understanding that there are to be public hearings on revision of the United Nations Charter held at the above address on Saturday, April 9, 1955. Since these hearings are to be held in San Francisco and none will be held in Los Angeles, and since it is impossible for either of us to attend, we are herewith requesting that the following be read before your committee and also be made part of the record.

(The resolutions referred to will be found in the testimony of Mrs. Hayes on pp. 1335-1337.)

Resolution No. 1, United Nations Charter Revision
Resolution No. 2, Specialized agencies of the United Nations
Resolution No. 3, United Nations Oath
Resolution No. 4, withdrawal from United Nations

Copies of the above four resolutions are attached. These resolutions are all pertinent to the subject matter, and were passed at San Francisco, Calif., February 25, 1955, by the California delegates attending the California State Conference of the Daughters of the American Revolution. We are both members of the DAR State and National.

We also would like to request that the paper clipping taken from the Augusta, Ga., Chronicle, March 25, 1955, titled "Augustan Levels Complaint; Partisanship

Is Charged to U. N. Study Committee" be read and made part of the record. This is attached.

(The article referred to is on file with the committee and a complete record of the Atlanta hearing has been published.)

Also we might mention the fact that should the full committee or any part of it care for material relative to this subject they read "The Hiss Case, a Lesson for the American People; Speech by Hon. Richard M. Nixon, of California, Dated Thursday, January 26, 1950." Also refer to page 2596, "Testimony of Dr. Marek Stanislaw Korowicz, Hearing Before the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, dated September 24, 1953." These are also attached but since they are quite long are not asking that they will be made part of the record in full.

(The material referred to is on file with the Committee.)

We very definitely feel that it has been proved without a doubt that there were enemies of the United States who helped frame the United Nations Charter in many of its aspects.

We are sending 12 copies of this letter to your attention. We would like a copy of your report.

Very truly yours,

MRS. GLENN M. MACHOVEC.
MISS FRANCES M. BACON.

This letter to be read and made part of the record.

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, pursuant to the instructions this morning by Senator Sparkman, who has been acting as chairman of the committee, after 4 minutes the witness will be notified that he has 1 minute remaining, and then at the conclusion of the 5 minutes, the witness will be expected to conclude his remarks so that we can move on to the additional witnesses to follow.

You may call the first witness for the afternoon session.

Mr. ISRAEL. Ray T. Elsmore. Following him will be Mr. Fagan.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mr. Elsmore, you may be seated.

STATEMENT OF RAY T. ELSMORE, PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Mr. ELSMORE. I presume the way now is "Mr. Chairman and Mr. Chairman." My name is Ray Elsmore, as given, and I am from Palo Alto, Calif. At the present time I am president of Western Sky Industries, a company that is engaged in the manufacture of airplanes in the bay area.

I am going to shorten my time to not more than 2 minutes and merely make an opening statement so that we will know in the record what I stand for, and then merely what we would like you to do.

First, I desire to go on record as favoring a review of the United Nations charter.

Secondly, I believe that some amendments should be made to the United Nations Charter, not only to strengthen it, but bring it up to date to the arrival of the atomic age.

ENFORCEMENT POWERS URGED

In my statement, which I am setting aside now, I want to direct my remarks to the amendment which I think is of greatest importance, and that is to give the United Nations the power to enforce some of the decisions that it makes, not all decisions, but I think those decisions that it has the power to enforce should be limited to those only that have to do with maintaining international peace.

I think the reluctance in having given that power to the United Nations already was a reluctance upon the part of the nations of the

world to give up some sovereignty. I think especially that is true with respect to the Big Four, and that is what I am addressing my remarks to at this time.

But I think it is mandatory for the continued peace of the world that some sovereignty be given up by member nations. I think it would be far less sovereignty that our Thirteen Original States gave up when they signed our Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

So I feel that it would be a limited amount of sovereignty to give up, merely enough to maintain international peace and not to enforce the economic, the social, the civic, and the various other instrumentalities that the United Nations has.

I am finishing up merely by making a statement which I would like to see you gentlemen here do.

My purpose, then, in appearing before this committee today is to urge that you as members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and finally, the Senate of the United States, take the lead in this country of ours in advocating and working strenuously for an amendment to the United Nations Charter which will give the United Nations the authority and the power to make binding decisions for keeping international peace.

In short, I urge you gentlemen here to use your influence to have the United States of America take the lead among the nations of the world in advocating an amendment to the United Nations Charter which will give the United Nations that vitally necessary power it now lacks.

Thank you very much.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Any questions?

Senator SPARKMAN. No.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Elsmore is as follows:)

STATEMENT TO COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, UNITED STATES SENATE, BY
RAY T. ELSMORE, PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Ray T. Elsmore of 428 North California Avenue, Palo Alto, Calif., and at the present time I am president of Western Sky Industries, a company engaged in the aircraft manufacturing industry in the San Francisco Bay area.

First, I desire to go on record as favoring the review of the United Nations Charter, a review which is provided for in the charter itself.

Secondly, I believe that some amendments should be made to the United Nations Charter, not only to strengthen the United Nations, but also to bring into being such provisions as have been found necessary because of the arrival of the atomic age since the charter was adopted.

I will direct my remarks to the amendment which I feel to be of paramount importance. The United Nations should be given the authority to make binding those decisions which are made to maintain international peace, and should also be given the means of enforcing those decisions once they are made.

I would limit the power and means of enforcement to those decisions which are made to maintain international peace; decisions made after full investigation of all the facts pertaining to international disputes or situations which threaten the peace of the world.

I believe that this power to enforce can well be given by an amendment creating a United Nations federal police force, heavily armed and of adequate strength to maintain the peace. Member nations would provide the manpower for this federal police force upon some equitable basis to be worked out. The size of this force could be gradually reduced as the various stages of universal

disarmament by member nations came into being. Whatever the means employed to give the United Nations this power of enforcement, I believe such power is mandatory if the United Nations is to achieve the high purpose expressed in the opening words of the preamble to the United Nations Charter, which reads as follows:

"We the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind, * * * and for these ends * * * to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, * * *"

So far the member nations have failed to provide the means for accomplishing the last quoted words of the preamble; "to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security." The prime reason for this failure, I believe, has been the reluctance of member nations, especially the Big Four, to surrender enough sovereignty to give to the United Nations a United Nations federal police force. This surrender would be of a very limited nature—just enough to maintain international peace—which conceivably could be vital to the continued existence of all mankind. It is far less sovereignty than the Original Thirteen States surrendered to our Federal Government when they ratified our own Constitution.

In speaking in favor of amendments, I do not wish to convey the idea that the United Nations is basically weak. On the contrary, I feel that the United Nations and the charter upon which it is founded are basically strong; that the United Nations has brought into being instrumentalities for good and the betterment of mankind undreamed of before the United Nations came into being just 10 years ago. I speak of the truce in Israel arranged through the instrumentality of the United Nations; of the Food and Agriculture Organization that has done so much to raise the living standards of underprivileged classes in remote corners of the earth by taking to them at comparatively small cost the techniques and the know-how that are so urgently needed; of UNESCO and other agencies of the United Nations that are accomplishing so much.

It is my firm belief that if we fail to give the United Nations the power to enforce its mandates insofar as they pertain to maintenance of international peace, then the entire United Nations organization is jeopardized. I am confident that not one of us here desires to see that happen.

My purpose then in appearing before this committee today, is to urge that you as members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, and finally the Senate of the United States, take the lead in this country of ours in advocating and working strenuously for an amendment to the United Nations Charter which will give the United Nations the authority to make binding decisions for keeping international peace, and the requisite power through a United Nations federal police force of enforcing such decisions once they are made. In short, I urge you gentlemen here to use your influence to have the United States of America take the lead among the nations of the world in advocating an amendment to the United Nations Charter which will give the United Nations that vitally necessary power it now lacks.

I thank you for the opportunity afforded me of appearing before your committee.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Myron C. Fagan, followed by Mr. Ammen.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MYRON C. FAGAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR, CINEMA EDUCATIONAL GUILD, INC., HOLLYWOOD, CALIF.

Mr. FAGAN. My name is Myron C. Fagan, and I live in Los Angeles, Calif., and I am the national director of the Cinema Educational Guild, which is a national organization fighting communism.

Now, gentlemen, I propose to establish that the United Nations is a sham and a fraud and a delusion; that it is the greatest menace in the United States today against our sovereignty.

I also propose to establish that in 1945, the United Nations employed deceit, fraud, and misrepresentation to delude and induce the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to ratify the treaty and the charter.

I would cite one instance. In their section 7 of article 2, I quote:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to interfere in matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of any state.

Senator McCarran and many others told me that that pledge was the thing that caused them to approve of the United Nations, and when that pledge was broken, Senator McCarran stated that that would be the one thing he would never forgive himself for.

Immediately after the ratification, the United Nations proceeded to transform itself into a super one-world government, and to replace our Constitution with their charter as the supreme law of the land.

U. N. INTERFERENCE WITH UNITED STATES ALLEGED

In my statement, I cite a number of court decisions which nullified our laws because they conflicted with the United Nations provisions.

We know what they attempted to do when Harry Truman attempted to seize the steel industry. We know what they tried to do with their genocide treaty. We know that they today have 200 such treaties hidden away prepared to sneak one over at the first opportunity they get.

The genocide pact would have muzzled every American and made him subject to United Nations laws without the protection of our Constitution or our Bill of Rights. They could seize an American citizen and transport him outside of the United States, try him before a United Nations tribunal, without the benefit of the protection of our Constitution.

Now, omission of secret agreements which gravely have a harmful effect on the United States is just as reprehensible as misrepresentation. At Yalta, during the secret meetings there, Alger Hiss and Molotov entered into a secret agreement which they did not dare to insert into the charter, to the effect that a Moscow Red at all times be—

Senator KNOWLAND. May we have order, please.

Might I interrupt the witness? At this morning's session, Senator Sparkman pointed out, under the rules of the Senate—and we are operating under the rules of the Senate here today—no indications of either approval or disapproval are permitted in the Senate Chamber, and we would ask that in the interests of carrying on orderly procedures here, the same rule be followed.

The witness may proceed.

Mr. FAGAN. At Yalta, Alger Hiss and Molotov entered into a secret agreement that the head of the Secretariat of the United Nations would have charge of all military affairs, such as the Korean police action; it would always be headed by a Moscow Red. As evidence that that secret agreement was kept, the first one was Arkady A. Sobelov. Mr. Sobelov had complete charge of the Korean police action. The Pentagon had to submit to him any orders that they would transmit to Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

As a result of the betrayal by Sobelov to the Embassy in Peiping, 142,000 of our boys were led into ambush, murdered, and maimed, and many of them are still in the dungeons in China, and the United

Nations, under whose flag they were forced to fight, does not even attempt to release them.

Gentlemen, it is my request that instead of revising, looking to the revisions, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigate the original ratification for the purpose of rescinding it.

Thank you, gentlemen.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Fagan is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY MYRON C. FAGAN, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE CINEMA EDUCATIONAL GUILD, INC.

My name is Myron C. Fagan. I am a citizen of the United States, now residing in Los Angeles. I am a playwright and author. I am also the national director of the Cinema Educational Guild, Inc., a nonprofit organization created in 1948 and incorporated in 1949, for the sole purpose of combating communism in the motion-picture industry and wherever it may be found. This organization has a wide membership throughout the United States.

I respectfully submit that when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee ratified the so-called treaty between the United States and the United Nations it was deluded and seduced into so doing by premeditated fraud, deceit, willing misrepresentation by the U. N., to wit:

The charter, when it was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, explicitly stated that the United Nations would not in any manner whatsoever interfere, or attempt to interfere, with our domestic laws, or encroach on our national sovereignty * * * the late Senator Pat McCarran publicly stated (as did other Members of both Houses of Congress) that it was that pledge in the charter that induced him to approve our membership in the United Nations.

But our signature of membership was hardly dry when the U. N., by acts and deeds, set itself up as a supergovernment whose charter supersedes our Constitution. So now we have the astonishing procedure in our American courts where the U. N. Charter is cited as domestic law. Among others, there are two historic cases from the State of California:

(1) In the case of *Perez et al. versus Lippold*, a white woman wanted to marry a Negro and a mandamus was cited to require the county clerk of Los Angeles County to issue a marriage license, even though California had a statute forbidding the intermarriage of these two races. The Supreme Court of California held that the California statute was unconstitutional—and went on to cite the U. N. Charter, which among other things provides “* * * to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom; and for these ends to practice tolerance in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.”

In other words, the courts of California assumed that the charter superseded our domestic law and cited the provisions of the U. N. Charter to support the right of the white woman to marry a Negro in that State.

(2) The case of *Sa Euijii v. The State of California*. Euijii was a Japanese alien, and under the California alien-land law he could not hold title to land, and upon his death his property went to the State. But the California courts held that by virtue of the U. N. Charter's article 17 of the Declaration of Human Rights, which proclaims the right of everyone to own property, that this alien had title to his property. The court went on to say, “Clearly such a discrimination against a people of one race is contrary both to the letter and to the spirit of the charter which, as a treaty, is paramount to every law of every State in conflict with it. The alien-land law must therefore yield to the treaty as the superior authority.”

There are many more equally brazen violations of that charter stipulation of no interference with our domestic laws; but the most positive evidence that the U. N. was deliberately set up and intended to destroy the sovereignty of the United States was made obvious when Truman attempted to seize the steel industry. Three United States Supreme Court Justices ruled that the U. N. Charter, by virtue of that “treaty,” supersedes the Constitution. Had 5 Justices ruled that way that would have been the end of American sovereignty—without recourse to, or consent of, the people—today, with Earl Warren and Harlan on that bench, we have 5 such Justices.

THE GENOCIDE TREATY

In 1950 the U. N. stealthily tried to induce our then still unsuspecting Senate Foreign Relations Committee to sign the Genocide Treaty. This committee is now fully familiar with all the horrifying provisions in that treaty, one of which decreed that any American citizen who would be charged—merely charged, mind you—with genocide could be seized by the U. N., transported to any part of the world they would designate, and placed on trial before a U. N. tribunal without protection of American laws, or defense by an American lawyer. Had our Senate ratified that vicious treaty it automatically would have deprived every American citizen of the freedom of speech as guaranteed by our Bill of Rights: it would have rendered our Constitution null and void.

The fact that our Senate Foreign Relations Committee was made aware—just in the nick of time—of the vile treachery embodied in that treaty and rejected it does not minimize the deliberate intent of the U. N. to destroy the sovereignty of the United States and of the American people.

To further emphasize that such is the witting and deliberate intent of the U. N., it is a matter of record that that organization has ready and on hand 200 similar treaties, each one containing provisions to destroy our domestic laws and our freedoms and to enslave the American people. All they are waiting for is an unguarded moment in which to slip those treaties over on us.

Still another deliberate United Nations plot to destroy the sovereignty of the United States is embodied in their UNESCO monstrosity. There are a number of devious schemes being designed by UNESCO, but because of time limitation, I will confine myself to their invasion of our schools with a craftily developed plan to brainwash our children into hatred of Americanism and love of one-worldism. I will establish it by quoting from their own books, in one of which they stated:

"Frequently, the family (parents) infects the child with nationalism * * * as long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education for world mindedness can produce only precarious results * * *. Kindergarten can correct the errors of home training, and can also prepare the child for membership, at about 7, in a group, the first on his way to membership in the world society * * *. History should be taught as a universal history * * * the study of it had better be postponed until the pupil is freed from the nationalist prejudices which now surround the teaching of history."

To those who would approve or condone that dastardly "UNESCO" scheme to brainwash love of country out of the minds and hearts of our children I merely repeat the words of Sir Walter Scott:

"Breathes there a man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land?"

CONCEALED SECRET AGREEMENTS

Omission of secret agreements affecting and menacing the freedoms and the lives of the American people are even more reprehensible than misrepresentation, and further invalidate our treaty with the United Nations. Such omission further induced the ratification of the treaty by a deluded Senate. The recently published Yalta papers revealed several secret agreements which, had they been included in the written charter, would have prevented ratification. However, in this paper I will deal with only one secret agreement which was deleted from the published Yalta papers, or, perhaps, never put in writing. I refer to the secret agreement made between Alger Hiss and Molotov—and approved by Roosevelt, Harry Hopkins, and Stalin—whereby the U. N. secretariat in charge of all military activities was to be headed permanently by a Moscow Communist. The name of the first such head was Arkady A. Sobolev, now Moscow's delegate to the U. N. When he was exposed he was succeeded by Konstantin Zynchenko, World War II censor of the Red army. When that character was exposed by the FBI he was succeeded by Ilya Chernyshev, another Moscow Red.

As a result of that secret agreement, it is a matter of record, publicly confirmed, directly and indirectly, by Generals MacArthur, Van Fleet, Ridgway, Mark Clark, and other field commanders, that Sobolev had revealed in advance to Moscow and Peiping every movement of arms, munitions and men—thus enabling the Chinese Reds and North Koreans to ambush and slaughter and maim 113,000 of our boys

In view of all that, I charge that the U. N. is an agency tailored and designed to permit and even to create here what has occurred in China, Korea, Indochina, and elsewhere. It provides an alibi for a delinquent Chief Executive and national administration. It serves as a shield for traitors. It effectively paralyzes the capacity of any member nation either to resist aggression or wage war in its own defense. It constitutes a beachhead not only for our Communist enemies but for any other enemy or potential enemy among the nationals of the nations constituting its membership. No better illustration could be cited than the most recent episode where American soldiers drafted for war are captured and condemned as spies by enemies who are not even members of the United Nations. The Chief Executive, whose obvious obligation is to provide for the common defense, and for the protection of our soldiers' rights, because of the charter, washes his hands of the whole matter, promising only measures "short of war"—which phrase must be interpreted to be no measure at all except a fatuous protest, and buckpassing to the United Nations. And the U. N., under whose so-called flag those boys were forced to fight, because of that charter, will not, or cannot, do anything to secure their release.

Under the circumstances I propose that, instead of holding hearings about revisions in the U. N. Charter, our Senate Foreign Relations Committee make a thorough investigation of the deceit and misrepresentations the U. N. practiced in securing the ratification of its charter—and then, based on their findings, rescind that original ratification. Only such an action can preserve the sovereignty of the United States and safeguard the American people.

Senator KNOWLAND. The next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Paul V. Ammen.

The next witness is Mr. Carto.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF PAUL VERNON AMMEN, ORINDA, CALIF.

Mr. AMMEN. My name is Paul Vernon Ammen, of Orinda, Calif. My occupation is that of secretary-treasurer and director of a manufacturing corporation in Oakland. I speak for myself and do not represent any organization.

Several times during my lifetime the actions of fanatics or super-nationalists in other countries have directly affected the course of my country and my life. In the past, it was the Nazi-Fascists, Japanese—at the present time the Russians. I have not the faintest idea who the next ones will be, nor how successful they will be in attempting to force their interests on mine. This has been happening since the earliest recorded history, with the severity of conflict increasing each time.

I believe it is possible to have one more war—but only one more. I understand that one more war would leave no nations or people strong enough to wage another war. This is not an alternative, but the course we are steadily following. We must devise a sound alternative for war and force a change in our course, thereby permanently eliminating this historical and drastic solution.

Many people in this country are too overwhelmed by the problem posed or feel too ineffective to act and, therefore, leave the solution of this problem to someone else. You gentlemen of the Senate cannot leave this responsibility to someone else—you are the "someone" who is charged with the responsibility of devising a just, enforceable peace in the interests of the world in general—my country specifically—my State, my community, and my family ultimately.

I believe that the United Nations is an instrument which offers us great possibilities for achieving a just, permanent peace.

GENERAL CHANGES SUGGESTED TO STRENGTHEN THE U. N.

I would not presume to go through the Charter of the United Nations, article by article, and suggest detailed changes. That is the responsibility of those capable and trained for such. I shall, however, set forth my ideas of what general changes in the charter must be accomplished to make the United Nations effective in maintaining peace.

First. There must be a comprehensive international law limited solely to the definition, maintenance, and breach of international peace. All nations and all individuals must be subject to this law.

Second. There must be an International Court of Justice to interpret and judge nations or individuals accused of breaching international peace. Its jurisdiction would be limited solely to cases involving a breach of international peace, and in such cases its jurisdiction is compulsory.

Third. An international police force must be established to enforce the actions of the International Court of Justice and to provide inspection teams to insure that all terms of an enforced disarmament are being complied with. A law that depends upon good faith solely for enforcement is unrealistic and unworkable. The international police force must be stronger than any other, or combination of other, nations' armed forces. The armed forces of each nation should be limited to those forces necessary to maintain their internal law and order. I would like to emphasize that I am strongly opposed to unilateral disarmament under present world conditions. I can envisage that, if an enforceable peace is accepted, disarmament could then be undertaken by all nations in stages, with international inspection teams certifying to each stage before the start of the next.

The international police force should be a permanent standing force, not a posse dependent upon voluntary contributions from each nation, based upon its particular interests as of a given moment. Effective controls and safeguards must be set up to prevent abuse of the police power and the domination of it by any particular nation.

Fourth. There must be an international legislature with its powers limited solely to those necessary for the promotion and preservation of international peace.

These, then, are the four absolutely necessary ingredients for international peace. In each case, these powers should be carefully delineated and limited solely to those necessary to maintain peace.

MINOR CHANGES ALSO LISTED

There are other corollary matters which should be considered at this time:

1. I believe there should be a bill of rights established to protect nations and individuals.

2. A strengthened United Nations should probably have a limited power of taxation to support its activities. This tax would be many, many times cheaper than the present huge expenditures that are necessary for each nation to maintain their present armed forces.

3. The present method of representation in the United Nations is inequitable, I believe. Representation by population solely would be

unacceptable. I believe a weighted representation could be worked out which would be equitable for all nations, large and small.

4. The membership in a strengthened United Nations should be open to all nations. I am opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations as now constituted, but in a strengthened United Nations it is mandatory that all nations be under its jurisdiction. In our society, we do not exclude robbers and murderers from our laws—we very forcibly contain them and hold them to account and punishment under the jurisdiction of our laws and society.

We do not know if the Iron Curtain countries would join in such a plan to strengthen the United Nations. I believe, however, that if the United States advanced such a plan and indicated its willingness to sit with the nations of the world to discuss it, we would have a powerful psychological weapon in the cold war.

These ideas are not new and untried—they are the ideas which founded this country. Our Constitution guarantees us peace within a federation of sovereign states with many divergent races, religions and interests.

What has worked so admirably for our country should, I believe, be extended now to the international level for a permanent, just peace.

I thank you, gentlemen, for extending me the privilege of expressing my views to you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Just one question, Mr. Ammen.

It is true that we have various people, including law violators, in our society, so to speak. Nevertheless you will agree, will you not, that you normally do not invite the town arsonist to be the head of the fire department?

Mr. AMMEN. I am sorry, sir. I didn't get the last of that.

Senator KNOWLAND. As an example, on the basis of rotation, the Soviet Union during the Korean war turned up as the head of the Security Council. While we do have various elements, including criminal elements, in our own society, nevertheless we do not, as a government, invite the town arsonist to head the fire department, do you agree?

Mr. AMMEN. However, if there are laws and there are methods of enforcing the international peace, then it is impossible for them to break the peace, because your international police force can cope with it.

Senator KNOWLAND. But the law violator normally is not asked to head the police department or the fire department.

Mr. AMMEN. No.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Willis Carto.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF WILLIS CARTO, LIBERTY & PROPERTY, INC.

Mr. CARTO. My name is Willis Carto, executive director of Liberty & Property, Inc., a patriotic organization.

The question of revision of the U. N. Charter is one in which every American has a vital stake. This arises out of the peculiar nature of the charter itself; its history; its backers; its effect upon domestic law and, by far the most important, any plans to convert the U. N. into

a world superstate. Because of these reasons, the closest attention should be paid to any plans for revision.

It is certainly safe to say that no American worthy of the name wishes to hand our priceless and blood-bought sovereignty to a group of foreigners, even were we to have representation among those foreigners. We have fought wars to assure that our sovereignty would endure.

DANGER OF PLANS TO STRENGTHEN THE U. N.

I will not dwell on the crackpot proposals of various internationalist organizations which wish to revise the charter "by strengthening the U. N."—a convenient euphemism to use for weakening or actually destroying the sovereignty of the United States—except to mention that they include plans to invalidate the right of secession from the U. N. (World Federal Government Conference, Copenhagen, 1953; Second London Parliamentary Conference on World Government), plans to establish a world police force with the right to travel anywhere in the world regardless of international frontiers (Second London Conference), and even plans to reduce this proud nation to a number of provinces of a world state, governed by a foreign commissar and policed by foreign mercenaries (London meeting, World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government).

It goes without saying that such proposals, if considered seriously by this country, would mark the alltime low of American diplomacy and statecraft and would be grounds for impeachment of those responsible. In the words of Congressman Burdick in a speech delivered in the House on April 28, 1954:

If this is not treason, then I do not understand the provision of the Constitution defining it.

Far from seeking ways to strengthen the U. N. and therefore further weaken the United States, ample evidence indicates that the U. N. Charter, as it now stands, is inimical to the best interests of this country and contains, in the words of Senator Jenner in a Senate speech of February 23, 1954—

the seeds of power to deprive our States of a republican form of government, guaranteed by the Constitution. It has within it the pattern for making the States into satellite provinces, subject to a Congress which, under the United Nations Charter, will have to tell them what to do.

These seeds are well-hidden in the ubiquitous UNESCO, in the so-called and misnamed Genocide Convention, and the equally misnamed Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which some fanatics would have supersede our own Bill of Rights.

WITHDRAW OR CHANGE THE CHARTER

And, to again quote Congressman Burdick—

It ought to be obvious to any fair-minded 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.

Hence, revision of the charter should be directed toward the elimination of many of its objectionable features. Either that or we should immediately withdraw.

We do not have the time to discuss a full statement of the revisions which should be made. However, I shall briefly refer to a few changes which are absolutely necessary, in my opinion.

REPEAL OF ARTICLES 55 AND 56 DISCUSSED

(1) Articles 55 and 56 should be repealed. Article 55 enumerates things which the members of the U. N. "shall promote." Among these are "full employment and conditions of economic and social progress." Article 56 states that "All members pledge themselves to take joint and separate action * * * for the achievement of purposes set forth in article 55."

Now, any reader of Frederick Hayek, Herbert Spencer or even the converted Max Eastman knows that there is only one way to have full employment—barring war—and that is to sovietize the economy; in other words, to draft labor, control production and prices, and otherwise to turn the United States of America into another slave state.

The House hearings which analyzed Henry Wallace's grandiose scheme for 60 million jobs a few years ago came to this identical conclusion. At least, we would have a fitting memorial to the two chief architects of the U. N., Hiss and Harry White. But freedom would be dead.

Now, the reason why these two articles are so tremendously dangerous to the United States is that the Attorney General has said that action of the United States is obligatory under these articles. Certainly, this is a situation to give all decent Americans pause for thought.

OTHER CHANGES SUGGESTED

(2) Another most important phase of our true situation under the U. N. Charter—and I purposely use the word "under" because the charter will remain the law of the land and will supersede the Constitution until the enactment of the Bricker amendment—is the constitutional status of our Armed Forces and the power of the Congress to declare war. Many authorities claim that articles 43 to 51, inclusive, of the charter, give the U. N. the power to order us into war at any time without the consent of Congress. Since the charter gives the U. N. the right to order us into war, does it also have the authority to order us to not go to war?

(3) It has been reported and, to my knowledge never denied, that the permanent military head of the United Nations is and always will be a Red Russian. This amazing fact is the result of a secret agreement made by the distinguished Secretary General of the 1945 San Francisco Conference, Alger Hiss, and Molotov. Is this the real reason why we suffered our first military defeat in the shameful Korean fiasco? Can it be that this Russian was in possession of all the military plans of the U. N. forces and reported them to the Red Chinese?

(4) All specialized agencies of the U. N. which interfere in domestic affairs, or which engage in propaganda, should be abolished.

(5) The right of extraterritoriality and immunity from American law of all U. N. employees must be abolished. Communist spies now working for the U. N. must be deported from American soil.

These things are a basic minimum of action if we are to enjoy the American island of freedom in a vast sea of tyranny awhile yet longer.

Gentlemen of the subcommittee, Americans can do no less. We are forced to choose between feeding a Frankenstein which soon may devour us, and taking immediate steps to save ourselves.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

The next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Robert Moon.

Next is Mr. Riordan.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT W. MOON, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON LEGISLATION, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA-NEVADA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mr. MOON. My name is Robert Moon. I am minister of the Methodist Church in San Leandro, and speak for the Northern California and Nevada Council of Churches.

This council represents 25 denominations, some 2,000 churches and some 400,000 members.

There are 5 or 6 things we would like to say about this matter this afternoon. The first is that we want to reaffirm our support of the United Nations organization. We believe that it is not possible for us to have world peace without international cooperation and the privilege of participating in an organization such as the U. N., which gives us the opportunity to do some of the things in company with other nations that can increase understanding between the nations.

VETO ON MEMBERSHIP

Secondly, we would like to suggest that the Charter of the United Nations be amended so as to make it easier for us to receive additional nations in. We believe, for instance, that the veto power over the admission of new nations ought to be removed. We ought to aim at universality of membership. Our goal ought to be to have every nation in the world represented in the U. N. without the privilege of withdrawal, so that the U. N. would represent all of the nations of the world.

U. N. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Thirdly, we are concerned that the United States increase its participation in some of the specialized agencies and the technical assistance programs of the U. N. The attempt to aid other nations by bilateral means is psychologically unsound, both for the giver and for the receiver.

If working through the U. N., through its specialized agencies and its technical assistance program, we will be able to do the things that will help other nations, not on the basis of political expediency, we will be administering our help to them on the basis of need, which is a much sounder way for an organization such as the U. N. to minister to the needs of peoples around the world.

REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Fourthly, we have been concerned about the development of some of the regional organizations, including those started by the United States, and those by the Afro-Asian groups soon to be meeting in

Bandung. It seems to us that these are devices. They are evidence of the failure of the United Nations. They are evidence that there are many nations around our world that have not yet learned to trust the U. N.

Our aim ought to be to produce the kind of organization that would inspire the confidence of all nations everywhere, and it would be a good thing if the United States would take the lead at that point and demonstrate by its own action that it has confidence in the U. N., so that the U. N. will make these divisive regional organizations unnecessary.

Fifthly, we want to speak for disarmament, and we suggest that the Charter of the United Nations be amended so as to make disarmament mandatory. We ought to make it so that no nation will have the right or the power to wage war, and we recommend that a specific schedule of disarmament, gradual but progressive and specific, be written into the Charter of the U. N.

ABOLISHMENT OF VETO URGED

Sixthly, we believe that the time has come for the nations which have the right to veto in the Security Council to surrender that right, and we suggest that the charter be amended so that no nation has the right to veto any action of the Security Council or of the U. N. as a whole.

It was an immoral thing that we did here 10 years ago when we gave 6 nations the right to veto actions. We asked other nations to do something which we were willing to do ourselves.

We have no moral right to expect other nations to surrender their sovereignty in world affairs when we are unwilling to surrender our own.

That concludes our statement, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Moon is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY ROBERT W. MOON, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON LEGISLATION, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA-NEVADA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The Northern California-Nevada Council of Churches represents 25 Protestant denominations in 2,000 churches having over 400,000 members.

1. We reaffirm our confidence in the United Nations. Though its effectiveness has been weakened by the veto, the bypass, and the nearsightedness of some of its member nations, it is still a live and productive example of international cooperation. There will be no peaceful world without international cooperation such as the U. N. represents.

2. The charter of the U. N. should be changed to make it easier for nonmember nations to belong. We ought to aim at universality of membership with no right of withdrawal. To that end we recommend that we remove the veto power with respect to membership and welcome all nations as members.

3. We should expand the specialized agencies and the technical assistance programs of the U. N. Bilateral-assistance programs are bad psychologically for the receiver and the giver. They are apt to be motivated by political expediency instead of need, and they inevitably produce resentment and tension. An expanded U. N. program could build friendship and the cooperative spirit.

4. The rise of regional alliances is an evidence that many nations have not yet learned to trust the U. N. This includes the United States as well as the Afro-Asian nations soon to be meeting in Bandung. These regional programs are divisive. They increase tension rather than reduce it. The United States should be taking the lead in demonstrating by our actions that our confidence in the U. N. obviates the necessity for privately arranged regional programs.

5. The charter should be revised to include a detailed program for general disarmament. Without disarmament there will be no peace. Let the nations, then commit themselves to a gradual but progressive and definite program to destroy all the weapons of war.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Jr. John Riordan, followed by Mrs. Douglas.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JOHN RIORDAN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. RIORDAN. My name is John Riordan. I live in San Francisco.

I appreciate the opportunity afforded by the special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Charter Review allowing the individual citizen to come forward to speak his views concerning a partial solution to the problem we are here striving to answer, that is, the way to strengthen and preserve our country in a world at peace.

It is my belief that the representatives of the American people should support with vigor the calling of a review conference, with an ear to the people's wishes to support all that can be done to seek a solution to that pressing and baffling problem of the preservation of peace, that they should strive to activate our American view that there should be a worldwide recognition of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man in the United States itself.

I feel that it would be tragic, indeed, if the United Nations' ideals falter for want of champions among our people, who had so much to do with the formation of the United Nations itself, who would so much benefit from what the United Nations can do to relieve the world's unrest that presses so heavily upon us.

AREAS FOR AMENDMENT

In considering areas for amendment, I would suggest first that consideration be given to the creation of a permanent organ, something along the lines of the Economic and Social Council, to deal with the manifold problems of disarmament. Being leaders of the disarmament proposals, I suggest we urge strongly implementation of President Eisenhower's suggestion, of an international atomic energy agency to be set up to receive contributions of materials, devising methods whereby this available nuclear stuff could be allocated to preserve the peaceful pursuits of the world community.

Second, there must be some limitation of the veto in the Security Council, in regard to admission of new members and as to the pacific settlement of disputes: finally, that the United States should urge the study and adoption of measures that will supplement the work of the social humanitarian, economic works of the United Nations: that spirit-wise, the United States should emphasize more and more the technical assistance work aimed at the underdeveloped areas, through help and economic stabilization, improvements of agriculture, health standards, and education, especially in that area called, in Mr. Stassen's phrase, "The arc of Free Asia," where some 766 million people live on the rim of the Communist-dominated Asian heartland, should the United States, through the attractive aid of the United Nations agency offer to the imaginations of the so-called have-not peoples the opportunity to raise their living standards.

I think that here in America we should encourage our representatives to do all that we can to join special United Nations funds for economic development, so-called SUNFED, and electrify our Asian friends as we did help to recharge their European counterparts with the program of the Marshall plan.

I think that the urgent need of the aid in Asia is well summed up by Senator Wiley in Milwaukee, when he said:

We sometimes fail to realize that the sources of war are perhaps over in Asia, where two-thirds of the people of the entire world today will go to bed without eating.

As for myself, having been in parts of Europe and the Near East these past two summers, I can say that we found a delightfully encouraging number of people who told us of the assistance and opportunities given to them by their friends to grasp hold of the proverbial bootstraps and begin tugging by themselves through the help set in motion by one of the United Nations agencies.

Needless to say, Senators, they were not unaware of the support of these agencies given by the American people.

Finally, then, as American citizens, we must continue to be apostles of confidence in the United Nations ideal, alert, but constructive critics of its shortcomings, quick to point out its many accomplishments, which are so often unheralded.

If we do this, we will have borne our responsibilities intelligently and purposefully; if we do not, we ourselves and our Nation and our world will be the losers.

Thank you, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Riordan is as follows:)

My name is John Riordan; my address is 1476 Willard Street, San Francisco, Calif. I am a garage attendant at the Industrial Center Garage, 521 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.

I appreciate the opportunity afforded by the special subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Charter Review, allowing the individual citizen to come forward to speak his views concerning a partial solution of the problem we are giving our attention to; namely, the way to strengthen and preserve our country in a world at peace.

I believe that the United States representatives at the 10th meeting of the General Assembly should support with vigor the calling of a Charter Review Conference. The United States should go to the Conference with the support of its citizens, familiar with the role that the United Nations is playing as an instrument of international mediation. The representatives should go realizing that the hope of the American people for a world growing healthier and happier is bound up with the continuing success of the United Nations.

It is my belief that the representatives of the United States—with an ear to the people's wishes—should support all that can be done to seek a solution to the pressing and baffling problem of the preservation of peace; that they should strive to activate our view so there would be worldwide recognition of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man in the United Nations itself.

It would indeed be tragic if the United Nations ideals falter for want of champions among our people, who had so much to do with the formation of the United Nations itself, who would benefit so much from what the United Nations can do to relieve the world unrest that now presses so heavily upon us

AREAS FOR AMENDMENT

1. Consideration should be given to the creation of an organ of the United Nations something along the lines of the Economic and Social Council to deal with the manifold problems of disarmament. A universal, enforceable disarmament program with full international control of nuclear weapons must be

achieved. This entails effective inspection methods and the power to impose certain sanctions against offending states.

Since we are the leaders of disarmament proposals, I suggest that we urge more strongly the implementation of the steps to the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency, suggested by President Eisenhower, to receive contributions of materials, and to devise methods whereby this available stuff would be allocated to serve the peaceful pursuits of the world community.

2. There must be some limitation of the exercise of the veto in the Security Council, in regard to the admission of new members and to the peaceful settlement of disputes; although, retaining the veto in matters of collective security actions.

3. The United States should urge the study and adoption of measures that will supplement the work of the social, humanitarian, cultural, and economic agencies connected with the United Nations. That spiritwise, the United States emphasize more and more the technical assistance work aimed at underdeveloped areas, through trade expansion, economic stabilization, and improvements of agriculture, labor standards, health, and education. Especially in that area, in Mr. Stassen's phrase, called the "Arc of Free Asia," where some 766 million reside at the rim of the Communist-dominated heartland of Asia, should the United States, through the attractive aid of the United Nations agencies, offer to the "have-not" peoples the opportunity to raise their living standards.

I think here in America we should encourage our representatives to join in the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—SUNFED—as soon as possible, and electrify our Asian friends, as we did their European counterparts with the Marshall plan.

I think Senator Wiley summarized the urgent need for assistance to Asia when he said: "We sometimes fail to realize the sources of war are perhaps over in Asia, where two-thirds of the people of the entire world today will go to bed without eating."

As for myself, having traveled in Europe and in portions of the Near East, I can say that I found an encouraging number of persons who told of the assistance and opportunity given them or to their families or to their friends to grasp a hold of that proverbial bootstrap and begin tugging by one or another of the United Nations agencies. And, needless to say, they were not unaware of the support of these agencies given by the American people.

Of course, more importantly, the success or failure of the United Nations is dependent upon the spirit and willingness of the nations and peoples comprising it. If the states or some of the states of the world desire war, they can have it quickly; but, if there is a desire for peace, then the mechanism for that is the pencil box shaped building in New York.

Finally, as American citizens, we must continue to be apostles of confidence in the United Nations ideal, alert, but constructive critics of its shortcomings, quick to point out its many accomplishments, which are so often unheralded. If we do this, we will have borne our responsibilities intelligently and purposefully; if we do not, we ourselves and our Nation and our world will be the losers.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. W. W. Douglas, followed by Mr. Buechner.

STATEMENT OF MRS. W. W. DOUGLAS, CHAIRMAN, INTERNATIONAL SECTION, BERKELEY LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Mrs. DOUGLAS. How do you do? I speak both as the chairman of the international section of the Berkeley League of Women Voters and also as an individual.

During the brief 10 years since the Conference in San Francisco, the Leagues of Women Voters throughout the United States have studied the United Nations operations with a full recognition both of what it has failed to accomplish and also of what it has achieved in vast areas of social and economic fields, and also in fields of finding solutions for some very dangerous world situations.

The result of all this study has been a wholehearted support of the United Nations as a fundamental and irreplaceable need of human beings throughout the world.

The organization has accomplished far more than the newspaper emphasis on its conflict would indicate. We would recognize the desirability and the eventual necessity of ending the tragic stalemate over disarmament inspection, over the admission of new members, over misuse of the veto, and of development of world law.

ATTITUDES TOWARD THE U. N. IMPORTANT

But—and here I speak as an individual, and not as representing the league—I feel that the failure to achieve these objectives is far more due to the attitude of the nations on both sides of the Iron Curtain than it is to the words of the charter.

The charter itself has shown itself having a considerable flexibility and having a capacity for change, as illustrated in the development of the powers of the Assembly and in the formation within the charter of regional alliances for defense.

The expulsion of the Soviet Union, which I thought Mr. Knowland suggested this morning, would not, I think, bring about the world peace that both we and he so earnestly desire. It would only split the world into two irreconcilable military alliances. It would destroy the still immature organization which nevertheless has for its goal and its long-term objective the universal association of nations within a rule of law.

We would be substituting a military alliance where it is sheer fantasy to think that we would be joined by all of the nations on our side of the Iron Curtain. We should be losing the platform which we now have, where we can, with our leadership, represent the conscience of mankind, where we can and do expose the recalcitrants of the Soviet Union and the falsity of its propaganda.

We should be losing and destroying a system where we can ourselves join in the already existing momentum toward world cooperation in economic development.

As to Korea, in spite of its tragedy and its unsatisfactory conclusion, it nevertheless remains the first time in history where a world organization of nations has acted, not each one in defense of its own borders, but against the whole principle of aggression.

PROSPECTS FOR CHARTER CHANGES

In conclusion, I would like very much to applaud the efforts of this subcommittee of Congress in trying to develop a widespread discussion of the United Nations Charter and necessary changes. But realism compels us to recognize that according to article 109, it is obvious that no changes can be brought about without ratification by the five permanent members and by two-thirds of the entire membership.

It is also, whether tragically or not, realistic to recognize that we are not yet ready for a world government to make binding decisions. We have to recognize that no change with regard to admissions of new members or modification of the veto would be accepted by the Soviet Union if it minimized or changed her control and powers, and we cannot overlook that among the other nations on our own side of the Iron Curtain, there are also the possibilities of widespread and violent disagreement over such matters as domestic jurisdiction.

So again, speaking only as an individual, I should deplore the United States presenting amendments which would either increase the world tensions that exist at the present time or force either the United States or the Soviet Union out of the world organization.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Frederick W. Buechner, followed by Mrs. Anker.

Senator KNOWLAND. Proceed.

STATEMENT OF FREDERICK W. BUECHNER, SAN JOSE, CALIF.

Mr. BUECHNER. My name is Frederick Buechner, San Jose, stockholder and lecturer.

I appear as an individual.

There are many excellent and obvious reasons why the United Nations Charter should not be revised, but I am aware of no valid reason why it should be revised.

Among the reasons against revision are :

1. The charter is not based on natural laws; therefore, it has no reason for being;

2. The people of the United States, through its Congress, would have no opportunity to pass upon the revision it might have rejected before the Soviet passed or rejected it. While this is a ridiculous situation, it is nevertheless true, because the Soviet would have the chance of veto before we could even express our opinion.

This would in effect put the Soviets in the position of making internal American law, since without the Bricker amendment, treaty law is the law of the land.

3. The charter of the United Nations points out that the members are nations with peaceful intentions, and that one goal is the suppression of aggression. But more people have been killed since the U. N. came into being than were lost during both world wars, on both sides.

4. The leading proponents of revision, the world parliamentarians, the world federalists, and other one-worlders, would tax the United States down to the level of other countries, through a 2 percent capital tax, according to the ability to pay, and the United States has more than 50 percent of the world's goods, and only 6 percent of its population.

BASIS AND CONCEPTS OF THE CHARTER

The principle of revision every decade is a confession that the United Nations Charter is not based on a system of natural law, civil law, or even common law. Asiatic concepts and the ideas of loose suzerainty and violence as the system of law may be discovered in the charter. However, positive laws may need amendment and a sound constitution may need a change in some procedure or method, but to allow basic revision signifies that a philosophy of change, not a concept of law, forms the charter.

Equity is not a legal basis. In a one-party world, equity would mean whatever the party handed down as the policy of the day. This might well lead to tyranny, since what recourse would a member state then have?

Sovereign equality, the basis of the U. N. order, is a false base. It has no meaning. Equality is not sovereign and sovereignty precludes

equality. Sovereignty means the ability to make the laws under which we wish to live. Sovereignty is the power, not the right, not the duty, but the power to say "Yes" or "No" lawfully.

There is only one world, and there is only one way to bring its various diversified national and political structures together to work in harmony, not necessarily to be absorbed one in the other, and that is a dual system of, one, treaties, and, two, conventions of professional groups.

HORIZONTAL WORLD ORDER PROPOSED

Greatly overlooked, there is a better way of vitally organizing the one world, and that is by independent agencies and free associations, having affiliation with one another throughout the various nations of the world.

This is a horizontal order, whereas treaty organizations set up a perpendicular order, and if used for socioeconomics and familial objectives may bring the State too intimately into our private lives.

Both lines of order are needed. The perpendicular represents the power and the powers; the horizontal represents the socioeconomic and popular action. This latter order is based on natural law and is threatened by two enemies of mankind: the threat that a state or congeries of states may seize world hegemony and the threat of a totalitarian one-party which may seize the power of the treaty-bound states and find it down to its own monopoly in the horizontal order. Respect for the nature of free associations, societal, familial, professional, will save us from both a 1-state world and a 1-party dictatorship. A 1-state world is the product of a 1-child family, orphaned.

The United Nations today is no better than the men and the states which form it. There are no people involved. Some members are mortal offenders and should become dead to the society of other states until they reform. The spectacle of representatives of free, independent states with governments based on natural law sitting across the conference table in an attempt to bargain, negotiate, and compromise with representatives of governments embracing atheism, submersion of the individual, and the philosophy of one-worldism through coercion and force, should be as repugnant to the people of the United States as the spectacle of the honest, God-fearing individual attempting a rapprochement with liars, thieves, and murders drenched in blood.

That mechanical unitarism which would snuff out states and disastrously would be a world parliament. Any attempt to create a world body like the House of Commons having the Whig concept of parliamentary omnipotence would be globally ultra vires, of course. It could do much harm before it exploded from natural causes.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Buechner is as follows:)

REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, BY FREDERICK BUECHNER,
SAN JOSE, CALIF.

The principle of revision every decade is a confession that the United Nations Charter is not based on a system of natural law, civil law, or even common law. Asiatic constitutional concepts in the idea of loose suzerainty (which is potentially totally imperial) and violence, as ultimate law, may be discoverable in the charter, however. Positive laws may need amendment and a sound constitution may need a change in some procedure or method, but to allow basic revision signifies that a philosophy of change, not a concept of law, informs the charter.

Equity is not a legal basis. In a one-party world equity would mean whatever the party handed down as the policy of the day. Sovereign equality, the basis of the United Nations order is a false base. It has no meaning. Equality is not sovereign, and sovereignty precludes equality. Sovereignty means the ability to make the laws under which we wish to live. Sovereignty is the power—not the right, not the duty—but the power to say “Yes” or “No” lawfully.

The United Nations structure is inverted. Having ingested the idea embodied in the catch-phrase that the “League of Nations had no police power,” the United Nations put the police power in charge of the whole organization. The only organ having power in the U. N. is the Security Council. The military and police are not under control of civilian authority, represented possibly by the Assembly. The Security Council is at once a league of powers and a war council. In 1948 Pope Pius XII pointed out this inverted order and also recommended isolation and solitary confinement for the lawbreaker nation.

The idea of obtaining international agreement by treaty is by far more ancient than any scheme of world order. Civilian groups, individuals, free associations certainly should have the right to petition governments either by publicity or through diplomatic procedures and to offer suggestions and criticisms for the betterment of the social elements. This does not need a vast unitary political setup. Attention need not be called to the uselessness of the machinery housed in the big glass house on the East River unlawfully, if legally, on private-presented property, enjoying extraterritoriality as if it were a state.

Agreements about social and economic matters can be arrived at by interested nations, but even more easily by free associations. The more enlightened nation will produce enlightened legislation for the edification of the less enlightened nations, if its people demand it. It has been said, and the doctrine is not disapproved by Pius XII, that the development of nation states is an outgrowth of the natural law. It is held by the Pope that the natural law with God’s grace works for the salvation of men, and therefore produces, as an accrument, a desirable social order.

We do not despise any of the productions of mere enlightened humanism. However, we are taught that because of the incarnation a second law has been added to the natural law whereby God works with men in a special union with them and with individual peoples, to develop the personality of men and the individuality of nations. Diversity—not uniformity—is what enriches human civilization and praises the Creator who ordained very great diversity in individuals and in species and in nationalities. No apology need be made for seeking a religious basis for international relations because what lies at the base of the United Nations is a secular religion and mere humanism without God. The natural law without God is the law of claw and fang. But one might put a prayer-room on every floor of the United Nations building and write God between every two words and this would not give the charter a theological and constitutional basis.

There is a great deal of confusion about the terms “one world” and “world federation.” The idea of federation presupposes a treaty basis and the functioning of international law. The fact that the United Nations sets up a Commission to codify international law seems to indicate that the United Nations assumes that international law does not exist or has never been codified; whereas it is at work every day on land, on sea, and in the air. The provision for a Commission to codify international law is a dishonest thing; calculated to create the effect of anomy and, subsequently to achieving that effect, to bring forward positive legislation—after the Assembly should become a world legislature—characterized as international law. Every day among the nations, among the peoples and the associations which have international relations, commerce, trade, shipping, travel, and communications flourish immeasurably well under functioning and ancient international law.

Treaties have from time immemorial hinged on two polar ideas: (1) They are sacred and must be observed under the gravest obligations; that is, *pacta sunt servanda*. (2) Circumstances alter cases. Treaties may be and should be revised when the circumstances under which they were initiated have been altered; that is, *clausula rebus sic stantibus*. The forgotten Hague Court system was a developing and constitutional system. There seems to have been a conspiracy to forget it. Customs in using arbitration courts had been growing up to 1914.

There is only one world and there is only one way to bring its various diversified national and political structures together to work in harmony—not necessarily to be absorbed one in the other—and that is a dual system of (1) treaties

and (2) conventions of professional groups. Greatly overlooked, there is a better way of vitally organizing the one world and that is by independent agencies and free associations having affiliation with one another throughout and among the various nations. This is a horizontal order, whereas treaty organizations set up a perpendicular order, and if used for socioeconomics and familial objectives may bring the state too intimately into our private lives.

Both lines of order are needed. The perpendicular represents the power and the powers; the horizontal represents the socioeconomic and popular action. This latter order is based on natural law and is threatened by two enemies of mankind; the threat that a state or congeries of states may seize world hegemony and the threat of a totalitarian one-party which may seize the power of the treatybound states and bind it down to its own monopoly in the horizontal order. Respect for the nature of free associations, societal, familial, professional, will save us from both a one-state world and a one-party dictatorship. A one-state world is the product of a one-child family, orphaned.

The United Nations today is no better than the men and the states which form it. There are no "people" involved. Some members are mortal offenders and should become dead to the society of other states until they reform. The spectacle of representatives of free, independent states with governments based on natural law sitting across the conference table in an attempt to bargain, negotiate and compromise with representatives of governments embracing atheism, submersion of the individual and the philosophy of one-worldism through coercion and force, should be as repugnant to the people of the United States as the spectacle of the honest, God-fearing individual attempting a rapprochement with liars, thieves and murders drenched in blood.

Currently, parallels are being drawn between the historical facts connected with the creation of the American Republic by the writing of the Constitution when *e pluribus unum* became a fact, and the efforts of the World Federalists to convert the United Nations into a one-state world. Without arguing that the writers of the Constitution were not cheating by amending the Articles of Confederation by means of creating a constitution; without arguing that actually they did at Philadelphia that which they came to do, namely, to amend the Articles of Confederation by giving the Confederated States a basic constitution because actually the written constitution articulated an underlying basic reality sketched by the Articles of Confederation—the proof of this is that the Declaration of Independence is still considered basic American law and an act of Congress—it must be observed that proponents of world federation desire to commit the fault, the cheat of which they accuse the writers of the Constitution. They proclaim that the framers of the Constitution met to amend the Articles of Confederation and instead devised a constitution having strong central government which they foisted upon the people of the various States. There are several schemes afoot to convert the loose federation of states (treaty-ordered), known as the United Nations, into a world federation so designed as to become a world state which would be governed by a parliament having at its command a police force. There is even on paper already a scheme to reorder geographic shape-ups and transfer ethnic patterns to give each newly bounded geographic area a "ruler" from an entirely different area. This scheme would seem too silly for time-consuming discussion except that it was devised by a "professional" international association made up of members of various parliaments—the World Association of Parliamentarians for World Government—meeting in London in 1952. This organization boasts that "the United World Federalists, located in the United States, work in close harmony with us." Both organizations believe that the only way to secure "peace" in the world is by force of arms.

The United States became a nation because there were other nations around it. It had a geographic, ethnic, historical, common experience. A one-state world would have no sister states. The forces that create an organized nation are not the forces that create a world government. Natural growth is to be distinguished from artificial construction.

Mechanical unitarism is proscribed by Pope Pius XII. (Some publicists argue that because "catholic" means "universal," all Christians should favor world government or should treat the U. N. uncritically.) Four times in his address to the United World Federalists he warned against the dangers of mechanical unitarism—the dangerous enmeshment of mechanical unitarism; the death by suffocation of the individual nation in mechanical unitarism. He raised a vital question about the source of authority; the nature of that authority to which people have recourse. By what kind of construct might this authority speak in any future implementation of collaboration of the political authority found in

states? Men seek to build an organ or world authority without having settled on its nature, also without having distinguished authority from power, law from force.

One argument brought to bear in favor of a one-state world is that the outside pressure driving the world into collective union is nuclear weapons. This argument is spurious; the pressure brought to bear by nuclear weapons arouses the instinct of self-preservation on all sides in every nation. Each state looks inward and accepted alliances with self-interested caution. The effort on the part of the one-worlders to scare the peoples into a unitary state is dishonest on the face of it. A one-state world in possession of a cobalt bomb and informed by a totalitarian political theory merely means tyranny and total conformity, and the insane insecurity of immobility. This is true even if the only form mechanical unitarism should take is that of a world tariff commission.

We must have a world made up of self-expressive states—little states like the United Kingdom and the United States—or we will have a mammoth state and only little people. States are living entities: "queen-states," not to be submerged in municipal socioeconomics or suffocated in world mechanics. The important function of private associations which will expand international interests as far as possible for social and cultural objectives is to carry forward and develop cultural frontiers. Many human ideals can be implemented by persons in free private associations working together whether they adhere in the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) or not.

ECOSOC might be developed as a clearinghouse for the economic and social agencies having charitable or cultural objectives, or embodying demands for ameliorative legislation. However, the history of the Casa de Contratacion proves that movements downward, that is from the ruling board of an organization down through the members is frustrating, clumsy and generally less effective than movements or dynamism generated by the people themselves. In other words, the dynamism of discovery and settlement by private agencies is far more effectively creative of desirable legislative, juridic or societal constructs than anything ordained by the bureaucratic staff of some clearinghouse.

One independent agency adhering in ECOSOC and antedating the U. N. is the International Labor Organization (ILO). Its system and its potentialities are for good or evil depending upon whether it considers itself an agent of partisanship or a global Whitley Council. Its record of wasted effort and scant achievement seem to prove that its structure is topheavy and that as a specialized agency it is in danger of converting itself into an instrument of social engineering.

Its immediate history began at a Socialist meeting in Leeds in England in 1918 when most of the Socialists were divided on national lines during the war. Another meeting in Bern, Switzerland, resulted in the creation of the ILO constitution. It was attached to the League of Nations and some time afterward George Bernard Shaw proclaimed it was the Vatican of the world, saying we had no need for the palace at Geneva or the Vatican in Rome. In the 1920's ILO served as a clearinghouse for socialism, publishing socialist reports almost exclusively. It cannot be denied that little by little—perhaps due less to the influence of the British Socialists than to Christian elements—ILO converted itself into a nearly model construct however few its concrete achievements in the form of ratified conventions.

On November 20, 1954, Pius XII addressed the 127th session of the governing body of the ILO, saying, as he did so, that it was customary for him to address various and sundry occupational associations. The remark was ignored by both ILO and the press, however, when they hailed the appearance of the Pope at their gathering, and indicated that by so doing he had blessed the organization, its goals and achievements. He advised ILO to keep studying in search of material to complete its structure. Its imperfection [incompleteness] seemed, judging by his advice, to consist in need for a drive to produce "social order where material prosperity is the result of the sincere collaboration of all [an "order"] and serves as a support for the higher values of culture [the outgrowth of religion, he was certainly aware] and [collaboration] above all, for the indissoluble union of minds and hearts."

The Pontiff asked ILO to seek "* * * not only the interests of the working class and its accession to the full exercise of its responsibilities, but the future of human society as a whole." The "labor movement" could not, he said, settle for material success, various guaranties and assurances, or for more influence on the economic system; it must not see the future in terms of class conflict or

envision a world in which the state takes "excessive ascendancy" over the individual.

"If men are to strive with ardor to build a temporal city where private initiative may flourish without fear, where—with full respect for persons—each man's aptitudes and resources (talents and wealth) may blossom and where everyone may adhere with all his heart to the higher moral and religious principles," they must first believe that there are spiritual values and secondly, must trust that these spiritual values can win, not just for workers, but universally, over anomy and violence—"dissolution and discord."

By "spiritual values" there can be no doubt the Bishop of Rome meant the two laws of his Christmas Eve message of 1952: The natural law works in and through the grace of God to achieve the ends of creation; the incarnation unites God and men to develop individual personality and diverse nations according to their own genius with the objective, union with God.

The recommended conversion for the new completeness followed, in the papal address, on a survey of ILO history and of ILO functioning structure. It had "never intended to represent only one social class or to become the means of expression of one tendency exclusively," i. e., ILO, in idea, was not the articulation of a partisan drive on the part of politicized "labor" or the servant of a social class, "the workers." In this respect it resembled Leo XIII's outlines in *Rerum Novarum*, according to Pius XII.

One wonders if the members of the governing body had ever contemplated their ideal image. According to a report by Mr. William L. McGrath, the employer delegate on the United States delegation, who does not advocate withdrawal of the United States from ILO, the ascendancy of state socialism and the concept of planned economy and welfare statism have conspired to turn ILO into a body moved by socialistic opinions. Our American delegates have "become the 'yes-men' of organized labor; they 'admit' that they support on the floor of the Conference, conventions which are contrary to our statutes, our freedom, and our economy; thereby deliberately giving representatives from other nations the false impression that our country as a whole would favor such conventions. They say they do this 'to help stop the spread of communism.' I do not believe misrepresentation and hypocrisy help to stop the spread of anything" (p. 14, 35th International Labor Conference of the International Labor Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, June 1952).

ILO's resemblance to the principles of *Rerum novarum* came at the top of the list of structural points before the recommendation for future completeness and needed perfection. Preceding this the Pope called attention to the "delicate" matter among "elements in the evolution of modern society"—the relations between employers and workers. He did not seem to envision the elimination of the employer class; the delicacy of the situation seems to suggest that the existence of owners other than in copartnership is threatened. The sketch of the functioning of ILO had included bringing state recognition and participation into an otherwise private free association conceived for legal protection of workers, the supporting of labor unions in efforts to ameliorate conditions and raise wages and to suppress abuses. The Pope noted the alteration of course which was signaled by the "Declaration of Philadelphia" of ILO in 1944. He sums it up as assuming for objectives "formulas of social security and full employment"; but he delimits these formulas, saying "limitation of hours of work, regulations of the work of women and children, measures for protection against accidents called for achievements forming an organic whole." His criticisms of formulas for full employment—a production for production's sake, artificial social engineering, wasteful exploitation of raw materials, conceiving of all human life as one vast industrialized state—and his criticism of "the social security state" or "the administrative state" were well-known from the 1952 Christmas Eve message. Now, recalling the proper concern for human relations "at the company level," he asked for catholicity on the level of motivation.

The history of ILO as the Pope traced it might either have surprised the members by showing them a part of their unknown history or it might have increased their ordinary doubts about the Pontiff's personal infallibility. Pius XII showed ILO they had Catholic origins—even so their construct seems to be more valuable than their achievement—possibly as an example of ideal structure, possibly because the Pope understood and agreed with Shaw in a modified sense: given the Vatican the world scarcely needs any other specialized agency; ILO is League of Nations, United Nations, and possibly ICFIU all in one. Operating under universal goodwill and serving to build a society capable of supporting a religious

superstructure because ILO itself recognizes that a desirable humanism is the outgrowth of doing God's will, ILO might conceivably be all that the world needs of international organization.

In any case Pius XII traced the history of ILO from a Berlin meeting in 1890, a year before *Rerum novarum* and from a letter of Leo XIII in 1893, through the beginnings in private associations in 1900 to 1919. He overlooked entirely the Socialist proposals of Leeds in 1918 and Berne in 1919, evidently because he considered them only ancillary to a larger movement. The ILO left the audience and shattered its meeting by trying to cope with Communists in a governing body informed predominantly by democratic Socialists.

Treaties have been adopted by 64 adhering nations regarding the nightwork of bakers, certain rights of workingwomen and safety regulations regarding the manufacture of phosphorous match heads. Almost 160 conventions agreed on by the ILO are now before the Congress of the United States which, if it follows the pattern of the past will not ratify them. The ideas of the ILO, the ideas of a world health organization, the idea of some kind of clearing house for technical assistance in the education of underdeveloped nations in western methods—all of these are good ideas. Only if an antihuman ideology usurps goodwill, will they tend to develop mechanical unitary constructs, which by causing individuals to be lost in the masses would defeat right reason. ILO and other agencies must be severely criticized but they need not necessarily become evilly unitarian. If they are not caught in the domination of a one-party secular religion, they can serve to protect peoples from undue state interference in their private lives and their free associations. Eternal vigilance is necessary to keep them lawfully at work. Constant changes in structure and institutional framework evades vigilance and frustrates constitutionalism. The American Congress is subjected to the criticism of the people every 2 years. United Nations agencies should be made to stand even severer criticism.

This long look at ILO seems necessary for several reasons: (1) It is the oldest of the independent agencies. (2) It could serve in place of the whole United Nations, combining as it does state collaboration with free associations. (3) If the state of its perfection still leaves much to be desired—what of the other, younger agencies? To come to grips with the forces pressing against the fabric of western civilization is a difficult task.

Even as there exists a plethora of agencies all needing the criticisms here meted out to ILO, there exists a plethora of half-formed political mechanical unitarisms: U. N., NATO, EU, Atlantic Community, SEATO. All exclude Korea, China, Ireland, Spain, and except for the United Nations, the Islamic world. The agencies and treaty organizations seem like supernumerary apparatuses. Multiplying apparatus may provide "safety" mechanisms—if one fails there are others. Without coming to a definite conclusion regarding the nature and applicability of any of these apparatuses, certain opposite facts are here presented.

Karl Marx in his columns printed in the New York Tribune in the 1850's, rather gleefully declared that a root of unrest was pressing on the fabric of the European constitution. The revolution, he said, would change all. (Cf. *The Eastern Question* ed. by Eleanor Marx Aveling, circa 1898.)

After World War I and Versailles came a shifting of peoples mostly by boundary manipulation. The 1920's and 1930's saw the Second and Third Internationals struggling for the affiliation of workers organizations and mutually educating the world for socialism.

World War II and Yalta gave us another example of one-world ordering. This time the shifting of peoples was by millions, by nations, by large geographic areas depopulated and repopulated. The 1940's and 1950's have seen the revived Socialist International and, closely associated by friendly ties, the ICFTU, all proposing recoil from Stalinism and the conspiratorial communism of the U. S. S. R. Meantime the Communist Party and the Socialist Party go to work at the "social rather than the electoral" level to articulate every difference and heighten every distinction, to inject socialism into every social and economic entity. Communist terror has for purpose to encompass "the mass base" which is found between itself and that other pole it sets up—far-right clerico-fascism and loss of freedom—to press the mass base into a Socialist third force or united front.

The conspirators know socialism is ideologically and historically the step to communism. This was the pattern followed recently in East Pakistan when the United Front, created by the Communists without the knowledge of the populace, and used by them to foment discord and create embarrassment for the Pakistan National Government, appeared as a spontaneous people's movement to protest the military pact with the United States.

Supporters of United Nations agencies should not need to resort to name calling and smearing. As an example of what we mean we cite the case of Americans who have stated their approval of the Bricker amendment only to find themselves denigrated by the farfetched accusation that they are "reactionaries," "isolationists," "anti-Semitic" or belong to "hate groups." Such tactics indicate a dishonest purpose. No state should be subject to the juridic order of another state and regardless of allowable differences as to method the underlying principle in the Bricker amendment is precisely this one.

Different states, represented by what is here termed the perpendicular order, as distinguished from the horizontal ordering of free associations, stand for vocational order. Men are called to serve their Creator to save their souls in a vocation. Their family, their state, their business, their nationality—all hierarchical things—constitute vocations. The political order which they give their nation, growing out of the physical facts of community of history, ethnic experience, national genius, produces an entity demanding respect from its kind and possessing even as a human being possesses its soul from God, the arc of authority and the majesty of a lawgiver.

That mechanical unitarism which would snuff out states most disastrously would be a world parliament. Any attempt to create a body like the House of Commons, having the Whig concept of parliamentary omnipotence would be globally ultra vires of course. It could do much harm before it exploded from natural causes.

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. Frank Anker, followed by Mrs. Hayes.

STATEMENT OF MRS. FRANK ANKER, B. E. A. R. SECTION, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, INC.

Mrs. ANKER. The B. E. A. R. section of the National Council of Jewish Women made up of 115 women representing the bay area cities of Berkeley, El Cerrito, Albany, and Richmond, an integral part of a national organization comprising 245 geographical sections with a national membership of over 108,000 women believes:

That the success of the United Nations in maintaining international peace and collective security and promoting the solution of economic, social, and humanitarian problems of all peoples, depends on the extent to which the member states use its facilities and carry out its recommendations even when these transcend the special interest of the member nations; and the National Council of Jewish Women believes:

That the United States must accept its position of leadership to help develop economic and social stability, and political democracy throughout the world.

SUPPORT AND STRENGTHEN THE U. N.

In keeping with this belief, the National Council of Jewish Women adopted the following resolutions in 1953 and reaffirmed them at its national convention held in New Orleans last month.

1. To urge the United States to continue to participate fully in the activities and agencies of the United Nations; to support, strengthen and implement their decisions; and whenever possible to utilize the services of the United Nations in the implementation of American foreign policy.

2. To urge the United States to support efforts toward the transfer of sovereignty by member nations to the United Nations in those fields of activity where concerted international action can advance peace and welfare.

As women—wives and mothers—we feel strongly that the United Nations is the only bulwark of peace in a world wracked with tensions and paralyzed by threats of thermonuclear war. We favor the regulation and reduction of armed forces, and conventional and atomic armaments of individual nations, safeguarded by a system of effective international control and inspection.

The United States, dedicated to peace, can prove its unselfish desire for world harmony only through the United Nations in a multinational effort utilizing all its machinery and international agencies, rather than by resorting to any bilateral arrangements with individual nations which by their nature arouse fear and suspicion.

We endorse President Eisenhower's proposal to the United Nations for an international pool for peaceful uses of atomic energy. We strongly support every effort made by the United Nations and its specialized agencies to bring to the under-developed areas of the world a higher standard of living based upon the sharing of technical and industrial know-how which are necessary in order to eliminate the deep-seated causes of war.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you very much.

Call the next witness.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mrs. William J. Hayes, followed by Dr. Deutsch.

**STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM J. HAYES, STATE VICE CHAIRMAN,
NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE, CALIFORNIA STATE SOCIETY,
DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION**

Mrs. HAYES. Members of the Special Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, in accordance with the instructions, I identify myself as follows: My name is Mrs. William J. Hayes. My address is 1209 Cortez Avenue, Burlingame, San Mateo County, Calif. I am a member of the San Francisco Chapter, of San Francisco, Daughters of the American Revolution. I am State vice chairman of its National Defense Committee, California State Society, D.A.R., an organization of 7,000 members, divided into 127 local chapters in California communities.

I am authorized to represent the California State Society in appearing before this subcommittee. I am also authorized to speak for the national defense committee of our National Society.

The California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, meeting in San Francisco, February 22 to 25, 1955, adopted certain resolutions relating to the United Nations Organization and the United Nations Charter. These resolutions emanated from local chapters and from individual members of the organization, thus expressing grass roots opinion.

Copies of these five resolutions are attached to this statement, which I would request be considered a part of this statement.

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

1. United Nations Charter Revision;
2. Specialized Agencies of the United Nations;
3. United Nations Oath;

4. Withdrawal from the United Nations; and
5. UNESCO.

WORLD GOVERNMENT OPPOSED

On the United Nations Charter Revision, we oppose advocated changes in the United Nations Charter which would involve the United States in a form of world government, without opportunity for the American people to vote for or against this destruction of their sovereign rights.

Specialized agencies, UNESCO, World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, et cetera, have developed programs subverting the alleged purpose of the U. N. Charter.

On the United Nations oath, we oppose each individual American member of the Secretariat being required to swear that in discharging their functions in the international service of the U. N., they will have the interest of the U. N., only, in view, and will not accept instructions from any government or any other authority external to it. We believe it is the duty and the right of every United States citizen to support the Constitution of the United States, as there can be no dual allegiance.

On withdrawal from the United Nations, we maintain that already there is in operation a world government under the U. N. which has already usurped authority from our Government and has interfered with domestic affairs, both National and State. The California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urges support of Congressman Burdick's bill introduced in Congress which would rescind membership of the United States in the United Nations.

On UNESCO, our resolution is pointed toward action relative to California schools, but a copy is submitted to you as our objection to the activity of UNESCO propaganda which tends to sow seeds of doubt and suspicion as to the integrity of our Republican form of government, and points up the alleged desirable aspects of some form of world community.

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, of over 179,000 members, is opposed to any change in the United Nations Charter that would convert the United Nations into a world government or partial world government, despite the basic concept of the United Nations as a federation of sovereign nations.

The Daughters of the American Revolution is opposed to any change in the United Nations Charter which might cause the surrender of the traditional sovereignty of the United States of America and the consequent loss of our elected representatives of their constitutional rights to make domestic laws and declare war.

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, opposes the adoption of the human rights covenant, believing that articles XIII and XIV of the Covenant of Human Rights of the United Nations could restrict freedom of religion and speech and thus destroy the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States.

Also attached to this statement is a copy of the resolution adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at its annual State conference in February of this year, entitled, "Affirmation of Faith in the Power and Majesty of the United States of America." It expresses the feeling of the members of the

Daughters of the American Revolution toward the United States of America, and their desire that the spirit of America be perpetuated.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Hayes is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM J. HAYES, FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE SOCIETY,
DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Special Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee, in accordance with the instructions, I identify myself as follows: My name is Bessie B. Hayes (Mrs. William J. Hayes); my address is 1209 Cortez Avenue, Burlingame, San Mateo County, Calif. I am a member of San Francisco Chapter, of San Francisco, Daughters of the American Revolution. I am State vice chairman of the National Defense Committee, California State Society, DAR, an organization of about 7,000 members, divided into 127 local chapters in California communities.

In the absence of the State regent, Mrs. Ruth Apperson Rous and my principal, the State national defense chairman, Mrs. Arthur L. Shellhorn, who are both out of the State to attend the 64th Continental Congress (national convention) of the National Society, DAR, to be held this month in Washington, D. C., I am authorized by the State vice regent, Mrs. O. George Cook to represent the California State Society in appearing before this subcommittee.

The California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, meeting in San Francisco, February 22 to 25, 1955, adopted certain resolutions relating to the United Nations Organization and the United Nations Charter. These resolutions emanated from local chapters and from individual members of the organization, thus expressing grass-roots opinion.

Copies of these five resolutions are attached to this statement. They are entitled:

- United Nations Charter Revision
- Specialized Agencies of the United Nations
- United Nations Oath
- Withdrawal from the United Nations
- UNESCO

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, is opposed to any change in the United Nations Charter that would convert the United Nations into a world government or partial world government, despite the basic concept of the United Nations as a federation of sovereign nations. The Daughters of the American Revolution is opposed to any change in the United Nations Charter which might cause the surrender of the traditional sovereignty of the United States of America and consequent loss to our elected representatives of their constitutional rights to make domestic laws and declare war.

The Daughters of the American Revolution believes it to be essential that the veto power be retained in the Security Council.

The Daughters of the American Revolution opposes the adoption of the Human Rights Covenant, believing that articles 13 and 14 of the Covenant of Human Rights of the United Nations could restrict freedom of religion and speech, and thus destroy the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States.

Also attached to this statement is a copy of a resolution adopted by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at its annual State conference in February of this year, entitled "Affirmation of Faith in the Power and Majesty of the United States of America." It expresses the feeling of the members of the Daughters of the American Revolution toward the United States of America, and their desire that the spirit of America be perpetuated.

RESOLUTION NO. 1. UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVISION

Whereas we, the Daughters of the American Revolution, are opposed to all forms of world government, Atlantic Union, the Genocide Convention, the Covenant of Human Rights, the statement of principles of UNESCO, and to all other specialized agencies which violate the letter and spirit of the United Nations Charter provision as set forth in article 2, section 7: "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; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under chapter VII"; and

Whereas in this year of 1955 the delegates to the United Nations will meet to consider amending or rewriting the United Nations Charter as provided by the United Nations Charter, articles 108 and 109, and will have unlimited authority to make changes, including the elimination of the veto in the Security Council; and

Whereas the changes in 1955 will, if made, automatically become binding upon member nations when ratified by a two-thirds vote of the member nations acting in accordance with their constitutional processes, including all the permanent members of the Security Council; and

Whereas certain treaties emanating from the United Nations hierarchy have been ratified by the United States Senate with but one Senator present and voting; and

Whereas a number of United States Senators have publicly stated their desire to eliminate the veto in the Security Council and to reword the United Nations Charter in a manner which would inevitably strengthen its authority over foreign and domestic affairs of the United States; and

Whereas certain world government groups have advocated changes in the text of the United Nations Charter during the 1955 revision, which would in reality involve the United States in a form of world government without opportunity for the American people to vote for or against this destruction of their sovereign rights as defined and reserved in the Federal and several State constitutions:

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, requests the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, to oppose any change in the Charter of the United Nations which would create world government or any form thereof; and

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and to all members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senate Judiciary Committee, and to the two United States Senators from California.

Adopted February 25, 1955.

RESOLUTION NO. 2. SPECIALIZED AGENCIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the United Nations or some similar organization is considered by the nation members to be advantageous for the meeting of nations, for the promotion of peace and understanding among nations; and

Whereas individuals and groups are constantly working to extend the scope and authority of the United Nations through the creation of numerous and varied specialized agencies within the United Nations Organization; and

Whereas methods are being used by these specialized agencies to supersede and nullify our Constitution, to change traditional laws by gradually taking over the duties and responsibilities of our elected law making bodies; and

Whereas such specialized agencies as UNESCO, World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, and others have developed programs subverting the alleged purpose of the United Nations Charter; and

Whereas it appears to be the avowed purpose of such agencies to effectuate a world government and thereby accomplish by Fabian philosophy and thus by peaceful means overthrow or subvert our constitutional form of government:

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, request the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, to urge the Congress of the United States to enact laws which will provide that no acts or recommendations of the United Nations, through its specialized agencies, will have the effect of law in the United States without the specific approval of two-thirds of the Members of Congress present and voting;

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the two United States Senators from California, to Congressman Usher L. Burdick, and to all Members of the House of Representatives from California.

Adopted February 25, 1955.

RESOLUTION No. 3. UNITED NATIONS OATH

Whereas every secretariat in the United Nations must subscribe to the following oath: "I solemnly swear (affirm) to exercise in all loyalty, discretion, and conscience the functions entrusted to me as a member of the international service of the United Nations, to discharge those functions and regulate my conduct with the interests of the United Nations only in view, and not to seek or accept instructions in respect to the performance of my duties from any government or other authority external to the organization"; and

Whereas there are about 2,300 United States citizens employed by the United Nations and its agencies; and

Whereas it is the duty and the right of every United States citizen to support the Constitution of the United States as there can be no dual allegiance:

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, oppose any United States citizen taking the United Nations oath above quoted, and requests the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, to adopt a resolution to this effect:

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to Henry Cabot Lodge, and to Senators John W. Bricker, William F. Knowland, and Thomas H. Kuchel.

Adopted February 25, 1955.

RESOLUTION No. 4. WITHDRAWAL FROM UNITED NATIONS

Whereas the California State Society and the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, have consistently opposed all forms of world government; and

Whereas several plans for a complete or limited world government have already been published, any one of which would reduce this Nation to a vassal state in a nationless world; and

Whereas a partial world government under the United Nations now is in operation and has already usurped authority from the Government of the United States, interfered with domestic affairs both National and State, and rendered certain laws of the various States null and void by judicial interpretation; and

Whereas Congressman Burdick in the 84th Congress reintroduced a bill to rescind and revoke membership of the United States in the United Nations, together with all agreement and treaties involving the United Nations organization and its various specialized agencies:

Resolved, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution request the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, to adopt a resolution urging the President and both Houses of Congress to take the proper steps to bring about the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations at the earliest possible date by supporting Congressman Burdick's bill, House Resolution 3296;

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Senators Knowland and Kuchel, Congressman Burdick, and to all Members of the House of Representatives from California.

Adopted February 25, 1955.

RESOLUTION No. 19. UNESCO

Whereas UNESCO (United Nations Education Scientific Cultural Organization), the educational arm of the United Nations, was established for the purpose of mentally conditioning teachers and students to accept the philosophy of world citizenship and world government; and

Whereas the same UNESCO program, at the suggestion of some of its most ardent proponents, now masquerades in our schools under such innocent-sounding titles as "World Understanding," "Improving Human Relations," "Intercultural Education," "World Tension," and "Mental Health"; and

Whereas the philosophy of these concepts does not require special textbooks, but the ideas can be cleverly integrated into any subject, including music and art, at any grade level, and are being used in school tests and questionnaires; and

Whereas under these circumstances it would be extremely difficult to pinpoint the responsibility for sowing seeds of doubt and suspicion as to the integrity of our republican form of government and our American way of life, while by inference, innuendo, or other means more direct, the desirable aspects of some form of a collectivist world community are created; and

Whereas school boards have been known to appropriate money for the training of teachers in the principles of the United Nations and for the purchase of UNESCO materials to be used in the schools; and

Whereas citizens are not fully informed in regard to UNESCO propaganda as it is now camouflaged;

Resolved, that the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its opposition to UNESCO in whatever form it is presented and urges that appropriate action be taken with local school boards and school administrators to prohibit the use of such materials and the use of school funds in such training of teachers, and to prevent the use of public schools to transmit propaganda systematically designed to weaken and undermine this Republic;

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Gov. Goodwin J. Knight, Lt. Gov. Harold J. Powers, Senator Nelson S. Dilworth, Assemblyman Harold K. Levering, to State Superintendent of Public Instruction Roy E. Simpson, and to the members of the California State Board of Education.

Adopted February 25, 1955.

**RESOLUTION No. 27. AFFIRMATION OF FAITH IN THE POWER AND MAJESTY
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

Resolved, 1. That we, members of the National Society and of the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm our faith in the invincible power and majesty of our Nation, in the world today and in the world of the future, and renew our confidence in the ability of the United States of America to preserve and maintain its way of life against all negative and destructive forces, foreign or domestic.

2. That we assume a positive and creative approach to all national and international problems and difficulties which may confront us—individually or collectively—consistently refusing to accept any defeatist or pessimistic attitude from any source whatsoever.

3. That we meet any propaganda attack or ideological sabotage aimed directly or indirectly against the democratic system of our Republic, in whatever guise, with effective countermeasures of immediate exposure, bringing it to the revealing light of truth.

4. That we, as free American citizens, protest and refuse to accept at face value any reports from any source of mass communication, be it radio, television, newspaper, or cinema, which tend to spread fear and destroy faith and trust of our American system.

5. That we refuse to be stampeded into a state of moral paralysis by the exaggerated or distorted statements of left-wing commentators, or the warped views of terror-mongering columnists who employ the perverted tactics of sensational shock and jingo journalism to attain their ends.

6. That we totally reject and condemn such assault upon the minds and the will and the well-being of the American people, and with vigilance and determination, we will do all in our power, both as individuals and as an organization—the Daughters of the American Revolution—to counteract the influence of those individuals who would dare to lay profane hands upon our sacred birthright.

Adopted February 25, 1955.

Senator KNOWLAND. Dr. Monroe Deutsch.

I am delighted to have you with us, Dr. Deutsch.

Dr. DEUTSCH. Thank you, Senator Knowland.

**STATEMENT OF DR. MONROE E. DEUTSCH, VICE PRESIDENT, SAN
FRANCISCO CHAPTER, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED
NATIONS**

Dr. DEUTSCH. Members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate, I am Monroe E. Deutsch, vice president and provost emeritus of the University of California, vice president of the

San Francisco Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations, for which I am now speaking.

THE VETO QUESTION

The most discussed and criticized element in the Charter of the United Nations or rather the feature most abused has been the veto. Should it be abolished? Its adoption rested on the opinion that, should the United Nations be involved in a war, its military strength would have to come in by far the largest degree from the five states which are now permanent members of the Security Council, and they should not be expected to contribute great forces in a cause in which they do not believe. And of course the power of the veto rests with the United States as well as the four other states. There is no doubt but that, had there been no veto for the United States, it is most questionable whether the United States Senate would have ratified the charter.

However, while we have never employed the veto ourselves, it has been used 60 times by Russia up to June 1954. France has employed it twice, once alone and once with Russia. To be frank, it may fairly be said that we have never felt the need of employing it since we have never lost a vote in the United Nations on any matter that we considered important, on which the veto would have been of help to us.

If the veto were abolished, and each state on the Security Council had one vote and a simple majority decided an issue, the nonpermanent members of the Council could determine the action of the United Nations although possibly representing only 40 million people and carrying very little political or military weight.

REMOVAL OF VETO ON QUESTIONS OF WAR

To be sure, the charter provides that decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote by any 7 members of that body, while on all other matters there must be an affirmative vote of 7 members including the permanent members. In our judgment in a matter as important as this the charter itself should indicate what matters are procedural and which are not. We feel that all matters which involve war, including not only a decision as to aggression, but matters of disarmament, and any possible decision as to the number and kind of armed forces each state would be expected to contribute to the United Nations forces, and of course, not least, pertaining to the use of atomic and hydrogen bombs, should be subject to the veto.

REMOVAL OF VETO ON MEMBERSHIP

There have been prolonged discussions on the admission of new states to the United Nations; indeed, 14 nations were excluded by the veto of the Soviets. In the course of this period, Russia proposed as a compromise that 14 members of the groups proposed by her and the Western Powers be elected. The United States, however, refused to accept this "package deal," and indeed, the majority of the Security Council have held that this is contrary to the principles of the charter. Such a stalemate by which no additional state may become a member of the United Nations, being blocked by one member, is intolerable.

To us it seems clear that the charter should be specifically amended by providing that the election of states to membership shall be free from the veto.

The barring from membership of numerous nations which are destined to play a great part in international relations, as for example Germany, Japan, and Italy, inevitably weakens its effectiveness.

You need not be reminded, I am sure, of the Vandenberg resolution adopted in 1948 by the Senate by a vote of 64 to 4 which urges that the veto be removed both from the admission of new members and all questions involving the pacific settlement of international disputes and situations. With this we are in hearty accord.

We realize, however, that any amendment to the charter requires the vote of all of the permanent members, and consequently we urge that before any effort is made to amend, a careful discussion be held with the powerful members of the United Nations, particularly the permanent members, so that a decision may be reached and we may not be thrown into a fruitless brawl.

Reference has been made to this organization as a Frankenstein. I should like to quote many statements made about it. I could quote statements of Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Sr., who, although an opponent of the League of Nations, nevertheless declared firmly that nations must unite as men unite in order to preserve peace.

President Eisenhower on many occasions has said:

What we need most and first to give the United Nations strength and effectiveness is to believe in it. I happen to believe in it with my whole heart. I cannot overstate my desire to see the United Nations made stronger, to see it win more and more people to its support, and to a greater determination for the practice of the principles it lays down. The entire enterprise is bipartisan. It is not Democratic. It is not Republican. It is American. Our Senate adopted the charter by an almost unanimous vote. My final word is, improve the United Nations Charter if you can, but if you cannot make changes in the charter, nonetheless be sure to preserve and defend our world organization.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you, Doctor.

For the benefit of those who came in subsequent to the opening of the meeting, I want to say we are operating under the Rules of the Senate, and as has been requested by Senator Sparkman this morning, in which I concur, there will be no indications of either approval or disapproval of the various witnesses before us this afternoon. This is in the interests of saving time as well as orderly procedure.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Deutsch is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY DR. MONROE E. DEUTSCH, VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST EMERITUS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, AND VICE PRESIDENT, SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

The most discussed and criticized element in the charter of the United Nations or rather the feature most abused has been the veto. Should it be abolished? Its adoption rested on the opinion that, should the United Nations be involved in a war, its military strength would have to come in by far the largest degree from the five states which are now permanent members of the Security Council, and they should not be expected to contribute great forces in a cause in which they do not believe. And of course the power of the veto rests with the United States as well as the four other states. There is no doubt but that, had there been no veto for the United States, it is most questionable whether the United States Senate would have ratified it. However, while we have never employed the veto ourselves, it has been used 60 times by Russia up to June 1954. France has employed it twice, once alone and once with Russia. To be frank, it may fairly be said that we have never felt the need of employing it since we have never lost

a vote in the United Nations on any matter that we considered important, on which the veto would have been of help to us.

If the veto were abolished, and each state on the Security Council had 1 vote and a simple majority decided an issue, the nonpermanent members of the council could determine the action of the United Nations although possibly representing only 40 million people and carrying very little political or military weight.

To be sure the charter provides that decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote by any 7 members of that body, while on all other matters there must be an affirmative vote of 7 members including the permanent members. In our judgment, in a matter as important as this, the charter itself should indicate what matters are procedural and which are not. We feel that all matters which involve war including not only a decision as to aggression, but matters of disarmament and any possible decision as to the number and kind of armed forces each state would be expected to contribute to the United Nations forces, and of course, not least, pertaining to the use of atomic and hydrogen bombs, should be subject to the veto.

There have been prolonged discussions on the admission of new states to the United Nations; indeed 14 nations were excluded by the veto of the Soviets. In the course of this period, Russia proposed as a compromise that 14 members of the groups proposed by her and the Western powers be elected. The United States, however, refused to accept this package deal and indeed the majority of the Security Council have held that this is contrary to the principles of the charter. Such a stalemate by which no additional state may become a member of the United Nations, being blocked by one member, is intolerable. To us it seems clear that the charter should be specifically amended by providing that the election of states to membership shall be free from the veto.

The barring from membership of numerous nations which are destined to play a great part in international relations, as for example Germany, Japan, and Italy, inevitably weakens its effectiveness.

You need not be reminded, I am sure, of the Vandenberg resolution adopted in 1948 by the Senate by a vote 64-4 which urges that the veto be removed both from the admission of new members and all questions involving the pacific settlement of international disputes and situations. With this we are in hearty accord. That one of the great powers should be able to say to the Security Council of the United Nations: "I forbid you to strive by peaceful means to end this threat to peace" is intolerable.

It must, of course, always be remembered that any amendment to the charter requires the approval not only of two-thirds of the members of the United Nations but must include all the permanent members.

It seems to us the part of wisdom prior to the Conference on Review of the Charter to have our representatives discuss their proposals with key members of the United Nations including all the permanent members.

Certainly whatever may happen centuries hence, for the present we must not permit the charter to be altered without the approval of the United States. Senator Wiley in 1954 said, "The United States no less than the other great powers, insisted on the veto as a condition for acceptance of the charter."

The proposal that there be some weighting of votes in the Assembly seems to involve great difficulties. If it be based on population, financial contributions to the United Nations, or other factors, there would be need for constant revision. Besides (to look at the matter from the interest of the United States, as we should) there is the fear that some of our best friends in the United Nations would suffer a loss of strength, which would, of course, react on us, and at the same time there would be great resentment among the states whose voting power would be reduced.

We should make every effort to have such changes as we have proposed made, but realize the difficulties that are involved. However, we must always remember that the very provisions that make change difficult, are the very ones designed to protect us as well, and certainly it is infinitely better to continue as we are than to destroy the United Nations in a futile effort. We must not lose our present advantages in a vain quest for greater ones, for we must stop and consider all that the United Nations in its 10 years has accomplished. Allow me to refer you to the address of the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, before the Senate on January 8, 1953.

For generations mankind has yearned for a world organization. The first proposal appeared in Woodrow Wilson's 14 points. Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, grandfather of our present Ambassador to the United Nations, and the most bitter opponent of the League of Nations, expressed the need for it saying: "Nations must unite as men unite in order to preserve peace." So, too, did Sena-

tor Robert A. Taft express himself. And on numerous occasions President Eisenhower has made clear his hearty support of the United Nations; among other things he said: "What we need most—and first—to give the United Nations strength and effectiveness is to believe in it. I happen to believe in it with my whole heart. I cannot overstate my desire to see the United Nations made stronger, to see it win more and more people to its support and to a greater determination for the practice of the principles it lays down."

The entire enterprise is bipartisan, it is not Democratic or Republican, it is American. Our Senate adopted the charter by an almost unanimous vote.

My final word is—improve the United Nations if you can, but if you cannot make changes in the charter, nonetheless be sure to preserve and defend our world organization.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mrs. ISRAEL. Capt. Stuart C. Griswold.

STATEMENT OF CAPT. STUART C. GRISWOLD, MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS

Captain GRISWOLD. Senator Knowland, my name is Stuart C. Griswold, and officer of World War I and a former foreign branch industrial executive and presently adjutant of the California Department of the Military Order of the World Wars.

Comdr. Harold D. Padgett, State commander, and other representatives of our order are present.

It is an honored privilege to appear before you as spokesman for an organization whose membership is composed of active, inactive, and retired officers from all branches of the United States armed services who served during either of the world wars or the Korean conflict. Many top ranking officers are active officers of our hereditary order.

With this composition, we feel we are well qualified to speak to the vital question of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee.

The primary objective of our order is to promote the cultivation of military, naval, and air science and to adoption of a consistent and suitable policy of national security for the United States of America. At the outset, Senator Sparkman referred to the atmosphere of hope and expectancy, for early attainment of world peace and personal security that existed here in San Francisco 10 years ago, which I personally well remember with the creation of the U. N.

That is a far different thing from the situation we face throughout the world today. We agree with our esteemed Senator William F. Knowland that the U. N. as now constituted and based on performances to date has not demonstrated its ability to serve as a satisfactory agency for providing collective security.

DIVISION IN THE U. N.

It is our studied opinion that the U. N. as now constituted was created on false premises. The assumption that all participants would practice freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and free choice of leadership was fallacious. The International Labor Organization, an arm of the U. N., has found this to be the case and is actively attempting to change their constitution to provide a remedy.

Hopelessly divided at the start on basic principles, nations supporting world communism face Western democracies supporting the capitalistic system of free enterprise. While billions of dollars, provided largely by the United States, have been expended by the U. N.

through its various agencies in its efforts to strengthen its influence throughout the world, nothing that we can see has happened in the first 10 years of operation within the U. N. other than the action of the International Labor Organization to show progress toward composition of the fundamental differences inherent to opposing ideologies of Russia and the United States.

Tangible security for the United States has been obtained through the regional defense treaties, such as NATO, and largely by independent action in the face of continuous bitter opposition on the part of Russia as a fellow member of the U. N.

Russia we accepted as our ally and assumed friend at Yalta, and later as an equal member in the U. N., has proven in no unmistakable terms to be an unrelenting enemy. She has repeatedly used the U. N. platform to oppose the efforts of the United States to negotiate agreements that vitally affect the peace and security of our Western world and the American way of life.

RETENTION OF VETO POWER

As long as this situation exists, the power of the veto is the last resort by which the United States can protect its vital interests and retain sovereignty against a foreign vote detrimental to the United States. We feel the veto power in the charter must be retained.

We have heard the oft-repeated statement, "The U. N. Charter should be strengthened." But there is wide difference of opinion among these advocates as to the definition of "strengthened," depending upon point of view.

We ask Congress to insure that the proposals to strengthen the U. N. do not weaken the United States. We believe that the rights of the United States citizens established under our Constitution are paramount and should be protected even though added U. N. Charter limitations may be necessary to bring this about.

MILITARY STRENGTH FOR THE U. N.

Another important matter that will arise among proposals to strengthen the U. N. is that of giving the U. N. greater military power by assigning it forces for its own use and under its own military direction. In our book, it is our responsibility to defend the United States as an independent nation and to maintain it as a true example of democracy in action, but not as an integrated unit of the world government.

A majority of our citizens still hold that it is the responsibility of our United States Military Establishment to build a sound defense for America against all enemies, whenever and wherever they appear, even though they might be members of the United Nations.

Member nations have not complied with articles 43, 45, 46, and 47, which will give this military power to the U. N., the reason being that with the surrender of this power to the U. N., world government is factually created and the independence of the United States may be irretrievably lost. We could not conceive of a U. N. army coping with Russia to enforce an atomic agreement, for instance.

A more efficient way of preventing aggression and at the same time not losing control of our own forces is being employed in a forma-

tion of reasonable pacts such as NATO, and the regional pact nations ally themselves in a particular region to meet a particular situation. We believe this is still the only practical approach to security for the United States and for the nations with whom we are allied.

May we conclude by saying that the obligations that the United States assumed in Korea under the U. N. Charter, are participation in what later proved to be a pyrrhic victory and the implication as to what may be expected of the United States when similar incidents arise, must be clarified. Any hope of successful coexistence with Russian communism is necessarily correlated to future U. N. policy in such a situation.

We and many thousands more like us in the State of California would like to know just what are the obligations of the United States to the U. N. under current agreements, interpretations and practices.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear here, and it has been a pleasure to contribute our views.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Captain Griswold is as follows:)

REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

(Statement prepared for presentation before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at San Francisco on April 9, 1955. This statement, representative of the opinions of the members of the Military Order of the World Wars, Department of California, is based on the fundamental principles advanced by Rear Adm. William Rea Furlong (retired) past commander in chief of the order in his appearance before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs in April 1954 at Washington, D. C.)

At the outset it will be well to record that we of the Military Order of the World Wars support the principle of establishment of security for the United States of America through alliances bound by treaty agreement. But we agree with our esteemed Senator William F. Knowland in that the U. N., as now constituted and based on performances to date, has not demonstrated its ability to serve as such an agency.

It is our studied opinion that the U. N. as now constituted was created on false premises. The assumption that all participants would grant equal rights to all their peoples—freedom of thought, freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and free choice of leadership, was fallacious. To bolster this opinion an insidious campaign for dilution of thought in our schools, churches, and public forums is being fostered to convey and develop the belief that the U. N. is founded on these democratic principles and therefore merits unquestioned support.

The atmosphere of hope and expectancy for early attainment of world peace and personal security, that existed here in San Francisco 10 years ago with the creation of the U. N., is a far different thing than the situation we face throughout the world today.

In our opinion, the nations presently constituting the U. N. are further apart instead of in closer agreement due to the failure of the U. N. to fulfill its primary obligations. Hopelessly divided at the start on basic principles nations supporting world communism face Western democracies supporting the capitalistic system of free enterprise. While billions of dollars, provided largely by the United States, have been expended by the U. N. through its various agencies in its efforts to strengthen its influence throughout the world—nothing, that we can see, has happened in the first 10 years of operation within the U. N. to show progress toward composition of the fundamental differences inherent to opposing ideologies of its members.

Tangible security for the United States has been obtained through regional defense treaties, such as NATO, and largely by independent action in the face of continuous bitter opposition on the part of Russia as a fellow member of the U. N. To us this is significant in the light of recent occurrences.

We are hearing a great deal of late by way of justification for the secret commitments made at Yalta. It is said that "We were dealing with an assumed

amenable ally and had every reason at that time to believe in his honesty of purpose." That is a rather naive assumption in the face of the known communistic dogma authored by Karl Marx and Lenin to which Stalin was unalterably committed.

This same situation existed at the time the U. N. Charter was formulated and we observe that some of the principals, representing the United States, served as architects and consultants in the creation of both instruments.

This we now know to be a fact: The Russia we accepted as an ally and an assumed friend has proven, in no unmistakable terms, to be an unrelenting enemy. She has repeatedly used the U. N. platform to oppose the efforts of the United States to negotiate agreements that vitally affect the peace and security of our Western World and American way of life.

As long as this situation exists the power of the veto is the last resort by which the United States can protect its vital interests and retain sovereignty against a foreign vote detrimental to us. We want the veto power in the charter retained.

There appears to be considerable agreement on the oft repeated statement that "The U. N. Charter should be strengthened." But there is a wide difference of opinion among these advocates as to the definition of "strengthen." We ask Congress to insure that the proposals to strengthen the U. N. do not weaken the United States. The persons most vocal about strengthening the U. N. are extremists who want world government now; and who hope to establish a super-world government through the necessary changes in the United Nations Charter.

We believe that the rights of United States citizens, as originally established under our Constitution, are paramount and should be protected even though added U. N. Charter limitations may be necessary to bring this about.

Another important matter that will arise among proposals to strengthen the U. N. is that of giving the U. N. greater military power by assigning it forces for its own use and under its own military direction. The member nations have not found it practicable or to their best interests to carry out those articles in the charter namely 43, 45, 46 and 47 which give this military power to the U. N. These articles require the member nations to make special agreements with the U. N. for the supply of armed forces and for keeping immediately available air force contingents, and for a Military Staff Committee in the U. N. for the strategic direction of forces under the Security Council. The member nations have not complied with these articles.

A more efficient way of preventing aggression and at the same time not losing control of our own forces is being employed in the formation of regional pacts such as NATO. In the regional pacts, nations ally themselves in a particular region to meet a particular situation. It serves no purpose to keep in the charter articles which nations will not carry out.

If the U. N. is to continue as a possible preserver of world peace it is our contention that it should use consultations, cooperation, diplomacy and sanctions, but it should not be equipped with a military force of its own. It may now call on nations to supply forces where sanctions are too slow, but it must never have a permanent military force of its own.

May we conclude by saying: That the obligations we assumed in Korea under the U. N. Charter—our participation in what later proved to be a pyrrhic victory—and the implication as to what may be expected of the United States when similar incident arises, must be clarified. Any hope for successful co-existence with Russian communism is necessarily co-related to future U. N. policy in such a situation.

We and many thousands more like us in the State of California would like to know "Just what are the obligations of the United States to the U. N. under current agreements, interpretations and practices?" We trust that the published findings of this committee will provide, in a large measure, the answer to this vital question.

It has been a pleasure to contribute our views.

Senator KNOWLAND. In the case of both prior witnesses, the Chair permitted them to go about a minute overtime because they were nearly at the end of the remarks and because they had somewhat different views, and the Chair did not want to cut off one, having allowed the other to go on. But I do ask the cooperation of all the witnesses. You will be given a warning at the 4-minute period by the time-

keeper that you have 1 minute left. Because of the large number of witnesses we have, when the 5 minutes are up, the Chair will have to call attention to that fact with the gavel, but the entire statement will be published in the record.

I do ask the cooperation of all witnesses. We still have about 50 to go.

Next witness. I would suggest, when the name is called the witness, if present, immediately say "here," so that we will know; otherwise we will call the next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Miss Marylouise Allen.

Next is William Brinton.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MARYLOUISE ALLEN, PRESIDENT, FEDERATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF SAN FRANCISCO

Miss ALLEN. My name is Marylouise Allen. My address is 1931½ O'Farrell Street. I am appearing as a representative of the Federated Young Democrats of San Francisco, of which I am the president.

We welcome you and the work of your committee to our great city of San Francisco.

Ours is an organization of about 250 members. We are the young people's arm of the Democratic Party in this county. We are involved in activities directed toward the welfare of the local, national, and international community. Our program is one of educating ourselves on vital issues, accepting political responsibilities, and then working in campaigns for candidates of our choice.

Our organization wishes to thank the members of the subcommittee for the opportunity to appear here and to express some of its views.

Although Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Walter George is not present today, we wish especially to extend our congratulations and express our support to him in his call for four-power talks.

SUPPORT FOR THE U. N.

The Young Democrats' platform affirms "that the surest existing instrument to achieve a lasting world peace is a strengthened and extended United Nations." Chapter VI, article 33, section 1 of the United Nations Charter states that when disputes may endanger the international peace and security, solution is to be sought, first of all, through negotiation, inquiry, mediation, and so forth. We believe that this section of the charter is the very core of the United Nations.

In the interests of international harmony and the safeguarding of the people of this Nation, we feel that this concept needs to be implemented and practiced by member nations. Senator George's position is in the best spirit of the United Nations and therefore in the best interests of the United States. We are proud of him as a fellow Democrat and a fellow American.

CHANGES TO BE CONSIDERED

In contemplating revision of the United Nations Charter there are many issues of vital importance and concern. However, the Young Democrats have elected to submit three items for the subcommittee's consideration.

1. The platform of the Young Democrats states that "we favor the establishment of a more effective United Nations Trusteeship Council for those colonies not yet ready for full independence." Toward this end we recommend that the Council in addition to its present functions as outlined in articles 87 and 88 of chapter XII of the charter, be empowered to make recommendations to the General Assembly and to member nations through the General Assembly and that the charter be revised.

2. Article 23 of chapter V of the charter describes the composition of the Security Council and lists its permanent members. We recommend that consideration be given to seating India as a permanent member, since it represents a major bloc of the population of Asia.

3. The platform of the Young Democrats calls for "the strengthening of the United Nations by encouraging its increased participation in international economic, cultural, military and political fields. We ask for the engagement of the United Nations in achieving the elimination of the barriers to free trade, and the understanding of the economic problems of its member nations."

Therefore, we recommend that the scope and activities of the Economic and Social Council be broadened and vitalized and that the valuable work of this council and its subsidiary bodies be further supplemented and expanded.

In conclusion, we wish to reaffirm our support of the United Nations and its guiding principles; we are confident that the work of this subcommittee will help in bringing the goal of lasting world peace closer to reality.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. William M. Brinton.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM M. BRINTON, PRESIDENT, YOUNG REPUBLICANS OF SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. BRINTON. My name is William M. Brinton. I am president of the San Francisco Young Republicans.

I am sure it is only a coincidence that I should follow the Young Democrats.

At the outset I would like to say that the Young Republicans of San Francisco, of which I am president, wish to reiterate their support of the United Nations. Their support springs not only from a recognition of the past achievements of the United Nations but also from the hope it holds for the future. Additionally, the Young Republicans of San Francisco accept and endorse the policy of its parent State and national organization which, by an overwhelming majority supported the United Nations.

Since its founding in 1945 and after extensive debate, the responsible members of both political parties have accepted American participation in the United Nations as an integral part of our foreign policy. In the following remarks, therefore, I have made several basic assumptions. I have assumed that the United Nations Charter will either remain unchanged or that revisions, if any, will preserve its essential vitality and flexibility. I have also assumed that this committee will not wish to hear testimony renewing the debate over American par-

ticipation in the United Nations. Finally, I have assumed that only revisions of a relatively technical nature will be seriously proposed, as to which only a person or organization who has made a thorough analysis of the charter and its operation would be competent to discuss.

It is not my intention, nor am I prepared or able, to discuss suggested technical changes of the charter, though many have been made. For whatever value it has, I would like, therefore, to suggest a possible standard against which proposed changes of any kind might be tested.

STANDARDS FOR CHARTER CHANGES

It seems to me that proposed revisions of the United Nations Charter should be judged in the light of what the U. N. is really supposed to accomplish. The Communist nations seem to believe that in practice the U. N. should remain neutral in its actions but allow its facilities to be used as a forum for special pleading. On the other hand there are those who believe that the U. N. exists only as a forum for the expression and support of American views. In my opinion neither of these positions is correct.

President Eisenhower has stated that the United Nations should provide as wide a forum as possible for the expression of different points of view, but that there should be standards of admission among which are an acknowledgment of international law and conventions. Beyond this, however, the U. N., having heard conflicting views, must be able to act in support of the principles set forth in the charter. These principles are enumerated in article I and include collective action under many differing circumstances as well as action to maintain international peace and security. It seems to me, therefore, that any proposed revisions tending to limit the effectiveness of collective action in support of these principles should receive the most critical attention.

MAINTAIN FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION

In the United Nations Charter there are numerous provisions touching on collective action of one kind or another even if that action involves no more than the discussion contemplated by article X or recommendations under article XIV. These sections are not inconsequential merely because the United Nations may never take direct action as a result of such discussions or direct action to enforce its recommendations. It is by such discussions and recommendations that the United Nations serves as a forum for mobilizing world public opinion. The fact that even the most embarrassing issues may be brought up for discussions serves as a pressure on free nations to put their house in order. That this pressure may ultimately be felt in the Communist nations is not beyond the realm of possibility.

Additionally, United Nations' examination of these matters forces smaller and weaker nations to make up their minds on the issues which divide the world. It seems to me, therefore, that the United Nations must be prepared to take on the most awkward issues, and that we should oppose revisions, if any are or have been proposed, which circumscribe the kind or scope of matters as to which the United Nations may now hold discussions or make recommendations.

DIRECT ACTION BY THE U. N.

It is, in my opinion, impossible to predict what kind of direct action the United Nations should take in any given situation. The sections dealing with pacific settlement of disputes and action with respect to threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, and acts of aggression set forth the nature of action which may be taken under particular circumstances. Intervention of the United Nations in Korea and the resolution naming Red China as an aggressor nation flow from these sections. In addition, the United Nations has concluded a permanent, if uneasy, armistice between Israel and Egypt and it has supported Greece while under attack from the Communists.

There are, of course, areas in which the United Nations has failed to take action, but this, in my opinion, is not a reason for believing that it has failed as a world organization. The action the United Nations has taken is no less important merely because it has not acted in all cases and under all circumstances. What it has done illustrates the action its members are willing to sanction and gives support to the belief that ultimately its members may expand the area in which they are willing to take effective action.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we should accept and support the idea that the United Nations is a forum for the expression of its members' views even though this idea may carry with it the obvious corollary that the views expressed may differ from our own. President Eisenhower last year stated that the United Nations provided "the only real world forum where we have the opportunity for international presentation and rebuttal." Secretary of State John Foster Dulles later amplified this principle by stating before this committee that this process tended, even though slowly, to bring about conformity to a common standard. This to me is an objective which we cannot and should not disregard.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you very much.

Mr. BRINTON. Thank you, Senator.

STATEMENTS INSERTED

Senator KNOWLAND. The Chair may state that if any of the witnesses who are later in the program desire, because of the problems of time, to come forward and file their statement after giving their name and the organization they represent, we would be glad to oblige them at this time.

The statements will be published in full in the record. If any so desire, you may raise your hand, and you may come up. Would you give your name?

Mrs. SHIRPSER. Mrs. Clara Shirpser.

Senator KNOWLAND. Mrs. Shirpser, you may come forward and file your statement.

(The statement of Mrs. Shirpser is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. CLARA SHIRPSER, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEEWOMAN
FOR CALIFORNIA

I believe that it is in our national interest to strengthen the United Nations—that we should keep and improve the U. N., through which our great power has been converted into leadership.

The United States has never lost a major vote in the U. N.

Only when we have taken an extreme position out of touch with international thinking of the free world have we suffered even a minor defeat. Even then, we have to accept the fact that the United States hasn't got all the brains and ability in the world, and we can't act like children, "pick up our marbles," and go home. Our withdrawal from the United Nations would irreparably damage world peace. I believe that the objective of this charter review is to strengthen the U. N. We have to be vigilant that proposals which would weaken and emasculate the U. N. are not accepted; these are mostly advanced by isolationists and minority "hate" groups. All opinion polls show that the American people overwhelmingly support the U. N. So have all our Presidents, since its birth in San Francisco 10 years ago.

The big question to be weighed by this committee and the coming Conference is whether it is better to let the charter stand as it is in its major tenets. Through use, a successful way has been developed of avoiding the veto through the General Assembly.

Some of the major deficiencies of the U. N. Charter are: Misuse of the veto by the Soviet Union; the problem of membership, for which a solution is badly needed; hope to see the universality of membership improved (to date, members have been kept out by the Soviet veto); some stronger provision for control and supervision of armaments; the present charter prevents the use of force, but progress is needed for reduction of armaments. (Atomic bombs were not known in 1945 when the U. N. Charter came into being; technical developments which brought the atomic age have brought new armament problems which must be solved); poorly defined arrangements between specialized agencies such as the Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization and the U. N.

Realization that the U. N. is still our best hope for peace, as long as the nations of the world meet together, strive for solution of problems which are worldwide, and learn to work together, and seek to develop good will among nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. Are there any others who desire to take advantage of this opportunity to get their statement in?

You may come forward. Give your name.

Mr. MITCHELL. U. S. Mitchell.

Senator KNOWLAND. That statement will be incorporated.

(The statement of Dr. Mitchell is as follows:)

STATEMENT ON CHARTER REVISION BY DR. U. S. MITCHELL, SAN MATEO, CALIF.

Gentlemen of the committee, it was my privilege to serve as an interfaith consultant and observer at the United Nations Conference on International Organization here in San Francisco in 1945. I have followed the work of the U. N. with great concern. I believe that the views which I shall express represent the attitude of the vast majority of informed and thinking citizens of this area.

I. We are honorbound to support the calling of a review conference. In 1945 we promised the smaller nations a review conference within 10 years provided they would go along with us on provisions to which they objected. We dare not renege on our promise.

That conference took place away back in the preatomic age. The historian Toynbee reminds us that we have lived 1,000 years since 1945, measured in terms of scientific achievements and world events. It stands as an irrefutable fact that the U. N. Charter must be brought up to date if it is to be capable of maintaining world peace.

II. "There is no alternative to peace," declared President Eisenhower. In his first formal address as President he stressed the utter futility of war as a method of settling international disputes. It then follows that there is no alternative to total disarmament as a means toward achieving peace. Even our own military leaders tell us that "Wars can no longer be won." That leaves no alternative to the strengthening of U. N. as our one last and best hope for enforcing peace.

Disarmament is not only desirable, it is mandatory. Nations have never before prepared for war without getting war. I believe that total disarmament of both conventional and atomic weapons is possible under proper safeguards within U. N. It should be accomplished simultaneously and gradually under supervision of a revised United Nations. To summarize:

1. World law should be made supreme in contrast to international anarchy of the past and present.

2. The World Court should be strengthened and every nation should be required to honor its decisions.

3. The U. N. should have the power of inspecting within all countries and its police force authorized to apprehend any violator and bring them to the bar of justice.

4. The U. N. police force should be trained in the methods of enforcing law and order, a psychology vastly different from training in the arts of war.

5. Nuremberg trials would be held before the devastation rather than after the crime. The manufacture or trafficking in unlicensed arms would call for swift punishment.

We want a United Nations strengthened and capable of disarming the nations and enforcing the peace. Let's amend the charter to give it to that power. This is our only hope for survival. Let the United States lead the way and place ourselves completely under its mandates. There is no other alternative.

Senator KNOWLAND. Are there any others who have statements?
(No response.)

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. The next witness is Mr. Louis L. Bernheim.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed, Mr. Bernheim.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS L. BERNHEIM, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. BERNHEIM. Senator Knowland and Senator Sparkman, it is good to see you again.

I might say with reference to the last two speakers that, while I am a Republican and have served on the county central committee and Contra Costa County committee for many years, it is indeed good to hear young Democrats and young Republicans reaffirming the principle made by our distinguished dean, George, in saying that this is strictly a nonpolitical question.

Thank you for the honor granted me in making this statement. I am aware of the great responsibility incumbent upon us all in considering these matters.

My name is Louis L. Bernheim. I am an attorney in private practice, a member of the firm of Bernheim, Sugarman & Gilbert, with offices here and in Richmond, Calif.

While I have the honor to serve as vice president of the Northern California Council of the American Association for the United Nations and as chairman for U. N. affairs and international contacts for the Richmond Rotary Club, I appear here as an individual citizen.

A child of 10 is barely in the fifth grade primary school. A successful corporation of 10 years' experience would barely command national recognition in its industry. Our own great sovereign Nation 10 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence was still attempting to find its way under the inadequate provisions of the Articles of Confederation.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE FIRST 10 YEARS

Surely it would be folly to expect an adult, strong, stable United Nations in only 10 short years. That so much has been accomplished is to the everlasting credit of those of the nations participating, such as our own, who have lent to that organization faith, strength, and wisdom, and who have brought to its conference tables understanding, patience, and forbearance.

It would be idle to review the tremendous strides toward world health, nutrition, and education which have been accomplished in these 10 short years. In the political field, though much more could

have been desired, to the everlasting credit of the United Nations Organization, and, to our country in particular, perhaps the first armed resistance to aggression undertaken solely on moral principles without hope of material reward, occurred in the Korean action.

By construction of the charter provisions, honorable in intent, and able in concept, the Security Council, in which the veto may be and has been so ineptly used, has been shorn of a considerable portion of its power to block action in the General Assembly, and it would appear that under present construction—the uniting for peace resolution, for example—the General Assembly would be in a position to take the necessary steps in the preservation of world peace.

It is only natural that large segments of the population would have anticipated even greater and perhaps more headline-catching results in these 10 years. Some of these persons in their disappointment in the child's progress would advocate that his growth be cut off completely. Others would feed him special medicines of uncertain value in an attempt to obtain overnight beanstalk growth.

For my part, and I sincerely believe for the part of the great majority of our citizenry, the child should be encouraged to grow and mature under the same charter rules and regulations which have brought him to his present healthy primary stage with such promise for high school, college, and adulthood.

CAUTION URGED IN CHARTER AMENDMENT

Any change in the Charter of the United Nations at the present time might well do more harm to our growing youngster than good, and proposals for change must be examined with a critical eye lest they interfere with orderly, normal growth.

On the whole I am against any charter amendments at this time, but there is an important area wherein a study might well be undertaken to determine the advisability of making additional charter provisions.

STUDY OF PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR NEW MEMBERS

In the matter of admissions, it is not generally known that the China problem does not technically involve admission as such but rather whether the Nationalist Government of China in Formosa has been superseded because of the de facto assumption of power by the Communist Peoples Republic of Peiping. Nonetheless, 21 sovereign nations actually have petitions for admission.

They are: Laos, Cambodia, Albania, Austria, Bulgaria, Japan, Hungary, Libya, Nepal, Rumania, Ceylon, Finland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Portugal, Republic of Vietnam, Democratic Peoples Republic of Vietnam, Mongolian Peoples Republic, Republic of Korea, Peoples Democratic Republic of Korea.

Unfortunately, due apparently to present charter provisions, as contained in chapter II, it is most difficult to obtain individual considerations of their petitions based solely upon their qualifications.

Thus rises a specter of our 10-year-old child whose growth may well be affected adversely because his dietitians will not permit him to eat strengthening meat unless he also consumes, at the same time, a food which may very well disagree with him.

In this regard it might well be that certain provisions in the charter may be made to the end that all sovereign nations may obtain immediate probationary status upon the filing of their applications and pending final action on admission. While in such probationary status these nations would then be available, though without vote, for counsel. They might take part in many of the nonpolitical aspects of the work of the United Nations and would be in a position where they could demonstrate before the critical eyes of the world their worthiness or unworthiness.

I would recommend that a serious study of this underlying apparent weakness with respect to the provisions for admissions be undertaken with view of making possible recommendations for charter amendments of chapter II on the subject of membership.

In considering this basic problem of membership, it would appear well to remember that each of the nations of the world is sovereign over an area and people of this one world, each exists by virtue of that sovereignty, each takes its place in a world political climate that exists, not a political climate which we would like to have exist, or hope exists, but one that is and must be reckoned with.

The United Nations seems to offer the best, and perhaps the only, avenue for assuring that the climate be beneficial.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Mr. BERNHEIM. I thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Ten years is not a very long time, to be sure. But in 10 years, 600 million people have lost their freedom and 50 million their lives under communism.

Call the next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Julian Mack.

Mr. MACK. Here.

Mr. GILBERT. Followed by Mrs. James Dowd.

STATEMENT OF JULIAN W. MACK II, SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

Mr. MACK. Good afternoon.

My name is Julian W. Mack. I am an attorney practicing in San Francisco. I am speaking today in behalf of the San Francisco Chapter of the American Veterans Committee and the California State Council of the American Veterans Committee.

I am a member of the former and chairman of the latter.

I am a member of the national planning committee of the AVC, but I am not speaking today on behalf of the national organization.

I wish to thank you for this opportunity to make our views known to you.

EXAMINATION OF PROPOSALS WITH VIEW NOT TO WEAKEN CHARTER

Neither of the AVC organizations I am representing today has taken any position on any specific charter revision program. We feel simply that all proposals must be closely examined to be sure that they do not in any way weaken the United Nations.

We feel that there is a danger not only that specific powers where the ability of the U. N. to resist aggression might be taken away, but that inadvertently, and in an attempt to get revisions strengthening

the organization passed, the door might be opened to disruptive elements with an ultimate weakening effect.

And this, of course, we think should be avoided.

I should like as an individual to suggest one specific revision for consideration. Article 109 provides the possibility for one revision conference. I suggest that provisions be made for periodic review and possible revision conferences at stated intervals.

It may well be, in my opinion, that charter revisions which would strengthen the United Nations may be unfeasible at present because of international or internal political considerations in the several countries, but they might succeed at a later date.

AFFIRMATIVE UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP NEEDED

The American Veterans Committee believes that the United States must exert much greater or even greater efforts than we have in the past to make the U. N. succeed. Without trying to dominate or coerce any other nation, we must provide much more of the type of affirmative leadership which was exemplified by President Eisenhower's speech on the peaceful use of atomic energy.

The United States can do much on all levels of activity and in ways that do not involve any charter revision to strengthen the United Nations, and we submit that these are things to which we should direct our attention and to which we feel the Foreign Relations Committee can direct its attention usefully.

For example, we believe that the American delegation should make every effort to revitalize the apparently dormant efforts to establish an available armed force as envisioned in the uniting-for-peace resolution, and in article 43 of the United Nations Charter. We feel that the United States itself could do a great deal to strengthen the United Nations.

Here, for example, the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives recently cut by 50 percent the deficiency appropriation designed to cover our current pledge to the United Nations expanded technical assistance program. We believe that UNITAP not only helps underprivileged people to help themselves, but that it has reduced to some extent the poverty, squalor, and ignorance in which communism breeds, and it has helped to keep more than one country outside the Bamboo and Iron Curtains.

We think the Congress, and particularly your committee, gentlemen, is in an excellent position to strengthen the United Nations by increasing American support without any charter revisions.

We also think that more should be done to inform the public about the United Nations. We feel that the more people know about the U. N. the more enthusiastically they support it.

As veterans, we are well aware of the desirability of peace. We agree with our many national leaders of both parties who so often repeated that the U. N. represents man's most determined and promising effort to save humanity from the scourge of war.

We think that the Korean conflict, regrettable as it was, and unfortunate as it was that we had to bear such a great burden and such a great part of the burden and cost—we believe that the Korean conflict was a milestone in human progress, and the fact that 46 nations made some contribution, including the Ethiopian battalion, by sym-

bolic contrast to the events of 1935, is extremely important and represents a great step forward toward peace.

GREATER SUPPORT RATHER THAN REVISION NEEDED

In conclusion, we in the American Veterans Committee, particularly the San Francisco chapter and the California State council, recognize that the charter is far from perfect, but we submit that the most urgent need is greater support rather than revision.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Mack is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF JULIAN W. MACK II ON BEHALF OF SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER AND CALIFORNIA STATE COUNCIL, AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE

My name is Julian W. Mack II. I reside in Corte Madera, Marin County, Calif., and am an attorney practicing law in San Francisco, Calif. I am speaking on behalf of the San Francisco chapter of the American Veterans Committee, of which I am a member, and the California State council of the American Veterans Committee, of which I am chairman. I am a member of the national planning committee of the American Veterans Committee, but I am not speaking officially on behalf of the national organization. I wish at this time to thank you for this opportunity to make our views known to you.

We are delighted that you are holding this hearing in San Francisco. Even here, where the United Nations was born, an amazing number of people know little about it and its accomplishments and, as a result, are afraid of and opposed to extensive American participation. The very real difficulties in dealing with the Soviet Union and its satellites have unfortunately received such great publicity that the solid accomplishments of the United Nations and its specialized agencies have often been entirely overlooked. We hope and believe that this visit and hearing by a subcommittee of so august a body as the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee will help bring the United Nations, its great accomplishments, and its importance to the United States and the world into clearer focus for the people of California and thus increase their support and enthusiasm for the United Nations.

The California State council and the San Francisco chapter of the American Veterans Committee both endorse the following planks of the international affairs platform adopted by the national convention of the American Veterans Committee in Boston in December 1954.

"We recognize the United Nations system as the world's most hopeful institution today, to and through which we can look for maturing and enduring peace.

"We reaffirm our wholehearted endorsement of the United Nations and its family of specialized agencies.

"We recognize the United Nations' present limitations, and we believe their remedy can be secured and corrected by national ratifications of the positive results coming out of such charter revision conferences as may be held in 1956. We are aware that difficulties beset the eventual transformation of the United Nations' system into a body of limited sovereign powers and enforceable sanctions, and that, further, parliamentary chaos and untold damage to the U. N. may result if substantial changes are sought too early on an unwilling majority or forced on a significant minority of nations or peoples.

"But we also know that only through such a strengthening of the United Nations with constitutional transfers, not surrenders, of the sovereignty and powers required for the job—can be yearning of mankind for a world with universal enforceable disarmament among nations and progressive technical and economic development among peoples become real.

"We urge the strengthening of the U. N. and all its resources, so that all its efforts and activities may be directed toward the development of atomic energy for peaceful uses for the benefit and welfare of all the peoples of the world."

I understand that the purpose of these hearings is to determine what the public thinks, on a grassroots level, about possible charter revisions, and about the degree of American participation in the United Nations. Neither of the

organizations I am representing today has taken any position on any specific proposed charter revision. We feel simply that any proposed revisions should be scrutinized carefully to be sure that they will in fact strengthen the organization. Not only should they be examined to be sure that they will not reduce any of the powers of the United Nations or its ability to meet and defeat aggression anywhere in the world, but there is a risk to be considered that in attempting to strengthen the charter by revisions at this time we might open the door to disruptive developments which might in fact weaken the organization.

There is one specific charter amendment which I, as an individual, wish nonetheless to suggest for consideration. Article 109 provides the possibility of one charter revision conference. There is no provision for subsequent review by revision conferences. I suggest that it might be desirable to provide for periodic review and possible revision conferences at stated intervals. It may well be that the charter could be modified in various ways to strengthen the United Nations but that international and internal political considerations in the several countries militate against successful action at the present time. Were periodic review provided, such changes could be reconsidered frequently and any changes that are made could be reevaluated after a reasonable test.

With respect to the question of American participation in the United Nations and its affiliated organizations, the American Veterans Committee believes that we must exert even greater efforts than we have to date to make the United Nations succeed. Our country played a major role in the initiation of the United Nations, in its financing, and in its successes to date, and it can and should play an even greater role in the United Nations' future conduct and activities. Whether we like it or not we are the principal leader of the non-Communist world, and our attitude toward the United Nations can to a large degree influence its ultimate success or failure. Without trying to dominate or coerce any nation the United States must provide the sort of active, affirmative leadership exemplified by President Eisenhower's speech on the peaceful use of atomic energy. In this connection, and as a specific example, we submit that the United States should energetically pursue all possibilities that may develop at the United Nations sponsored conference in Geneva this summer, and make a genuine effort to see that the program suggested by the President is put into practical and widespread effect.

We in the American Veterans Committee believe that there are several other important ways in which the United States can and should strengthen the United Nations. These do not involve any question of charter revision but rather require greater effort to support the existing United Nations organization and to operate effectively under its existing structure. One such effort would be for our delegation to strive to revitalize the attempts to establish an available armed force and collective measures committee as envisaged in the uniting for peace resolution and in article 43 of the charter.

Similarly, Congress could easily do much to provide greater support for the United Nations. A good and current illustration relates to the deficiency appropriation for the United Nations expanded technical assistance program. The appropriations committee of the House of Representatives recently reduced by 50 percent the appropriation intended to cover our current pledge. UNETAP is, in our opinion, one of the most important of the many useful activities being carried on under United Nations auspices. It not only helps underprivileged peoples throughout the world to improve their own economic and social standards of living, but in so doing it also reduces the poverty, squalor, and ignorance in which communism so often breeds, and thus has helped keep more than one free country outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

We also think that more should be done to educate the public as to just what the United Nations is and what it is doing. As I said at the beginning of this statement, we feel sure that such information would lead to constantly growing public enthusiasm for the United Nations. The American Veterans Committee, consisting as it does of men and women who have had reason to know the evils and horrors of war, is firmly committed to the search for peace. We agree with President Eisenhower, former President Truman, Secretary Dulles, and the many national leaders who have so often repeated that the United Nations represents man's most determined and promising effort to save humanity from the scourge of war and to establish justice between nations. It is essential to the peace of the world. As a forum where the Communists and the rest of the world may meet and exchange views, its value has been incalculable. Having a forum where the Communist bombast and arguments can be heard and exposed has en-

abled millions of people throughout the world to see through Communist propaganda. People might have believed much if not all of that propaganda.

We veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war in the American Veterans Committee believe that the Korean conflict represents one of the decisive moments in history, and the fact that the United Nations was able successfully to resist military aggression gives us one of our highest hopes for a free and peaceful world. It was most unfortunate that so great a share of the burden of that war had to be borne by this country, but we find the fact that 16 nations made military contributions to the United Nations cause, and 46 nations made some contribution, military or economic, most significant. We find the presence of the Ethiopian Battalion a highly symbolic contrast to the events of 1935 when another aggressor was loose on the world. Had the United States gone it alone in Korea, we fear even greater sacrifices would have been necessary, and had no one resisted, we believe that all of Southeast Asia would now be under the control of the Chinese Communists.

In conclusion, gentlemen, we recognize that the United Nations Charter is far from perfect, and revision might yield some beneficial results. We submit, however, that the most urgent need today is not charter revision, but greater support of the United Nations by Congress, greater familiarity with the United Nations by the public, and more constructive leadership in and cooperation with the United Nations by the Government of the United States.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. The next witness is Mrs. James Dowd, followed by Mr. Laurence Dawson.

STATEMENT OF MRS. JAMES DOWD, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mrs. Dowd. I am Mrs. James Dowd, a mother, and I am speaking as an individual, and I have come to urge the recognition and to have a common moral standard like the Ten Commandments set up. And if this is not done, then we should withdraw from the United Nations.

I would also like to make this statement. I don't think it is possible for any woman or any group or organization to speak for the Catholic Women of America and to say whether or not they are for or against the United Nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Laurence Dawson, followed by Mrs. William Ostrander.

STATEMENT OF LAURENCE DAWSON, LOS ALTOS, CALIF.

Mr. Dawson. My name is Laurence Dawson, of Los Altos, Calif. I am employed in San Francisco as a film editor, testifying as an individual.

You have heard much today about disarmament and strengthening the United Nations Charter. I would like to direct my testimony toward one principle which I hope can be incorporated in any strengthening or amendment of the United Nations Charter.

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY BEFORE THE LAW

The principal of individual responsibility before law is, I believe, vital to successful functioning of any peacekeeping machinery, whether the community of that machinery's operation is the locality, the nation, or that community which is the world.

In spite of the wording of the preamble to the United Nations Charter, the membership of the United Nations is not the peoples, but rather the nations of the world. However, in our thinking, I believe

that we have fallen into what is essentially a semantic difficulty. We have attempted to equate one unit, the individual nation, with a different unit, an individual person, and then have tried to apply concepts which are adequate to explain and control the behavior of individual human beings. But such concepts fail when the unit with which you are dealing is not a person but a nation.

The most obvious example of what I would like to call this personalization fallacy is the political cartoon in which the United States is represented by the person of Uncle Sam, Great Britain by John Bull, and so forth. This practice would be quite harmless if it stopped with cartoons. But subconsciously this fallacy colors all of our thinking about international relations.

For example, we have heard the United Nations referred to as a democratic organization because each member has one vote, as though the nation were a person. We still hear glib talk about aggressors as though they were persons, about the United Nations police action or about trials before the bar of world opinion.

Carry such analysis a little further. How do you go about swearing out an indictment against a nation? How do you arrest it, bring it to trial? And if it is found guilty, above all, how do you punish it?

The only ultimate answer in the present Charter of the United Nations is, unhappily, the sanction of collective military action. We use many names to make this fact more palatable, but, put as baldly as possible, it means that our devotion to peace is such that we will go to war to enforce the peace, and this, of course, is nonsense.

Governments are established among other things to protect their citizens from violence from abroad. No government can, therefore, take part in the creation of a force outside of itself and over which it does not have complete control, so long as there is any possibility that at some future date that force might be turned back against that nation. This is the reason that we have never seen the creation of the United Nations police force envisioned in the charter.

I believe that the principle of individual responsibility before law offers us the only real opportunity adequately to strengthen the United Nations, because we can grant the United Nations the power to write laws binding upon individuals, since such a power does not inherently constitute a threat to our continued existence or security as a nation. In our own country, for example, the arrest of a State official for a Federal crime is not a threat to the existence of that State; it goes right on.

The external threat has been, since time immemorial, the one essential tool which despotic and tyrannical leadership has required to continue itself in power and to unite people unwilling to support such leadership except through a love of motherland. Any people whose homeland is threatened by military action—justly, as in a U. N. police action, or unjustly, as in aggression—will inevitably support its leadership, good or bad, if only because everyone is in the same boat and despite the fact that within any community no government is fortunate enough to hold the unanimous and enthusiastic support of its entire people.

If, however, the enforcement of world law, in the first instance, is a threat only to the individual responsible for its violation, we have deprived the tyrant of his tool and we may reasonably expect support

from that majority of people in any nation who are inherently law-abiding.

RELATED IDEAS

The principle of individual responsibility before law cannot, of course, be considered isolated from a number of other ideas which I can only mention.

First, there is the constitutional problem of properly circumscribing the power I have suggested. We Americans, with our heritage of the Bill of Rights, need, I believe, have no fear on that score.

Second, the problem of the vast differences which exist in the world today can be met most effectively by some application of America's unique contribution to political science, the device of federal government in its true meaning.

Third, the problem of achieving universal disarmament can be successfully solved only if we can provide some effective means of settling disputes and enforcing the settlement. I believe that the principle of individual responsibility before law is the key to such a solution.

Let me say in conclusion, that I believe in and support the United Nations as the first essential step in our progress toward a peaceful and ordered world in which our differences can flourish in healthy competition because we have the machinery we need to keep the peace. I believe that the principle of individual responsibility before law is the basis on which such machinery can be constructed for the United Nations. In other words, I want to see a United Nations which has the legal right and power to hold a Nuremberg trial before the next war.

Thank you, sir.

Senator KNOWLAND. The only comment that I have to make is that I hope the Soviet Union, which hasn't the concept of Anglo-Saxon justice, would not be sitting as a justice at such a trial. I can envision Paul Revere being cited as a war criminal by the British at the time of the Revolution for arousing the resistance to the British invasion.

I think possibly you might find the Soviet Union having a little different concept of Anglo-Saxon justice.

Mr. DAWSON. I said initially, Senator, that there were many other things that go along with this, but I think that this is the key to effect the alternative of the enforcement of world law.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Walter Ostrander, followed by Thomas J. Murray.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WALTER M. OSTRANDER, MEMBER, PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SAN FRANCISCO YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

Mrs. OSTRANDER. Mr. Knowland, gentlemen, I am Mrs. Walter M. Ostrander, 1701 Vallejo Street, San Francisco, representing the board of directors of the San Francisco Young Women's Christian Association.

This statement is based on the national platform which has been endorsed by the local public affairs committee, of which I am a member.

The association is part of a national movement, and through the national association, part of the World Young Women's Christian Association, we work in 65 other countries.

CONTINUED PARTICIPATION IN U. N. URGED

We wish to reaffirm our confidence in the United Nations and its specialized agencies as the most effective instrument for the promotion and maintenance of peace and for the improvement of economic and social welfare; and continue to urge our Government's responsible participation, including the appropriation of our fair share of the funds for their financing.

We support efforts directed toward obtaining within the United Nations agreements by all nations for the control and limitation of armaments under proper safeguards; and support sound proposals to devote at least part of the funds released by such a program to the promotion of human welfare.

We support efforts to establish within the jurisdiction of the United Nations as international pool of fissionable material designed for the promotion of human welfare.

We urge increasing work through the United States Government for the improvement of the standard of living of people in underdeveloped areas through long-range and expanded programs of technical cooperation and assistance as well as economic development, not subordinated to military consideration.

We support programs in the United Nations to promote human rights and fundamental freedoms, we urge our Government's ratification of the Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention and the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

We oppose constitutional amendments which would limit the powers of the executive branch of our Government in international relations.

The United States should support the principle of bringing all states into membership in the United Nations whatever their form of government when they are held to have met the requirements of the charter for membership, namely, that they are able and willing to carry out its obligations.

We regard an effective United Nations as vital to the security of the United States in this interdependent world. It is moreover the only agency equipped for testing and correcting misinformation, clarifying, and mediating difficult disputes, releasing pent up pressures and relieving hazardous tensions through peaceful channels and discussion in the open forum of the world.

The charter, article 33-F says:

The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice. II. The Security Council shall, when it deems necessary, call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means.

Its "sheer necessity" is expressed in the commitments of both the Republican and Democratic leadership to the United Nations as the cornerstone of United States foreign policy. We urge, therefore, that the United States set the example for the full use of the United Nations.

In considering the problem of charter review it is important to recognize that the charter as it is can be made to serve well the cause of international peace and justice.

Thank you, Senator.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Thomas J. Murray, followed by Reverend Meserve.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. MURRAY, SENIOR VICE COMMANDER OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, Senator Sparkman, I have been asked by the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of California, to represent him.

The Department of California constitutes over 70,000 men and women in the State of California and 1,550,000 in the United States.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is in favor of United Nations and through its 10,000 posts in the United States has actively campaigned for more widespread support of United Nations. We want every American citizen to understand the United Nations, its functions, its operations, its goals and more importantly, its limitations. We in Veterans of Foreign Wars have gone on record from time to time, in our encampments, endorsing the United Nations as the best means for the member nations to get together over the conference table to settle disputes.

II. UNITED NATIONS VERSUS WORLD GOVERNMENT

The Veterans of Foreign Wars, however, opposes the use of the United Nations as a framework for the development of a world Federal government. When the delegates met across the street at the War Memorial Building, 10 years ago this April 25, it was not the intention and purpose of organizing a world government. Subsequent events beginning with atomic pile of July 16, 1945, have been used by proponents of world government to reshape the United Nations into an organism of world statism. This would mean a single world executive, a world legislature, and a world judiciary. It would mean 1 army, 1 currency, 1 postal system. It would mean the abolition of these United States. The Veterans of Foreign Wars advocates that the original intention and purpose of United Nations be retained, that is, an organization of sovereign nations.

III. VETERANS REACTION TO UNITED NATIONS OPERATIONS

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars like millions of their fellow citizens, have been disappointed from time to time in the failure of the United Nations to maintain world peace and to eliminate the trouble spots. Our members have been incensed by the abuse of the United Nations by Russia as a forum in which to attack the United States and to disseminate communistic hate. The ordinary member

of the post seems to be quite disturbed by the fact that the United States has been required to supply nearly all the money and the manpower for the United Nations effort. In this respect, the ordinary veteran who has served overseas is inclined to think that the foreign nations, where we served, are letting us down.

IV. CHANGE PROPOSED FOR UNITED NATIONS PROCEDURE

At the 1955 Philadelphia encampment, the Veterans of Foreign Wars reaffirmed its faith in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. The Veterans of Foreign Wars considers the superimposing of any organic world government abhorrent to the spirit and philosophy of these great documents. In line with its favorable attitude to United Nations, the Philadelphia encampment recommended the following reforms in the United Nations procedures:

(1) That the burden of financing the operations and functions of the United Nations be more equally distributed among the participating countries on the basis of their present economic resources which have been greatly rejuvenated since the close of World War II.

(2) That all other participating countries be required to accept a greater share of these operating costs in a way that will substantially reduce the tremendous burden of costs the United States has been forced to absorb ever since the United Nations was founded.

(3) That the charter of the United Nations should be amended in a way that will deny countries the opportunity to obstruct and defeat the fundamental aims of the United Nations.

(4) That the charter of the United Nations should be amended in a way that will henceforth require of all member nations equal sacrifices, both in money and manpower in proportion to their respective resources, when the United Nations votes to resist aggression in any part of the world.

V. VFW ATTITUDE TOWARD PROPOSALS

Certain proposals have been put forth by other organizations for the purpose of furthering the development of the United Nations into the image and likeness of a world federalist government in which this Nation and its citizens would be subject.

1. Elimination of veto power. Although the veto power has been badly abused by Russia, the United States should not consent to giving up the veto power. It is at the present time, our only safeguard with relationship to what government should represent China in the United Nations. It would be our only control as to the use of and disposition of the American troops under any United Nations command. The VFW believes that the veto power should be retained as a most valuable sovereign right within the membership of the United Nations. Efforts to eliminate its abuse should be continued before world public opinion.

2. Automatic admission into United Nations. The VFW opposes any automatic membership in the United Nations by reason of the existence of a state or government and opposes also the compulsory membership of every state or government in the United Nations. The

United Nations should be permitted to have standards of decency and morality as criteria for membership in the United Nations.

3. Application of United Nations law to individual citizens. The VFW is opposed to the surrender of American sovereignty for the purpose of permitting a supergovernmental law to apply to the individual citizen, for example, to the citizen of California, in the same manner and to the same extent that a Federal or State law would apply to him.

4. World army. To American veterans who have served in foreign lands for three generations, any proposal that the United Nations should be empowered to enlist American men in a world army, as distinguished from a United States Army, is unthinkable. This suggestion of conscription of American men in a world army makes the ordinary veteran shudder.

VI. CONCLUSION

The VFW requests its elected representatives to weigh any proposals to modify the existing charter of the United Nations against the balance of American integrity, individual liberty and economic health. The VFW is willing to share our democracy and our prosperity with the rest of the world, but we do not want to be forced to share their slavery and poverty.

I thank the committee for their patience.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Rev. Harvey G. Meserve, followed by Mrs. Pat Halloran.

STATEMENT OF REV. HARRY G. MESERVE, CHAIRMAN, SAN FRANCISCO INTERFAITH COMMITTEE FOR PEACE

Dr. MESERVE. Senator Knowland and Senator Sparkman, I am Harry G. Meserve. I am minister of the First Unitarian Church of San Francisco and I am chairman of the San Francisco Interfaith Committee for Peace, an independent committee made up of clergymen and laymen from a number of synagogues and churches in our city.

Our major concern is to help educate the people of our churches in the basic issues which relate to the making of peace.

Our committee has not formulated specific suggestions for United Nations Charter review, but the committee is unanimous in its conviction that the United Nations represents the world's one best hope for the achievement of peace, because it provides opportunities for a continuous negotiation of differences and for united efforts in the direction of human welfare and health without which there can be no peace.

The committee therefore urges that no change in the charter will be made which will result in a weakening of the organizational structure or the worldwide prestige of the United Nations. The committee also urges that our own Government support the United Nations financially and morally to the highest possible degree, that it use the agencies and offices of the United Nations increasingly in its relationships with other nations.

GRADUAL STRENGTHENING OF THE U. N.

It seems to our committee fully desirable that the United Nations' responsibility be extended into areas many of which are now handled on the basis of unilateral or bilateral policy and agreement, and it seems to us that the general goal of United States policy should be to strengthen the United Nations gradually until it shall possess both the power and the moral authority to negotiate conflicts between nations, to enforce disarmament, to prevent war, and to establish a worldwide structure of law and order.

We believe that the United Nations' record to date, while far from perfect, represents very definite constructive progress in the direction of these, and that patience and intelligence and faith can make that progress continue. We think it is a part of the religious obligation of people who believe in the brotherhood of man to give the United Nations their educated and steady support.

The question, gentlemen, is not sovereignty, the question before the world today in the search for peace is a question of survival, and survival in the hydrogen age will require the building of a world organization which must at length include all peoples and all nations which will be able at length to speak for man himself above all parties and all factions and all nationalities, for man and for his universal need for justice and freedom and peace.

I thank you for the privilege of appearing here.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Meserve is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF HARRY C. MESERVE, SAN FRANCISCO INTERFAITH COMMITTEE FOR PEACE

The San Francisco Interfaith Committee for Peace is an independent committee made up of clergymen and laymen from a number of synagogues and churches in San Francisco.

It was formed in February of 1953 for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the religious people of San Francisco the very great importance of an intelligent and ethical approach to the problems of world peace. The committee has sponsored a number of well-attended public forums on various problems related to world peace, and has provided through its peace education calendar competent speakers for a number of church and temple groups. The main theme of this committee's program is that the quest for peace should be a major concern of all religious people, regardless of race or creed.

The committee has not formulated specific suggestions for United Nations Charter review. But the committee is unanimous in its conviction that the United Nations represents the world's best hope for the achievement of peace, providing as it does opportunities for continuous negotiation of differences and for united efforts in the direction of human health and welfare.

The committee therefore urges that no change in the charter be made which will result in a weakening of the organizational structure or prestige of the United Nations. The committee also urges that our own government support the United Nations both financially and morally to the highest possible degree, and that it use the agencies and offices of the United Nations increasingly in its relations with other nations. It seems to our committee fully desirable that the United Nations responsibility be extended into areas now handled on the basis of unilateral policy, and that the general goal of United States policy should be to strengthen the United Nations gradually until it shall possess both the power and the moral authority to negotiate conflicts between nations, to prevent war, and to establish a worldwide structure of law and order.

We believe that the United Nations record to date, while far from perfect, represents real progress in the direction of peace, and that with patience, intelligence and faith, the United Nations can be encouraged all over the world. We regard it as a part of the religious obligation of all who believe in the brotherhood of man to give the United Nations their dedicated and steady support.

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Pat Halloran, followed by Dr. Herbert Bauer.

STATEMENT OF MRS. PAT HALLORAN, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mrs. HALLORAN. Senator Knowland and Senator Sparkman, I am Mrs. Pat Halloran of 2195 Green Street. I am here as an individual. My name was submitted while I was out of the country. They asked for me to have the opportunity to speak.

I have no prepared statement, but I am very grateful for the opportunity to say that I am in favor of withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Dr. Herbert Bauer, followed by Mrs. Paul Couture.

Senator KNOWLAND. Proceed.

Dr. BAUER. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DR. HERBERT BAUER, DAVIS, CALIF.

Dr. BAUER. I am Dr. Herbert Bauer, of Davis, Calif. I am health officer of the county of Yolo, and I am speaking as a private citizen.

The United Nations Charter, in its present form is totally inadequate to prevent war since it gives the United Nations neither legislative power to make laws or executive power to enforce them. It may be argued that this is no valid statement since today it is not unlawful to wage war. The obvious next step, then, must be to outlaw war and give the United Nations twofold executive power; to control and supervise disarmament, and to employ a sufficiently large and strong police force to repel aggression wherever it may occur.

As has been pointed out by the great majority of witnesses here today, the principle of enforceable law has been found invariably effective on all governmental levels, from municipal police force up to national law-enforcing agencies. Only in international relations, we will rely on such notoriously ineffective techniques as treaties, alliances, and agreements.

No serious effort has ever been made to create a state of peace under law; and yet, this is not only the next logical step but also one which would fill one of the most common human needs.

INTERNATIONAL POLICE FORCE

No fear needs to stand in the way of creating such an international police force; no real sovereignty is given up; our present sovereignty only preserves our right to attack, which we are morally obliged not to use; it does not protect us from being attacked as was so tragically demonstrated at Pearl Harbor. No undue advantage of large, or neglect of small, nations is implied since population would be but one among many other factors determining the composition of world police. And certainly, the often-parroted phrase that "we are ready but the others aren't" is meaningless until we have tested the political strength and moral force of the idea by openly proposing a world-binding law against aggression.

Behind those intellectual arguments, cogent as they may be in themselves, there lie some awesome facts: The ABC of modern warfare

stands for atomic, biologic, chemical. It no longer allows for victory, only for defeat. As soon as one country possesses the minimal lethal dose to destroy a potential enemy, it is no longer of strategic advantage to the opponent to stockpile twice as much. This is why inspection will have to cover every spot on earth to detect and destroy war material. No half-way measure will do. Total war can be prevented only by total peace.

And this implicitly answers the previously stated question by Senator Knowland earlier this afternoon, should we make an arsonist in our country the fire marshal? No, we should not. But I surely would want him to be subject to the very same law I am pledged to uphold and demand.

The thought that another war will probably mean the end of civilization as we know it, can at best act as temporary deterrent; even in our own country, we already hear sporadically the voice of insanity calling for a "preventive war."

When the time for United Nations Charter review arrives, let us stand up and solemnly abrogate anybody's right to wage war. Let us voice our plea for radical and world-wide disarmament under strict United Nations supervision; and let us call for the establishment of a United Nations police force whose sole task it would be, to repel aggression swiftly and decisively in any part of the world. If we do this, the moral leadership of the world will be ours. Peace on earth, man's foremost desire, must be peace by law.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

I might once again say to those who may be toward the end of the witness list, that if they would like to take advantage of the filing of their statement, stand and so indicate, giving their name and organization, and they may file their statements out of order, and therefore, not have to wait perhaps an hour or two to get their testimony in.

Mrs. HAMBURG. I would like to file mine. I am Mrs. Alice Hamburg.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The statement of Mrs. Hamburg is as follows:)

STATEMENT BY MRS. ALICE S. HAMBURG

The United Nations is man's greatest hope for settling differences and avoiding strife among the nations of the world. Such an organization is absolutely necessary in this period when atomic and thermonuclear warfare might well mean the end of civilization as we know it.

As Secretary Dulles has stated recently, the United Nations has not proved a panacea, yet it has helped to settle conflicts which might otherwise have resulted in major conflagrations.

Scientific and technical advancements in the fields of transportation and communication within recent years have so telescoped the vast areas of the world that no region remains remote, and by the same token every country is brought within striking distance of war, pestilence and disease—regardless of where the initial outbreak might occur.

The Assembly of the U. N. is proving an effective forum where the voices of the people of the world may be heard and their differences reconciled. With the continuing cooperation of governments and the hoped for increase in membership it will come closer to representing the full force of world opinion.

All of the international agencies of the U. N. were forged to answer the serious needs of sections of the world in various stages of development. The Trusteeship Council, as an example, works at assisting backward nations to develop their own educational and political resources to the point where they are nearer to taking responsibility for self-government. The specialized agencies, such as FAO and WHO, help backward areas fight disease and increase and improve the production of food and other commodities so sorely needed. The U. N. more than

anything else is a source of hope and encouragement to the two-thirds of the world population still struggling to overcome illiteracy, disease and hunger.

The American people, as the most advanced and prosperous in the world, must continue to exert their leadership through support of the U. N. financially and what is equally important—through a continued reaffirmation of faith in the international organization.

In my opinion the United Nations can become a more effective instrument for peace when membership becomes universal, so that all peoples have representation and an opportunity to speak out on what they consider the main causes of tension and unrest in the world today.

To sum up I should like to recommend that :

First, membership become universal. It is only when all nations are members that aggressive actions can be disciplined by the full force of world opinion ;

Second, work start immediately on a program of progressive universal disarmament under strict international control. The first step should be the outlawing of all atomic and thermonuclear weapons.

Senator KNOWLAND. Are there any others who desire to file their statements at this time ?

(No response.)

Senator KNOWLAND. You may insert into the record certain letters.

Mr. MARCY. Here is a letter from Catherine McCann, a letter from Mildred Machado, a communication from Mrs. G. S. Malcolm, a communication from Marjory LaForge, a letter from Mrs. Virginia Coleman, a letter from Kathryn W. Noonan, and a letter from Imogen McMurtry.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

MENLO PARK, CALIF., April 6, 1955.

Senator WALTER GEORGE.

Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: The San Mateo County Democratic Council of Clubs, representing the 16 Democratic clubs of this area, at their April 5 meeting, unanimously adopted the following resolution.

Resolved: That the United States favor the holding of a Charter Revision Conference in 1956, and that the United States endeavor to strengthen the United Nations Charter effectively to maintain peace and reduce the tensions of war.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE MCCANN,

Secretary, San Mateo County Democratic Council of Clubs.

VIGILANT WOMEN FOR THE BRICKER AMENDMENT,
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
Studio City, Calif.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,

*Chairman of the Subcommittee on Revision of the United Nations Charter,
Foreign Relations Committee, United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: We respectfully request that your committee give consideration to the views herein expressed concerning the proposed revision of the Charter of the United Nations, and that these views be entered into the records of your committee.

We oppose any attempt to revise the U. N. Charter for these reasons:

1. The charter as it exists provides that no such revision shall be valid without the unanimous approval of all five of the permanent members of the Security Council, which means that no revision is possible which is not approved by Soviet Russia.

2. Our entire experience with the Government of the U. S. S. R. has been that we are able to reach agreement only at the cost of compromises on our part in conformity with ideological concepts acceptable to the U. S. S. R. —and which by the same token are wholly alien and for the most part actually inimical to the principles of the United States Constitution and to our established way of life.

3. Thus no revision could possibly be agreed upon which by any interpretation could be construed as an improvement of the United Nations Charter, but

much could be done which would multiply its dangerous potentials from the American point of view.

For example, it is widely proposed that the sole revision which we would propose or accept is the elimination of the present veto power by members of the Security Council. The arguments advanced for this revision seem plausible enough at first glance—the fact that the U. S. S. R. has used the veto on numerous occasions, whereas we have not, which would make it appear that the veto is a Soviet weapon of which they would be deprived by the simple method of removing the veto power entirely.

This argument, however, fails to take into account the fact that all other nations with the exception of Liberia already have an effective veto authority in their own constitutions, which require formal ratification of all U. N. agreements before they become effective; whereas the United States has no such protection. Our courts have ruled that executive agreements, which need no ratification, have the force and effect of treaties; and that treaties and/or executive agreements, under our Constitution, supersede our own internal laws and even the Constitution itself.

Thus the existing veto power which we possess in the present Charter of the U. N. is the only effective veto authority of the United States. Although we have not yet used it, therefore, our right to use it must never be surrendered.

4. It is clear, however, that the exercise of our veto power in the U. N. at the international level would affect only external affairs, but would not be effective as to the application of U. N. treaties, executive agreements, or other covenants, to the internal laws of the United States.

For this reason, it is our view that of far greater importance than the consideration of any possible revision of the Charter of the United Nations, is the enactment of the proposed Bricker amendment to the Constitution, which would restore to the United States Constitution the supremacy needed for the preservation of a free and independent Republic.

Respectfully submitted.

(Mrs.) MILDRED MACHADO, *Coordinator*

AUBURN, CALIF., *March 26, 1955.*

Re U. N. hearing, San Francisco, April 9, 1955.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,
*Chairman Foreign Relations Subcommittee,
 Care of Mr. Robert J. Dolan, Executive Secretary,
 Mayor of San Francisco,
 San Francisco, Calif.*

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Petition of redress by Mrs. G. S. Malcolm (Marion), 133 Olive Street, Auburn, Calif. Am chairman of North California Minute Women, United States of America, Inc; member of Auburn Republican Women; and charter member of the Emigrant Trail Chapter, DAR, Auburn.

Corinthians II, Chapter 6, verse 14: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness?"

Quote from Stand on What Is Right With America, by Emma Dunn:

"But the central principle of the Constitution—that no one is above the law, nor beneath the law, that all citizens are 'equal before equal law'—is derived directly from the Bible. In Leviticus 19:15, it is provided: 'Ye shall do not unrighteous judgment * * * thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honor, the person of the mighty.' The Master's commandment, "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." is enforced by the first provision of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. 'The things of the spirit: the things that are God's,' are placed by the Constitution beyond the power of the Government to seize, suppress, control, or tamper with. 'They are sacred and secure from Caesar,' but only as we awake and use them. Each one may think himself unimportant, but this is not true, and never can be in a true Republic. Each one is part of the whole. 'Perhaps you know that our Constitution provides not a democracy, but a Republic. You will not find the word 'democracy' in the Constitution; in the Declaration of Independence; in Lincoln's Gettysburg speech; or in Washington's Farewell Address; and in our Allegiance to the Flag, we do not say 'to the democracy for which it stands,' but 'to the "Republic" for which it stands'."

Mr. Frank Holman, former president of the American Bar Association, and Senator John W. Bricker of Ohio have spearheaded the drive for a constitutional amendment necessitated by the advent of the U. N. and the United Nations Charter, ratified July 28, 1945, which was adopted as a treaty which, according to article VI of our Constitution, becomes the supreme law of the land. As pointed out by Mr. Holman, the danger arises because of the fundamental difference between our constitutional conception and the structural nature of the United Nations Charter, unholy notions. That difference is that American citizenship rights are not given to the people by Constitution or law, but are considered to be inalienable—God-given—and possessed by the people before we ever had a constitution for the purpose of keeping our Government, any government, from interfering with those rights.

Treaties, as the Covenant on Human Rights and the Genocide would nullify our rights as set forth in the Bill of Rights. World-government schemes as set forth by the world parliamentarians; Atlantic Union committee; United World Federalists; American Association for United Nations, and others are in direct conflict with basic Americanism and our Constitution.

On February 9, 1955, Senator Estes Kefauver, Tennessee, reintroduced his Senate Concurrent Resolution 12 and in the House are House Concurrent Resolution 62, 73 through 80 and 84 for Atlantic Union or Federal Union which reads as follows: "*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

"The democracies must learn that the world is now too small for the rigid concepts of *national sovereignty* that developed in a time when the nations were self-sufficient and self-dependent for their own well-being and safety." (*italic added*). From *Crusade in Europe*—Dwight David Eisenhower, page 477.

The Constitution directs that the President shall take the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States." (Custom decrees the use of the words "So help me God" at the end of the oath when taken by the President-elect, his left hand on the Bible for the duration of the oath, with his right hand slightly raised.) The judicial oath is similar.

The Yalta secret agreement, dictated by the godless Kremlin, formed the basis of the U. N. Charter with Hiss, as one of the architects. The post of Secretary of Security Council Affairs was made a permanent Russian post at Yalta. Russia is a permanent member of the Security Council and Soviet officers are members of the military staff committee that makes United Nations strategy, as per article 47, paragraph 2. Russia has, with her satellites, 5 votes to our 1.

Does the strengthening or revising of the United Nations Charter mean full and complete conversion of the United Nations—alias UNholy Notions—into a world government with the forfeiture of our sovereignty? Is this a plot to supplant a government of law by a government by men?

If so, then our past and present Presidents, with some of our duly elected legislatures, who support world-government schemes, committed treason, after having sworn, on oath, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution? Subsequent to Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, 82d Congress, 2d session on H. R. 7289 (testimony of Major General Lowry), Public Law 495 was passed which states:

"None of the funds appropriated in this title shall be used —

"(1) to pay the United States contribution to any international organization which engages in the direct or indirect promotion of the principle of world citizenship:

"(2) for the promotion, direct or indirect, of the principle or doctrine of one-world government, or one-world citizenship."

Why is it this law is not enforced to outlaw the U. N. Charter and such agencies as UNESCO? Since this was voted into law, how can our Congress vote funds for support of the United Nations and agencies?

My suggestions to the subcommittee on changes or amendments to the UNholy Notions Charter which would be totally in the interest of the United States and world peace are as follows:

1. Turn the U. N. modern tower of Babel into apartments for the "under-privileged."
2. Scrap the U. N. Charter and celebrate the U. S. Day once again.
3. Deport all fifth amendment employees of the U. N. back to Russia.
4. Demand the release of our 944 prisoners of war and the 11 United States flyers in Red China.
5. Sever diplomatic relations with the Kremlin and regain the respect of our former allies—particularly the Nationalist Chinese.
6. Retain control of the nuclear weapons; U. N. control means Communist control and subjugation of all freedom-loving peoples.
7. Repudiate all secret agreements.
8. Rout all one-worlders, Socialists, internationalists, and Communists.
9. Give direct assistance to the enslaved in Communist-held countries.
10. Return the Government of America back to Congress.
11. Reinstatement the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as the law of the land; repeal the 16th amendment; protect States' rights.
12. Reinstatement the dignity of the Supreme Court on the side of America.
13. Pass the Bricker amendment; repudiate the status of forces treaty.
14. Revoke American citizenship of all U. N. employees who take the U. N. oath.
15. Make no amendments to "strengthen" the U. N. Charter, which ultimately means world government.

All our acquiescence to coexistence and the cold war is handing the freedom-loving peoples of the world over to the Communist-dominated Kremlin by default. The subcommittee could better use their time and the taxpayers' money in saving a sovereign America rather than strengthening the Charter of the U. N. under the smokescreen of peace.

Thank you for this privilege to express my views since I am doing so as an individual and an American housewife and mother.

Mrs. G. S. MALCOLM.

God forbid that the U. N. spiderwork rag fly any place at any time in this our beloved land.

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., April 4, 1955.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Foreign Relations Subcommittee,
City Hall, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: Are these United Nations Charter hearings for the purpose of learning the sentiments of the people of the various states at the so-called grassroots?

If that is true, it is a far cry from what will really happen.

It is now April 4, and the meeting is scheduled for April 9. To date, there is no mention of it in either of our two Sacramento daily papers which serve the large superior California area. How then is the general public to even know about it in time to prepare an expression? Then too, 12 copies of anything is not usually within the possible realm of the housewife, the farmer, or the general public.

It would appear that only a few who receive special notice or learn by accident as I did, that there is a meeting called in San Francisco.

Will that be a grassroots expression?

In the first place, the United Nations Charter was written and its provisions particularly shaped in the most part by the Russian Communists and a certain Alger Hiss, since convicted in our courts for perjury when he denied sending secret material to the Soviet Union representatives.

Is anyone naive enough to believe that he would do otherwise than conceive and set up provisions to further Soviet goals?

These are some of the facts that strengthen that belief.

1. The United Nations Charter was written to apply as a treaty. This was aimed at the United States since it seems to be understood that a treaty can be construed to supersede our Constitution, though our Founding Fathers had no intention of subverting our own sovereignty. In view of the fact that ours is the only member nation of the United Nations whose Constitution could be superseded, this was not accidental.

Let us withdraw while we can. It will further world peace. Posterity will hold us to account.

2. The International Court of Justice of the United Nations would take from the courts of this country their traditional powers.

Article 36 of the International Court of Justice provides "The jurisdiction of the court in all legal disputes concerning: (a) the interpretation of a treaty; (b) any question of international law; (c) the existence of any fact which, if established (and who has found the Communists or the Soviet truthful in boasts or propaganda), would constitute a breach of any international obligation.

This is in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States, section 2, article III, "The judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under the Constitution, the law of the United States; or treaties made or which shall be made, under their authority."

Do we want our Constitution violated and our courts eliminated from their jurisdiction?

Definitely not. In the name of peace and liberty let us withdraw. Posterity will hold us to account.

3. The people at the grassroots level have not been informed of the real objects of the United Nations Charter. If they knew or understood they would arise in indignation.

Our press is generally most remiss in putting forth anything about the United Nations Charter except its purported peace objective. This should be to their everlasting discredit. "Man's judgment is no better than his information" is so true.

In the case of the United Nations Charter, the information has been sketchy, apparently with a definite plan for the withholding of critical data.

Certainly we all want peace but not at the price of liberty as we understand it in the United States. Shall we forget Patrick Henry's "give me liberty or give me death"?

What about slave labor and prison camps in the so-called liberated satellite countries?

4. A world government which would eliminate national sovereignty is the last thing the people of our country desire. Is not the United Nations Charter written to do just that? How many grassroots people have the faintest idea of such a deal? It is carefully concealed in general newspaper articles.

People in various walks of life refuse to believe the facts "Our Congress would never allow that," is the feeling. They have the "It can't happen here" confidence in the men they trust to hold intact for us all our traditional liberty, and the sovereignty of our own country.

How could a one-world government preserve the individual freedom and liberty as we understand it when the vast bulk of the world population do not yet understand what we mean in this country by individual freedom and liberty?

I should like to see some process of educating the world masses in these concepts but not at the desperate risk of losing what we have achieved in this country.

Congress should then do some retracting and eliminate the dangers of the United Nations Charter and all its agencies, particularly UNESCO.

The United States is not an aggressor. Today it is being destroyed from within and without.

We should withdraw from the present U. N. and remove it from our country. That would indeed be the opinion of the grassroot citizens if they knew the situation and had the facilities to make known their wishes.

Freed of the dangers of the U. N. we would be in a better position to help promote peace.

The U. N. has failed to bring peace to the world. There is more distrust than ever.

Today there is fighting in many parts of the world, undoubtedly kept alive by Communist activities. It is their avowed intention for world revolution.

The U. N. has failed to bring our wrongly imprisoned boys out of Red China.

The U. N. has failed to keep peace between Israel and the Arab States.

The U. N. has failed to prevent the Indonesian and Korean armistice agreement from being broken by the Communists.

How can we be so gullible as to believe the high-sounding aims that are fed to us when the avowed intent of Russian communism is to revolutionize the world into a Communist state? She does not keep covenants nor does she intend to, unless they suit her purpose.

We all want world friendliness, brotherhood, and peace, but not a one-world government.

The very least we can do immediately is to eliminate the U. N. as a treaty, then proceed to withdraw as fast as possible.

The Bricker amendment should be passed as quickly as possible. How can anyone object to it when it is only a means of protecting ourselves and our children?

We are proud of the heritage of liberty our forefathers gave us. Can we do less for posterity? We will be held to account by posterity and justly so.

I wish this letter to be printed in full in the record, please.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) MARJORY K. LAFORGE.

STATEMENT BY VIRGINIA S. COLEMAN

Ten years ago this month the United Nations was organized in San Francisco. It was an experiment in hope—hope that Soviet Russia and the western nations could and would cooperate in establishing and maintaining a just peace. That hope was based on a fundamental misconception as to the nature and aims of international communism.

Had the leaders of the Western World bothered to read what Communist leaders from Marx, Lenin, and Stalin in Europe to Foster and Tractenberg in the United States have written, they might have realized that peace to the Communist means the subjection of all nations to a world Communist dictatorship, and the destruction of the free society—for these objectives have been stated again and again in the most explicit language.

Subsequent events since the organization of the United Nations, have only served to confirm the fact that the Soviet Government has never had and does not now have any intention of cooperating with the free world. Sworn testimony in the reports of congressional committees reveals that—

1. Communists were ordered to infiltrate postwar French military establishments.

2. Soviet representatives on the Allied Control Commission in Germany applied all means available to sabotage the work of the Commission from the time of its establishment.

3. Soviet economic officers in Germany were amazed at the naivete of Americans in transmitting honest and conscientious information on the Western Zone of Germany to the Soviets. The Soviet did not reciprocate, or if they did, the information transmitted was false and misleading.

4. Soviet espionage apparatus attempted to penetrate and subvert the military organization and the foreign policy of the United States.

5. Practically every Soviet representative in the United States is engaged in espionage of one sort or another.

6. Soviet Russia uses her position in the United Nations to launch subversive propaganda and for liaison between foreign Communists and the Communist party of the United States.

7. Tons of propaganda printed in Moscow enters the United States ports daily.

The sum total of these activities has been to increase the prestige and vocal range of communism in all its evil work, bring about the enslavement of 600 million people by the Soviet Union, and contributed considerably to the suffocation of freedom movements in the satellite countries. This should do much to explain why the United Nations has not been able to—

1. Stop aggression.

2. Stop cold war and subversion the world around.

3. Limit armaments or contribute anything to peacetime application of atomic power.

4. Contribute anything to world economic stability, nor to the security of foreign capital investment and development.

The one outstanding accomplishment of the United Nations has been to breathe the breath of life into pagan communism, give it intimate daily access to all the political and military secrets of the world. The United Nations Charter, as we see it now, was a gigantic bear trap—a carefully wrought scheme to clothe communism in the robes of respectability and give it a place at the world council table.

If there is any hope for the ideals of the United Nations, that hope lies in a new organization in which Alger Hiss and his ilk can have no creative part—and without the Soviet Union or any other Communist state included in its membership.

THINKERS GUILD OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento 18, Calif., April 4, 1955.

Mr. WALTER S. GEORGE,
Foreign Relations Subcommittee,
San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Effectiveness now in preventing the United States from being deceived into subordinating its sovereignty to that of the United Nations or any other body, international or otherwise, which authority transcends the authority of the United States in any respect is or should be the major objective of the American people at this time. We can join other nations in world enterprises but never should we deliver to any body the power to control and direct the destiny of our Nation against its will or by treaties superseding our American Constitution. Genocide is suicide to the sovereignty of the United States.

Abraham Lincoln, when confronted with a crisis that rocked the Nation in his day said, "One nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." How can we carry out these words if we turn over our sovereignty to another body, call it by any name. Abraham Lincoln's words and the ideal that gave them worth did much to preserve the Union and the strength of our Nation. May his words be recalled and used with the same meaning when we are confronted with the intolerable issue of any agreement which would supersede our Constitution.

Yours very truly,

KATHRYN W. NOONAN.

MARYSVILLE, CALIF., April 5, 1955.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate;

This letter contains my views for presentation in San Francisco on April 9, at the subcommittee hearings on foreign relations of the United States Senate concerning the review of the United Nations Charter.

The United Nations Charter should be revised so that it in no way supersedes the Constitution of the United States. United States sovereignty must be preserved.

If we are to remain a free and independent United States, the present plans to revise the United Nations Charter into a one-world government, with the United States subject to alien dictatorship, must be abandoned. The United States could assure this by passing the Bricker amendment.

Ratification of the treaties, covenants, conventions, and agreements proposed by the various organs and agencies of the U. N., in particular the Human Rights Covenant, the Genocide Convention, and the International Labor Organization, would completely destroy our Bill of Rights, our American way of life, our freedom of speech, press, and religion. They would wreck our industry, greatly reduce our standard of living, and place us under jeopardy of trial in foreign courts for activities which in this country are not even a minor offense.

Amendments to the U. N. Charter recommended by the proponents of world government would, if adopted, make United States withdrawal from the U. N. forever impossible; would disarm us, place U. N. police over us; destroy our Republic, our domestic courts, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights.

It is impossible to have two loyalties. If you are loyal to the United Nations flag and to a one-world government, it follows that you cannot be other than disloyal to our Stars and Stripes and to the Constitution, for which it stands.

The U. N. has failed in its proclaimed objective of promoting world peace.

Continued membership in the U. N. is continued betrayal of the American people.

Further strengthening of the U. N. means further weakening of the United States of America.

IMOGEN McMURTRY, *Housewife.*

Senator KNOWLAND. Are there any other statements to be filed?
(No response.)

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Paul Couture, followed by Mrs. William Lister Rogers.

Mrs. COUTURE. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MRS. PAUL COUTURE, MODESTO, CALIF.

Mrs. COUTURE. I am Mrs. Paul Couture, a farmer's wife from Modesto, in the San Joaquin Valley. My husband and I have four children, and we are naturally concerned for their security.

For the past 7 years I have been studying and discussing with others the question of our country's security, and I am convinced that General MacArthur is right in saying that 99 percent of the people do not want war.

However, most of the people do feel that the United Nations cannot at the present time prevent a major war. Our own Government cannot assure us that an atomic war will not be the unfortunate, unwanted result of trying to settle a dispute in a struggle for power.

I believe, then, that we are in a very dangerous position. We are relying, on the one hand, on military strength which can be equaled by our adversaries; on the other hand, we are seeking to settle our disputes peacefully in an organization that does not provide the security for the nations so that they can stop preparing for war.

Now, as Americans, we understand full well the solution to this problem of peace and security. Our Founding Fathers were faced with the same kind of situation and provided us with an answer, so that now you and I and every person in this room can delegate authority for our protection to local, State and Federal agencies, and in return we receive security and freedom.

PEACE BASED ON LAW AND ORDER

Now, you know that we could not live even in our own community by good faith or by agreement with our neighbors, because it might possibly be that a neighbor or a neighboring city or a neighboring State might not prove trustworthy, and because of that possibility, we would have to remain armed for our protection.

Now this idea seems ridiculous to us today. We would not think for a moment of carrying a gun in California for our protection as the early settlers had to do when they came out West. We wouldn't think for a moment of the State of California going to war against the State of Arizona in order to settle the dispute over the water rights of the Colorado River.

Now, the fact that we can live in peace does not mean that we don't have differences. It does not mean that we see eye to eye with each other, and it does not mean that we have no criminals. It does mean, though, that the relation among the nations in our cities and States and within the nation are regulated by law, that there is machinery established, the machinery of lawmaking, of jurisdiction and of law enforcement.

I do not want, like Senator Knowland, the arsonists to be the head of the fire department. But if our Founding Fathers had not so brilliantly understood this basic issue, and had we not formed a Federal Union at that time, we might today be fighting in California, on the borders of California and Arizona, over the water rights of the Colorado River.

Then, were we to see the folly of our ways and establish law, we would then be able to say, "What? Let those Arizonans in, those arsonists, as the head of our fire department?"

Peace, then, is order based on law, and as the late Senator Robert Taft said—

In the long run the only way to establish peace is to write a law agreed to by each of the nations to govern the relations of such nations with each other and to obtain the covenant of all such nations that they will abide by that law and by decisions made thereunder.

Clearly, the United Nations must be given this law, as Senator Taft saw, given the law in the field of security only, so that all nations can disarm, with the complete assurance that no nation again can threaten their security with military power.

I would like to say, in the amount of time I have left, that I believe strongly in the United Nations, that it must live, but in order for it to live, it must grow. Nothing remains static, and I firmly believe that we must revise the charter, so that it can be given the power to do the job, so that it can live.

Thank you for allowing me to testify.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Couture is as follows:)

TESTIMONY FOR THE PUBLIC HEARING OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

I am Mrs. Paul Couture, a farmer's wife from Modesto, Calif., and the mother of four children. I am naturally concerned for the security of my family. For the past 7 years I have been studying and discussing the matter of this country's security.

There is no doubt in my mind that General MacArthur is correct in saying that 99 percent of the people do not want war. We feel, though, that the United Nations at the present time cannot prevent a major war. Our Government cannot assure us that an atomic war will not be the unfortunate result of trying to settle disputes in a struggle for power. It seems to me that we are in a dangerous position: relying on the one hand on military power which can be equalled by our adversaries, and on the other hand seeking to settle disputes through an organization that does not have adequate machinery to do the job. It is evident that the United Nations does not provide the security without which national governments are forced to continue preparing for war.

Now, as Americans we understand full well the solution to the problem of peace and security. The problem is not to maintain a permanent status quo, but to be able to change and grow peaceably rather than violently. Growth and change are inevitable in any society, and we couldn't in our own communities live peacefully if we had to rely on agreements between neighborhoods, cities, or states, hoping our neighbors would prove trustworthy. But because of the possibility that they might not prove trustworthy, we would of necessity have to remain armed for protection. This idea seems ridiculous to us now: fighting over differences in annexation in a growing American city, fighting because of a dispute over the water rights of a river flowing through two states. Clearly, a peaceful society does not mean a society without differences, it does not mean that peace is utopia. It simply means that relations among the people of our communities, our cities, our states are regulated by law * * * that there is established the machinery of lawmaking, of jurisdiction, and enforcement.

Peace, then, is order based on law; and as the late Senator Robert Taft said in his book *Foreign Policy for Americans*, "World order, in the long run, depends not on men, but upon law, law which embodies eternal principles of justice and morality." World peace is world order based on world law. Any other concept of world peace is impractical, utopian, and any other approach to the problem of world peace and security would be inadequate or dangerous. Peace is a practical proposition that can be brought about just as well between nations as it has been realized so often in the past among states, provinces, and other units. The way to bring this about is through United Nations Charter revision.

When President Eisenhower so admirably appointed the Honorable Harold Stassen to the new Cabinet post on disarmament, he stated, "The recent session of the Disarmament Commission of the United Nations has again resulted in no progress and no clear crystallization of thinking on this subject."

I am convinced that clear thinking on this subject is needed desperately today: the ability to see that law is the only foundation upon which modern man can exist. We cannot rely on men's promises not to murder, not to cheat, or to disarm. We have to have laws and courts and police with duties and functions clearly defined in advance.

This committee has the greatest opportunity and the corresponding responsibility in leading the world to a practical peace. I implore you to consider this idea carefully. It is a hope for survival. A hope for a life for us and generations to follow that will be something more than war and the preparation for war. America can take the leadership in making a decisive step in preventing this civilization from committing suicide. We know from our own experience what has to be done * * * we must find the will to do it.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. William Lister Rogers.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM LISTER ROGERS, PRESIDENT, SAN FRANCISCO COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Mrs. ROGERS. Senator Knowland, Senator Sparkman, I am Mrs. William Lister Rogers, president of the San Francisco Council of Churches.

As the 10th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter draws near, people all over the world are approaching the event with mixed emotions. The first high hopes held by millions everywhere, that the United Nations would be the medium of ensuring the peace, have given way to widespread disillusionment. This has come about for a multitude of reasons. It is seldom realized how monstrously difficult it is to make the transition from war to peace. But in this instance—at the time of the signing of the United Nations Charter—a disastrous miscalculation was made concerning the possibility of peacetime cooperation among the five great powers. The United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Republic of China, and the U. S. S. R. became the permanent members of the United Nations. Ultimate authority was given into their hands, and quite reluctantly by many of the smaller nations, because it was generally thought that they would work together for peace as they had for war.

Primarily due to abuse of the veto power by the U. S. S. R. the Security Council is unable to properly discharge its primary obligation for maintaining world peace. This is the charter's greatest weakness. In the matter of public opinion concerning review or revision of the charter, we should ponder carefully the instrument of the charter in relationship to man's social and spiritual progress. Is it a symbol in advance of man's enlightenment, or is it something which is impeding man's progress toward a better life?

THE UNITED NATIONS AS A MORAL FORCE

The record of the United Nations during the past 10 years is subject to many interpretations. Within the church there are as many different attitudes as there are conflicting views within the United Nations. The San Francisco Council of Churches, speaking for 24 denominations in 98 Protestant churches, is absolutely certain of only one thing and that is that moral power will eventually prevail over all other kinds of power. The United Nations is a moral force. It has proven this on numerous occasions. The United Nations is the only international instrument now at our disposal where the moral

force of world opinion may be brought to bear upon injustice and aggression. The council believes that "as Christians and citizens of the United States, we have an inescapable obligation to support the United Nations as a body essential to the freedom of nations and the peace of the world."

The San Francisco Council of Churches agrees with the President of the United States and with the Secretary of State for the United States, that support of the United Nations is fundamental to the successful execution of American foreign policy. The council further agrees with stated American approval of charter review, believing this to be a matter of good faith with the nations that signed the charter on the basis that it could be changed in 10 years.

The council would be content to be guided by the best judgment of the President and the Secretary of State in the matter of revision at this time, holding that revision at the cost of weakening the charter would be inconsistent with our principles and contrary to the best interests of the United States.

Some of the proposals being suggested for amending the charter would also involve amending the Constitution of the United States. How can we contemplate doing that when the United States Senate is divided between proponents of Atlantic union, world government and the Bricker amendment? In the United States we have not clarified our own thinking on whether we want the United Nations to be truly an association of all nations, or whether we wish to abide by article 4 of the charter, or whether we wish to become more exclusive in the future.

GRADUAL EVOLUTION OF CHARTER FAVORED

If we are content to let the United Nations Charter evolve little by little, step by step, we will be running less risk of internal as well as external upheavals which could conceivably wreck the United Nations. Note the extraordinary progress which has been made in 10 years under most frustrating conditions. The General Assembly has risen in prestige and stature. An example of how procedure may be improved without charter amendment was the Uniting for Peace resolution adopted November 3, 1950, by the veto-free General Assembly. This put the Assembly in a position to act in emergencies, when the Security Council was veto-bound. The Assembly has grown to be the great moral force in the United Nations, and this was entirely unseen in San Francisco.

The San Francisco Council of Churches urges a greater emphasis upon the work of the specialized agencies of the United Nations, a more generous and wholehearted support of technical assistance to help raise the standard of living of all peoples. The council would particularly like to see American leadership become as strong morally and spiritually as it has become technically and militarily. It would be content to work for freedom and brotherhood here at home, leaving the revision of the imperfect charter to some future date when Americans would be in a stronger position to implement it.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Robert Cecil, followed by Mr. Roy Blackmer.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ROBERT E. CECIL, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mrs. CECIL. First of all, dear Senators, I want to thank you for the courtesy and patience you have both shown in listening to all our sides and views, expressed here today, and I know that everyone in Alabama and California is proud that we have two such fine gentlemen to protect the American Constitution and way of life for us.

Other women before me have referred to the kind of world they want for their child or children. I also want a bright and beautiful world for my four children. But the wonderful world I want is one in which they can truly enjoy to the full the God-given rights guaranteed by our American Constitution—so they can have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; life such as is not enjoyed in any other country on this planet.

This is easily seen by the millions pounding at our gates to get in and share this life.

This life has been accomplished by our American Constitution and our system of free enterprise; and, that, honored Senators, is what I want the Congress of the United States to safeguard for my children and for all other Americans.

PROTECT THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

The inalienable rights God gave my children are in the Declaration of Independence but are not in the United Nations Charter. I wonder how many here today have actually read all through our Constitution and the United Nations Charter.

Because of its adverse effect on the Constitution of this great country, and therefore our way of life, I am against the present United Nations system. America is great because of its Constitution and its free enterprise system. In my opinion, the United Nations effect on our lives will destroy the way of life that has made the United States so successful. Destruction of the United States is the purpose of Russia and signs point to the fact that that will be the result of our U. N. membership.

Others before me spoke of peace. Yes, I want peace, too, but peace with liberty, not the Russian idea of peace—in a salt mine or in a slave labor camp or with a life so regimented that it is not worth living.

I have faith too—not just a visionary faith but a faith founded on specific accomplishment, on the demonstrated success of the American way of life.

The life we live in the United States is the result of much bloodshed—our ancestors fought, bled, and died so that we might live under our Constitution.

To preserve our American way of life, my husband and I, like our forefathers before us, are prepared to give our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF T V COVERAGE

Senator KNOWLAND. I would just like to say at this time on behalf of Senator Sparkman and myself, because the television program is about to come to an end here, that we should like to express our appreciation to television station KRON-TV for its public service in covering this meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee, here in San Fran-

cisco, where, at the request of the Senate of the United States, we have come to give the people an opportunity to be heard on this important question. Certainly it is in the spirit of our constitutional form of government, when we can meet in various sections of the United States.

I should like to call on Senator Sparkman for a word at this time.

Senator SPARKMAN. I simply want to agree with all that Senator Knowland has said. I do want to add this word. I think this has been a very fine hearing. We have had viewpoints expressed ranging from one end to the other, just about, with reference to the United Nations.

Sooner or later, Senator Knowland and I, along with other members of the Foreign Relations Committee, are going to have to resolve these opinions into certain recommendations to the Senate. I know this meeting will have been helpful for that purpose. I want to express my appreciation not only to the public service of the TV station, but to you people who have contributed so much to this hearing.

Senator KNOWLAND. I am only sorry I might say, Senator Sparkman, that behind the Iron Curtain there cannot be similar meetings of people who have varying points of view, including some views which may not coincide with the government in power, and that behind the Iron Curtain they cannot have this free expression of public opinion, where people within the Soviet Union, who were, after all, the first victims of Communist tyranny, could make their voices heard.

Perhaps the men of the Kremlin are not speaking for the entire Russian people.

Senator SPARKMAN. I agree with you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Roy Blackmer.

Is Mrs. Blackmer here?

(No response.)

Senator KNOWLAND. We have her statement. It will be incorporated in the record.

(The statement of Mrs. Blackmer is as follows:)

TESTIMONY BEFORE UNITED STATES SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

I am Mrs. Roy Blackmer, housewife, and I live on a ranch near Hickman, Calif. With all women I share the concern for war because of home and family. I come before you because I want my husband to remain an ex-naval officer and my children to remain free from the cone-shaped shadow of radioactive particles that would fan out from a destroyed San Francisco in the event of atomic war.

Regarding United Nations Charter review, my chief concern is the machinery necessary to achieve disarmament. By definition I mean universal, enforceable disarmament down to internal police forces necessary to maintain internal order, not merely reduction of armament as is now being discussed in the deliberations of the U. N. Disarmament Commission. Complete, foolproof disarmament can only be achieved under a new kind of security system, not a continuation of the present one, where a nation's security depends in the long run on its warmaking power.

History points up the awful truth that ever arms race, with a couple of obscure and rare exceptions, has ended in war. We know that the next war will be a duel of hydrogen bombs, and man may well become extinct.

Collective security as set forth in the United Nations is a failure and this is the reason. The only way military aggression can now be met is by voluntary collective war on the aggressor. Since war has become suicidal this security system is obsolete. We must replace it then with one which is foolproof. The only way to be sure 1 nation will not prey on its neighbor or that 2 nations

will not settle disputes by war is to make war impossible. The only way to make it impossible is to take away the national armies of nations.

The U. N. Disarmament Commission is now discussing unenforceable quotas, in other words, partial disarmament. This may be more difficult to achieve than complete disarmament, because nations may hesitate to agree to a plan which does not make them secure from war, but they would give up some advantage they now have. Once war starts the disarmament agreements are no longer in effect and the antagonists can again begin manufacturing hydrogen bombs and the like.

A change in the U. N. Charter is needed for complete and enforceable disarmament. A definite plan for successive stages and control should be written into the charter so that there may be agreement on these main features in advance during negotiations on the revised charter.

Machinery, civilian and military, must be created to enforce the disarmament agreement. This permanent inspection and police force should have jurisdiction over individuals to apprehend the offender. This is the key to its success. Without enforcement a disarmament agreement is another scrap of paper.

There must be a veto free control agency, maybe the Military Staff Committee appointed by the Security Council, but responsible for organizing, training, and disposing of U. N. police forces.

A limitation of sovereignty, offensive as it sounds to many, is absolutely necessary in the matter of armaments.

An adequate judicial system to settle disputes must replace the present one if the war system is abolished. Courts must have compulsory jurisdiction over legal dispute.

All nations of the world must be members of the U. N. if such an organ is to achieve universal disarmament. It could certainly never control the war power of a country outside of its jurisdiction.

Whether Russia is ready to accept such changes is not the issue. The United States must stand up for what we know is right and necessary. The Kremlin is being shaken by this very issue now as the struggle for power seems to be over giving up world conquest by military means because some Russian leaders now realize the H-bomb could destroy all civilization and not just capitalism. By the time ratification of charter changes comes up, Russia may well be ready to accept for her very survival. The details of such a world-saving security system could be worked out over the charter review conference table if the United States will take the lead. You gentlemen hold a major share of the responsibility for taking such a step.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. William Page, followed by Mrs. John L. Martin.

STATEMENT OF MRS. WILLIAM A. PAGE, ANTIOCH, CALIF.

Mrs. PAGE. My name is Mrs. William A. Page, and I live at 2000 Dennis Street, Antioch, Calif.

I believe that a simple will to live is universal. The instincts of self-preservation are not reserved for any particular nation, but they prevail throughout all the nations. And that will to live must needs dictate ultimate policy in the sphere of world order.

There can be no peace without justice, no justice without law. I believe that without world law, we will all be the target, the victims, of world war, tragic victims, and without having served any purpose at all, without having proved one solitary thing.

All our efforts must be concentrated and directed toward a stronger, more effective United Nations. We must open our doors to every nation in the world and invite them in.

WE MUST LIVE TOGETHER IN PEACE

Just as we live peaceably with our neighbors in a local community, must we live and work on the international level. Our communities are orderly, not because we all think alike or because there are no grievances or disputes or because we have no economic problems or

because there are no criminals. We get along simply because we have an effective system of enforceable law.

I believe it is imperative to relieve nations of their ability to wage aggressive war. This can be done only through disarmament, with just sufficient arms allocated to each nation to maintain domestic order.

The possibility evidently is this, of the East and the West working out their political differences. Each day there is more talk among our top leadership of four-power conferences. If this possibility does exist, we must come to the United Nations conference with proposals that are morally defensible.

We as world leaders must truly lead other nations toward peaceful attainment of their goals.

In this age of the hydrogen bomb, either we live together or together we face degeneracy and disease, and if we are fortunate, perhaps sudden death.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Bennet Skewes-Cox, followed by Mr. Jack Werchick.

Mr. SKEWES-COX. Chairman Knowland.

Senator KNOWLAND. Proceed.

STATEMENT OF BENNET SKEWES-COX, ROSS, CALIF.

Mr. SKEWES-COX. Mr. Chairman, Senator Sparkman, my name is Bennet Skewes-Cox. I live in Ross, Calif. I am an accountant, and I am speaking as an individual, a student of the subject of the U. N. Charter, having written a thesis on this topic for a master's degree, and having given over 250 talks on the subject to various groups in Washington, D. C., Oregon, Washington, and California.

SUMMARY OF POINTS ON U. N.

In essence, the testimony which I have presented in writing is this:

1. The primary purpose of the U. N. is to maintain international peace and security. Yet because the United Nations is a league of nations, it is by its very structure incapable of preventing war. The charter expressly provides that ultimate enforcement be the waging of international war. Witness Korea.

2. Regardless of whether mankind is emotionally prepared for the necessary change, the fact is that the U. N. will remain incapable of achieving its main purpose until given the power of enforceable law.

3. To maintain international peace, such laws must apply to individuals, an important fact too little recognized. Action against entire nations can take only the form of war. Laws applied to the individual permit ordinary police action and binding court decisions.

4. Given the existing structure of the U. N. as a league, neither the Soviet Union nor the United States can risk even partial disarmament.

5. When public and governmental opinion are finally ready to demand that the U. N. have power to outlaw war under law, this will require drastic surgery to the U. N. Charter. However, the problems involved are, as my studies have indicated, far more psychological than technical.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Mr. Skewes-Cox is as follows:)

THE U. N. FROM LEAGUE TO GOVERNMENT

Why the United Nations Cannot Prevent War Until It Is Granted the Power of Enforceable Law—An outline respectfully submitted by Bennet Skewes-Cox

WHY THE U. N. CANNOT PREVENT WAR UNTIL IT IS MADE A GOVERNMENT

The U. N. as it is now constituted is by its very nature incapable of preventing war. It will be seen from the following that because the United Nations is a league of sovereign nations (sovereign meaning not subject to outside law) its rulings and actions apply to entire nations. Consequently, ultimate enforcement under the U. N. as it is today must necessarily mean waging international military war. As a government capable of making, interpreting and enforcing laws that apply to the individual, the United Nations would be able to take police enforcement measures against a guilty individual (the basis of the Nurnberg trials) prior to violation of a world law on armaments or international aggression or at the very outset of such violation, and thus would be able to prevent full-fledged war.

HOW THE U. N. FUNCTIONS UNDER THE PRESENT CHARTER, HOW IT WOULD FUNCTION AS A WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I. JUDICIAL POWERS

U. N. under present charter

(a) Only states may be parties to the U. N. World Court (International Court of Justice). The individual has no right to apply and individuals cannot be tried by it.

(b) The International Court of Justice has no compulsory jurisdiction. The United States specifically does not need to recognize its jurisdiction unless it wishes to (Connally amendment to the Morse resolution, whereby the United States Government itself decides if a matter is essentially domestic). In certain cases (such as those involving the Netherlands and South Africa) one nation or more have wished to refer a matter for Court interpretation, but another or others have blocked it.

(c) The U. S. S. R. claims the World Court has not even the right of interpreting the charter.

U. N. as a world government

(a) Individuals, being subjects of world laws, would certainly have the right to apply for redress in case of abuse or violation of the world laws by any authorities, and would be subject to rulings of the world courts.

(b) Jurisdiction would be compulsory, not optional; otherwise the system of law would break down.

(c) The world supreme court would undoubtedly have power to interpret the world government charter or constitution.

II. LEGISLATIVE POWERS

(a) The General Assembly of the U. N. now functions on 1-nation-1-vote basis, completely disregarding the inequalities between nations in population and development. At first thought this sounds democratic and wise. Actually, it is undemocratic and renders the U. N. unworkable. Example: Iceland, with 125,000 citizens, and Luxembourg, with 150,000 citizens, can outvote the U. S. with 145 million citizens, 2 to 1. This voting rule, based on the theory of "sovereign equality" of nations under the charter caused the U. S. and the other great powers to refuse to allow the General Assembly any real power.

II. LEGISLATIVE POWERS—continued

and caused them to demand the veto right in the Security Council.

(b) The General Assembly has only the right to "discuss and recommend." It is a deliberative body only, not a true legislative body. The Assembly can never take binding action of any sort, and the Security Council can at any moment be prevented from doing so by the veto.

(c) The recommendations of the Assembly apply to entire nations, not to individuals, hence enforcement would mean war, not police action against individuals.

(d) Delegates in the Assembly vote as representatives of national governments, not as individuals. They represent official governmental policy, not their own wills and consciences.

(a) The Congress of a World Federal Government, according to major proposals brought forward by outstanding authorities, would take into account the differences in population and development between nations, giving them a voting power commensurate with their relative positions in the world today. This would be done by "weighted representation," taking into account such relative factors as population, economic development, educational level, and others. Many smaller nations have already indicated their willingness to accept such a practical system.

(b) A world legislative body would have real and binding legislative powers within the limited sphere permitted by the world constitution or charter. Powers not specifically granted to a world federal government would be reserved to the separate nations, as the U. S. Federal Government is limited, powers not granted to it belonging to the states and their peoples. Laws passed by the world legislature would apply to matters purely of international concern, such as preparation for aggression, one nation's interference in another nation's internal affairs, and armed conflict. Limitation of powers of world federal government would insure to each nation the right to have its own domestic, political, economic, social and religious institutions.

(c) The laws of the world legislature would apply to individuals, permitting enforcement in the way of police action before the act, rather than international war after it is too late to stop it any other way.

(d) Members of a world legislature would vote as individuals, representing the views of their constituents.

III. EXECUTIVE POWERS

U. N. under present charter

(a) The Security Council, as the U. N. Charter is presently constituted, is actually supreme over all other nations and could act as legislature, executive, judge, jury, and police—if there were unanimity among the five permanent members (U. S., U. K., U. S. S. R., France, and China) with the support of 2 of the 6 other nations on the Council. The entire structure of the U. N. as a "peace-keeping" organization rests on the unanimity of the "Big Five." When the unanimity is lacking, the Security Council is powerless to act for the U. N. as such. Recommendations then depend solely on the voluntary cooperation of the member nations (as is true at all times of the Assembly and the specialized agencies: the Food and Agriculture Organization, World Health Organization, etc.).

(b) The unanimity rule (veto) supposedly safeguards the large nations from irresponsible voting or action by the smaller nations. The veto merely formalizes what is inherent in any league (such as American Articles of Confederation, prior to U. S. Constitution)—it gives a nation (five in the case of the U. N.) specific authority to disregard the recommendations and suggestions of the others.

(c) The Security Council is not the creature of law, but decides each case with which it deals on the spot. It is not responsible to the General Assembly; it has the right to ignore the Assembly's recommendations.

(d) Besides the systems of arbitration, mediation, etc., between sovereign nations—which history has found unsuccessful in preventing nations from arming and going to war—the U. N. Charter calls for enforcement measures such as severance of diplomatic relations and blockade, and, as an ultimate measure, warfare. In short, U. N. action is applied to entire nations, to whole populations including guilty and innocent alike. Actually, the U. N. does not and cannot outlaw war, for the reason above and because warfare is legalized by the charter when it is undertaken by the pooled military contingents called for by the charter to be at the disposal of the Security Council's Military Staff Committee. (Because of disagreement by the Big Five, these pooled contingents have not even been constituted as yet.)

Because the U. N. provides for the waging of war as an ultimate enforce-

U. N. as a world government

(a) The executive branch of a world government would be an administrative organ responsible for carrying out the legislation of the world congress. Administrative power might be vested in a cabinet body (like Great Britain's), "board of directors" (like Switzerland's) or a single head (like U. S. A.'s). Its powers would be strictly administrative.

(b) If representation in the world congress were more realistic, democratic, and equitable (instead of the present one-vote-per-nation formula), the larger nations would be safeguarded with a greater vote and the "veto" would not be needed for their protection. The will of the world legislature would not then be thwarted by any one nation's refusal to implement its laws.

(c) The world executive would have powers clearly defined by the world constitution or charter, and it could carry out only those laws enacted by the world legislative body (whose powers, in turn, would be limited and defined by the charter or constitution).

(d) Enforcement of the provisions of a world constitution and of the laws of a world legislature would take the same form as enforcement measures within our nations: i. e., courts and marshals backed by police. Enforcement would ordinarily be taken against individuals found guilty of violating world laws. Violators would be tried and sentenced, if found guilty, by world district courts, with right of appeal to a world supreme court. Arrests would be made by world police, and violations detected by world inspection forces. In cases of mass insurrection or disobedience to world laws, world military forces (like our National Guard) would be used, but ordinary action would be against individuals. Warfare and preparation for warfare (such as illicit manufacture of atomic or biological weapons) would definitely be outlawed by a world government, in its constitution and by its laws. Enforcement would be police ac-

III. EXECUTIVE POWERS—continued

ment measure, complete disarmament is impossible under the present charter. Since the U. N. does not have its own independent forces, the small nations must rely for security on their own arms and armaments unless they wish to rely on U. N. unanimity and magnanimity. The Big Five, because of their disagreements, are now engaged in a great arms race.

tion in the sense in which every nation knows it, not warfare. The crushing burden of national armaments, assumed by each nation in the present state of international anarchy where each nation seeks its own security, would be replaced by the far lesser financial responsibility of paying for the security forces of the world government.

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Jack Werchick, followed by Dr. Max A. X. Clark.

**STATEMENT OF JACK WERCHICK, SAN FRANCISCO CHAPTER,
AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION**

Mr. WERCHICK. Senators, my name is Jack Werchick. I am an attorney with offices at 995 Market Street in San Francisco. I am a member of and speak on behalf of the San Francisco Chapter, Americans for Democratic Action.

We earnestly desire to assist this subcommittee in its objectives of learning what changes, if any, should be made in the Charter of the United Nations which would be in the interests of the United States and of world peace generally.

First, I want to state emphatically that Americans for Democratic Action, in San Francisco as throughout the United States, are unanimous in their belief in, and support of, the United Nations and the principles basic to such an organization.

MAINTENANCE OF THE U. N.

We believe that the United Nations must be continuously maintained as a living, dynamic, growing union of nations, working together harmoniously for the peace and well-being of all mankind.

We urge that the membership of the United Nations strive continuously and earnestly toward the goal of membership of all nations of the world under a program of cooperation by all members on the highest plane of international ethics and morality.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDED FOR STUDY OF CERTAIN PROBLEMS

We recommend that the United Nations maintain a committee charged with the responsibility of studying the structure of that organization and of proposing changes required for efficient and effective functioning.

We believe and recommend that such a committee, as well as this subcommittee, should study and seek to solve the following problems:

Admission of nations to membership, with effective machinery for the determination of the proper national authority.

The veto power in the Security Council.

Provision for an international police force.

Codification of international law to meet present and future needs.

We believe that the United Nations must peacefully and effectively solve the following problems in the very near future:

Control of arms and munitions on an international scale.

International development of atomic power for peaceful benefits.
The elimination of slavery and discriminatory treatment of peoples.

The elimination of unilateral action on the part of member nations in regards to international disputes.

The solution of trade-barrier problems on an international basis with equal consideration and benefit to all member nations.

WEAKENING OF THE U. N. RESISTED

We seriously and urgently recommend that this subcommittee, the Congress of the United States, the President of the United States, and the United Nations, singly and collectively, resist and oppose any and all attempts on the part of individuals and groups to destroy or make less effective the United Nations.

We condemn such attempts on the part of persons who have heretofore appeared before this subcommittee and who have and do seek the destruction of the United Nations and the return of the United States to a policy of strict isolationism.

We urge resistance to any suggested change, such as the Bricker amendment, or any other which in any way might have the effect of limiting the effectiveness of United States membership in the United Nations.

We urge this subcommittee, in considering and recommending change, that it not permit itself to be made the dupe of extremists who, under the guise of Americanism, seek to impose limitations upon the contributions of the United States toward world peace and progress by widening the schism already existent in the world.

Finally, we Americans for Democratic Action have great faith in our democratic institutions and seek the expansion of those underlying principles of liberty and freedom and democracy to all the peoples of the world in the spirit of brotherly love and the Golden Rule.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

I can assure you that neither the subcommittee nor the full committee on Foreign Relations nor the Congress of the United States will be the dupe of anyone, but we recognize the right of all Americans under the Constitution to express an honest difference of opinion, including that governing the United Nations.

Mr. WERCHICK. We join with you in that belief, Senator.

Mr. GILBERT. Dr. Max A. X. Clark, followed by Mr. Robert L. Davis.

STATEMENT OF MAX A. X. CLARK, D. D., EDITOR, NATIONAL CHRISTIAN JOURNAL, DIRECTOR, AMERICAN FLAG COMMITTEE, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Dr. CLARK. Honorable members of the committee, we charge that the United Nations presents a world constitution and parliamentary procedure designed to supersede the Congress of the United States.

The U. N. was planned as a step toward a complete world government which, when consummated, will destroy American sovereignty and make a crime of nationalism.

No program for peace nor any other program can succeed which is ashamed of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. In the United Nations the name of Christ through prayer or otherwise is ruled out.

The United Nations flag, designed after a Soviet battle flag, would fly above the American flag, and we would be forced to salute and honor it more than the Stars and Stripes.

In the formation of the U. N., the conservative governments were practically excluded.

FAILURES AND DANGERS OF THE U. N. LISTED

Our 10 years of membership in the U. N. has lowered our prestige among the nations of the world, and today we have more enemies than friends. If we remain in the U. N. much longer, I am afraid we may not have any friends left.

The U. N. was planned not by American patriots but by a clique of international parasites determined to destroy all freedom and enslave all peoples, so they could perpetuate themselves in political power, and feast as hyenas and vultures upon the abundance of the United States.

Aided and abetted by Communists, Socialists, and other anti-American minority groups, this unholy alliance has ensnared independent nations under the pretext that in unity we would gain strength. But, instead of it being a congress of peace-loving nations, the U. N. is a hotbed of jealousy, intrigue, and hatred. Instead of cementing the bonds of peace, it is sowing the seeds of distrust and division. Quite naturally—as is the case in all treachery—the real aims of the United Nations were camouflaged behind idealistic phraseology, stupifying slogans, and a hypocritical pretense of unity and common purpose.

During its 10 years of blundering, the United Nations has proven itself useless for peace; but on the other hand a very convenient sounding board for Red propaganda—an instrument for humiliating and insulting the United States of America. From its very beginning, the United Nations has been a sanctuary for foreign spies who enjoy immunity from our laws.

On a population basis, the United States is outnumbered 7 to 1, and on a unit basis, as is now constituted, we are outnumbered 59 to 1.

To revise the U. N. Charter or otherwise strengthen the U. N. would mean a corresponding weakening of the United States.

U. N. manipulations have resulted in American boys having to do 90 percent of the dying (exclusive of the South Koreans) in a so-called U. N. police action—against a Russian satellite—without the United States being allowed control over our own Armed Forces in the field.

The greatest Communist nation on earth, Soviet Russia, is represented on the Board of Strategy of the United Nations; thus the Reds are, and would continue to be, a determining factor in the planning of any military action against Soviet Russia.

Soviet Russia has the power in the U. N. to veto not only the United States but all the members, collectively.

We charge, further, that the United Nations, through its sponsorship of UNESCO, is waging a systematic, scientific campaign to poison the minds of American schoolchildren by indoctrinating their teachers, and by censoring and revising their textbooks to facilitate the destruction of patriotism to the end that our youth shall become internationalists instead of Americans.

We, therefore, as loyal, Christian Americans call upon the members of the subcommittee to prayerfully consider the foregoing testimony.

WITHDRAWAL FROM THE U. N.

We herewith humbly petition your honorable body to recommend, and work toward, early passage of enabling legislation liberating the United States of America from this modern "Tower of Babel"—called the United Nations—and thus restore to Americans the tradition of national sovereignty.

I thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. May we have order, please.

For those who came in late, under the rules of the Senate, no indications of either approval or disapproval are allowed.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Clark is as follows:)

We, the undersigned citizens, representatives of several patriotic and Christian groups of the Eastbay, in response to an invitation to express our convictions relative to the United Nations Charter, herewith present the following testimony before the special United States Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee hearings held at San Francisco on Saturday, April 9, 1955:

We charge that the United Nations presents a world constitution and parliamentary procedure designed to supersede the Congress of the United States.

The U. N. was planned as a step toward a complete world government which, when consummated, will destroy American sovereignty and make a crime of nationalism.

No program for peace nor any other program can succeed which is ashamed of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace. In the United Nations the name of Christ through prayer or otherwise is ruled out.

The United Nations flag, designed after a Soviet battle flag, would fly above the American flag, and we would be forced to salute and honor it more than the Stars and Stripes.

In the formation of the U. N., the conservative governments were practically excluded.

Our 10 years of membership in the U. N. has lowered our prestige among the nations of the world, and today we have more enemies than friends. If we remain in the U. N. much longer I am afraid we may not have any friends left.

The U. N. was planned not by American patriots but by a clique of international parasites determined to destroy all freedom and enslave all peoples, so they could perpetuate themselves in political power, and feast as hyenas and vultures upon the abundance of the United States.

Aided and abetted by Communists, Socialists, and other anti-American minority groups, this unholy alliance has ensnared independent nations under the pretext that in unity we would gain strength. But, instead of it being a congress of peace-loving nations, the U. N. is a hotbed of jealousy, intrigue, and hatred. Instead of cementing the bonds of peace, it is sowing the seeds of distrust and division. Quite naturally—as is the case in all treachery—the real aims of the United Nations were camouflaged behind idealistic phraseology, stupefying slogans, and a hypocritical pretense of unity and common purpose.

During its 10 years of blundering, the United Nations has proven itself useless for peace; but on the other hand a very convenient sounding board for Red propaganda—an instrument for humiliating and insulting the United States of America. From its very beginning, the United Nations has been a sanctuary for foreign spies who enjoy immunity from our laws.

On a population basis, the United States is outnumbered 7 to 1, and on a unit basis, as is now constituted, we are outnumbered 59 to 1.

To revise the U. N. charter or otherwise strengthen the U. N. would mean a corresponding weakening of the United States.

U. N. manipulations have resulted in American boys having to do 90 percent of the dying (exclusive of the South Koreans) in a so-called U. N. police action against a Russian satellite—without the United States being allowed control over our own Armed Forces in the field.

The greatest Communist nation on earth, Soviet Russia, is represented on the Board of Strategy of the United Nations; thus the Reds are, and would continue to be, a determining factor in the planning of any military action against Soviet Russia.

Soviet Russia has the power in the U. N. to veto not only the United States but all the members, collectively.

We charge, further, that the United Nations, through its sponsorship of UNESCO, is waging a systematic, scientific campaign to poison the minds of American schoolchildren by indoctrinating their teachers, and by censoring and revising their textbooks to facilitate the destruction of patriotism to the end that our youth shall become internationalists instead of Americans.

In conclusion, may we cite that it is quite understandable why the Congress of the United States under the two preceding administrations utterly failed to protect the American people; because their leaders were filled with alien ideas and/or influenced by aliens with un-American ideas. But now, gentlemen, after 20 years of compromise, treason, and humiliation, there can be no excuse for our present Government to fail us in this critical hour when the destiny of America hangs in the balance.

We, therefore, as loyal, Christian Americans call upon the members of the subcommittee to prayerfully consider the foregoing testimony.

We herewith humbly petition your honorable body to recommend, and work, toward, early passage of enabling legislation liberating the United States of America from this modern "Tower of Babel"—called the United Nations—and thus restore to Americans the tradition of national sovereignty.

Respectfully submitted by:

Dr. Cecil J. Lowry, pastor, Revival Tabernacle, editor, Christian Vanguard, 425 10th Street, Oakland, Calif.; Mrs. Rena Meyers, secretary, Women's Missionary Council, 425 10th Street, Oakland; Mrs. George Holland, Jr., secretary, Oakland Revival Tabernacle, 425 10th Street, Oakland 7, Calif.; Max A. X. Clark, D. D., editor, National Christian Journal, director, American Flag Committee, P. O. Box 2022, Oakland 4, Calif.; Edith Essig, editor and publisher of the newsletter, Keeping the Record Straight, 1830 Fremont Drive, Alameda, Calif.; George Saljian, John A. Whitaker, representing the Committee on Christian Action, P. O. Box 2022, Oakland 4, Calif.

Dated, this the 5th day of April, A. D., at Oakland, Calif.

Senator KNOWLAND. Senator Sparkman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Doctor, before you leave, I want to ask you this. You omitted a paragraph that starts right at the bottom of page 2, and is completed on page 3. Did you intend to cut that out of your statement?

Dr. CLARK. Oh, no. I understood I only had 5 minutes.

Senator SPARKMAN. Yes. I just wanted to know, because I wanted to say this.

I have not asked any questions today or made any statements, but your statement is so full of distortions and complete prejudice, particularly that paragraph which you did not read, that I want to say to you, sir, that I resent the entire statement.

Dr. CLARK. Do you want me to read it?

Senator KNOWLAND. Again I say that we will not have approval or disapproval, either way. If we are going to have the rules enforced, they ought to be enforced on both sides. And I do ask the cooperation of the audience and the witnesses on this.

Dr. CLARK. Mr. Chairman, did you want me to read that paragraph?

Senator SPARKMAN. No. I do not care about you reading it. I want to know whether or not you were cutting it out of the record.

Dr. CLARK. Oh, no, sir.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Robert L. Davis, followed by Mrs. Connie Grothkopp.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT L. DAVIS, PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Mr. DAVIS. My name is Robert L. Davis. I reside in Palo Alto, and I am a member of the Santa Clara County Republican Central Committee and the State Republican Central Committee, and I am also Americanism chairman of the Palo Alto Legion Post 375, but I am speaking here today as an individual.

I sincerely wish that I could come before this subcommittee with a statement commending the United Nations Organization. But I cannot in conscience applaud the United Nations. Although I criticize this organization, I still believe in world cooperation.

ATTITUDE OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS TOWARD THE U. N.

I want to leave several thoughts with you. The first one is that the Young Republicans of California at its convention 2 months ago reaffirmed its endorsement of the United Nations. The significant point, however, is the difficulty the proponents of this resolution had in gaining passage of it. In the resolutions committee the pro-United Nations resolution was deadlocked by a vote of 5 to 5. The committee chairman cast an aye vote to break the tie. On the convention floor there were 15 minutes of debate before a vote was taken.

The chief argument against the resolution was that the United Nations has failed to keep the peace and that there was a good chance that the United States might be drawn into another Asiatic war under the auspices of the United Nations.

This anti-United Nations attitude among conservative, moderate, and liberal young people did not exist with any determination 5 years ago. The voice vote taken at the Young Republican convention indicated that another 10 votes on the negative side would have killed the resolution. Next year I wouldn't be surprised if a resolution condemning certain action of the United Nations passes.

U. N. ACTION IN KOREA CRITICIZED

I believe the important thing is that the sad spectacle of the United Nations and our near defeat in the Korean war has made the young men of my generation seriously question whether collective action as carried out by the United Nations is the answer.

When I was in the service during the tag end of World War II, I saw our combat veterans returning with smiles of confidence and victory on their faces. When I was in the service during the Korean war, I saw our combat veterans returning with frowns of discouragement. Honestly, they looked like they had been defeated.

In 1952 California's American Legionnaires asked Congress to reconsider its ratification of the United Nations Charter. In a resolution adopted at the State Legion convention in Fresno, the delegates condemned the United Nations Charter as superseding the laws of the United States. A second resolution also slapped out at the United Nations, urging that UNESCO material be barred from public schools.

Alan Cranston, while president of the United World Federalists, looked upon 1955 as a crucial year in the progress of his organization. "It's 1955 or bust," he was quoted as saying. Cranston was referring to the fact that the United World Federalists and other world gov-

ernment groups want the United Nations to be revised into a Federal world government.

GUARANTY OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY ASKED

If we must revise the United Nations Charter, let's revise it so as to guarantee the individual sovereignty of member nations. I don't believe it is fair to us, or any nation, to be a pawn of a supranational authority.

The growing unpopularity of the United Nations may be traced directly to the tragic mistakes of the United Nations.

Finally, I want you to remember that the California Republican Assembly last month urged that American servicemen overseas be given back their constitutional rights. In some nations where the Status of Forces Treaty is in effect men and women of our Armed Forces must be tried in foreign court if they break local laws or customs. No longer does the American flag follow an American citizen wherever he goes.

This Nation has lost its punch. I'm afraid the 11 American airmen imprisoned in Red China can vouch for this. But I believe there is still time for the United States to regain its vigor and vitality on the international scene.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Connie Grothkopp, followed by Mrs. W. W. Cox.

STATEMENT OF MRS. CONNIE GROTHKOPP, MODESTO, CALIF.

Mrs. GROTHKOPP. I am Connie Grothkopp, of Modesto, a housewife and a teacher.

The United Nations Charter as it stands is obsolete. Hardly had the delegates scratched their names to the document, when a totally new and unpredictably destructive weapon shattered men's concept of warfare and in the process rendered obsolete the machinery for maintaining peace. It was John Foster Dulles who admitted in 1953 that—

One inadequacy sprang from ignorance. When we were in San Francisco in the spring of 1945, none of us knew of the atomic bomb which was to fall on Hiroshima on August 6, 1945. The charter is thus a preatomic age charter. In this sense it was obsolete before it actually came in force. As one who was at San Francisco, I can say, with confidence, that, if the delegates there had known that the mysterious and immeasurable power of the atom would be available, as a means of mass restruction, the provisions of the charter dealing with disarmament and the regulation of armaments, would have been far more emphatic and realistic.

HORRORS OF HYDROGEN AND ATOM BOMBS

If the atomic bomb crippled the charter, then the hydrogen bomb has all but dealt it its death blow. The facts are not all in. But what we have of them points one way: the United States of America and Russia are now in possession of enough thermonuclear weapons to destroy or to modify radically life on earth. And the time has passed when the United States could have guaranteed world peace by a monopoly on superweapons.

Hans Bethe said rather wistfully only last year that the "greatest security for the United States would have lain in the conclusive proof of the impossibility of a thermonuclear bomb." We live at this moment with the dilemma of possessing the power to destroy the enemy, yet in that destruction we must ourselves face the terrible fact that we, too, shall be destroyed.

Because of the unspeakable consequences of any large-scale war, the extent of which even the scientists are unable to predict with accuracy, action must be taken now to outlaw war as a means of settling disputes between nations. The Thirteen American Colonies in order to insure their survival united in a Federal organization with an enforceable system of law; so the nations of the world must, to insure their survival, agree to settle difficulties under an enforceable system of limited world law.

Charter revision must aim toward a strong organization which can halt not only the explosion, but also the production of thermonuclear weapons. Although Dr. Robert H. Holmes, director of the United States Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission, says that not enough time has passed to enable us to predict the long-range effects of the atomic bomb, we do know some of the effects of an unexpected fallout from the first hydrogen-bomb explosion in the spring of 1954.

Of the three groups of people who received doses of radiation from that explosion, the most complete information is available concerning the 23 sailors of the Japanese fishing boat, the *Lucky Dragon*, which was all of 72 miles from the test site at the time of the explosion. The U. S. News & World Report of December 24, 1954, reveals that 10 months after the explosion: (1) One fisherman died because of damage to the liver by radioactivity. Of the badly injured, all have liver ailments. (2) All of the fishermen who survived are sterile. (3) Future delayed-action ailments are expected to appear, caused by radioactive substances lodged in the bodies of the survivors. (4) Present condition of the survivors seems to vary for no accountable reason. All are being hospitalized. None has regained normal health. (5) Damage by radioactivity from the fallout apparently has centered in the generative organs, the spleen, and the lymphatic glands, as well as in the liver.

It requires but little imagination to picture the effects on the entire world of a sufficient number of such explosions. French physicist Charles-Noel Martin in an article in Time magazine, December 20, 1954, says that in the past 2 years there have been about 10 hydrogen-bomb explosions, each of them equivalent to from 1,000 to 2,500 atomic bombs of the type exploded at Hiroshima. Their effects involve an appreciable portion of the planet. Certain effects on the atmosphere may upset the natural conditions which life has become adapted.

PRESERVATION OF HUMAN RACE

If we really feel it necessary to preserve the human race, we must take a new look at our problems and approach the question of universal disarmament with the full realization that it is imperative for our own survival. Perhaps the most difficult thing for a human being to imagine is his own death, but we, and the peoples of the world, have come to realize that not only death, but worldwide destruction on a

ghastly scale is all too possible, if we do not stop this fatal production of the weapons of annihilation.

War must be made a crime, just as family feuding and killing has been made a crime in any civilized country. Difficult as it may be for many to accept, we must provide the United Nations with a limited system of law, backed up by a police force, a permanent military group, with a monopoly of the major weapons. All nations must contribute to its support through an equitable system of taxation. If we are to ever have the peace and security which we all desire the prime purpose of the United Nations as stated in article I, we must use the opportunity offered to revise the charter into an instrument which can truly offer peace to the people of the world.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. W. W. Cox.

STATEMENT OF MRS. W. W. COX, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mrs. Cox. Honorable members of the subcommittee, I congratulate you on these hearings, and I thank you and appreciate this privilege.

As the mother of 2 sons who risked their lives in World War II and the grandmother of 4 fine young grandsons who most certainly would be called into future wars, I am very deeply concerned to see the world drifting closer and closer to open warfare. I feel that it is imperative that we now do something definite and constructive to avert such a terrible eventuality.

I respectfully submit the following as my considered, sincere opinion, and in coming to these conclusions, I have considered at all times the well-being of our own United States of America.

Why should we longer depend only upon treaties and agreements or even upon a great buildup of military strength to keep us out of war? These methods have never succeeded in the past, and I see no reason to hope that they will be any more successful today. Surely the inventive genius of the American people need not be spent solely on the development of weapons of tremendous destructive power. In the very best interests of our own great country, we must devote at least equal if not greater thought and energy to the development of order on the international scale.

We have in existence now a world organization, the United Nations, which offers the framework upon which to build a peaceful world. We may well wonder where we would be today after 9 years of mounting armaments and fears if there had been no U. N. with its forum for agreement and disagreement, charge and countercharge, and ultimately in many cases an agreed settlement. It already has to its credit a record of strength and achievement and an undoubted moral influence throughout the world.

GREATER USE OF CHARTER URGED

For this reason, I urge first its greater use under the charter as it stands today. President Eisenhower's suggestion to the United Nations for the international pooling of atomic materials for peaceful purposes is a fine example of what I mean.

We should make greater use of the U. N.'s facilities during the present tensions in the Pacific area. Another field of common action for

human welfare is the United Nations technical assistance program. This is not a give-and-take program on a great nation-small nation basis but a common sharing of technical and scientific knowledge by many nations. It accomplishes much good at little cost and is a very effective way of winning the hearts and minds of people everywhere. Therefore I feel that it is necessary that our Senators and Congressmen as Representatives of a Christian Nation, continue our financial support for this vital program.

LAW ON WORLD LEVEL NEEDED

But fine and necessary as these things are, they do not go far enough to prevent war. Many of our great men, past and present, have advocated the idea of law on the world level.

As far back as 1780, Benjamin Franklin said:

I wish to see discovery of a plan that would induce and oblige nations to settle their disputes without first cutting one another's throats.

In the late Senator Robert Taft's book, *A Foreign Policy for America*, he wrote:

The fundamental difficulty (concerning the U. N. Charter) is that it is not based primarily on an underlying law and an administration of justice under law.

Our State Department declares that world order, in the long run depends not on men but on law.

And the late William Randolph Hearst wrote:

There is no question but that international disputes ought to be adjudicated by a court of arbitration (San Francisco Examiner, March 29, 1955).

Under the present charter, the U. N. can only recommend; it cannot make decisions binding upon its members.

It seems quite evident to me that if we sincerely desire peace and an international order consistent with our ideals of freedom and justice, we can no longer merely indulge in platitudes concerning the desirability of peace but must take definite, practical steps to bring it about.

In my opinion, the first essential step would be a strengthening of the United Nations in the matter of international disputes, this to be achieved through revision of the charter. Among such necessary changes would be a gradual universal disarmament under a sure system of universal inspection. Also, in order to make international law effective, all nations of the world must be subject to its jurisdiction. Thus membership must be compulsory and not based on good behavior, as at present. Another subsequent and necessary step toward peace and international order would be our willingness, as a nation, to forego the sovereign right of declaring war.

I realize that these steps cannot be taken immediately or simultaneously. However, I believe that it is most important that our Nation take the lead in this matter. We must have faith that peace is possible and then use to the utmost our patience and intelligence to achieve that peace.

In my opinion, the proposed Charter Review Conference would afford the United States the opportunity to assume the moral leadership of the world by boldly advocating such fundamental changes in the charter as would be necessary for a world at peace under law.

It is my sincere hope that the representatives of our Government will carry forward this program at the Review Conference.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Mrs. Cox. Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Gilbert Heisig, Jr.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF GILBERT W. HEISIG, JR., SAUSALITO, CALIF.

Mr. HEISIG. Mr. Chairman, my name is Gilbert W. Heisig, Jr. My residence is at Waldo Point, Sausalito, Calif.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for permitting me to express my views concerning the U. N. Charter review. I do not represent any formal group or organization. On the other hand, many friends and acquaintances agree with the following analysis.

SHORTCOMINGS OF THE U. N.

1. Revise the goal. Peace is fine, but a more substantial goal would be justice—justice with charity. The U. N. is set up to fight; so it should have something worth fighting for. Justice would be defined as “to each his due, without injury to others.”

2. U. N. is designed to wage war in order to prevent war. To prevent, we must first understand, and many of us do not understand, the causes of wars. Poverty and ignorance are not the culprits. Look at the warrior nations. How many of them are poor and uneducated? Moral weakness is the cause—moral weakness in leaders and in the peoples from which leaders emerge. It is not likely that fundamentally weak men will draft documents that are fundamentally strong.

3. The Security Council voting procedure was set up at Yalta, the Big Three having agreed that nothing could be accomplished if they didn't agree. These three then organized so that nothing could be accomplished if they didn't agree. Is that an organization?

4. What common goal brought the charter signers together? What is the unifying principle of United Nations? Peace? The Big Three cannot agree on a definition of “peace.” If there is more than one definition then there is more than one goal, basically. No wonder the U. N. is cracking. Also lacking are definitions for “rights” and for “man.” Is man an animal? Is man a rational animal? Is man a rational animal with an immortal soul who is to know, love and serve God? If we cannot agree on a definition then we can't talk about men fundamentally because we are not talking about the same thing.

5. The U. N. is a forum—a market place—for ideas, according to some; ergo, it is useful. This is a filet mignon phrase with cotton candy substance. We know Eire's problems and goals; we know West Germany's policy; we know Spain's aims; we know exactly what Red China's ideas are. We know all this and we also know that not a one of those nations can use the “world forum.” Even the U. N.'s members bypass the U. N. Consider the NATO's and SEATO's and the countless other international agreements which, in effect, encompass the whole world.

6. Just recently Mr. Lodge recited a dozen international incidents and he said that none of these had developed into a world war because of U. N. Anybody who believes that will believe anything. Especially will you believe the following use of the same fallacious logic: In *Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels* by Charles Beard, there is listed, chronologically, from 1793 to 1901 some 50 international crises. These did not develop into world wars. Lodge's logic would insist that the reason these crises didn't turn into world wars is because we didn't have a U. N.

NEED FOR CHARTER REVISION

In short, the charter needs revision because:

1. Its goal is in need of perfection.
2. It does not understand the disease of war which it is trying to prevent.
3. The dominating Security Council was organized to make certain that nothing could be done if nothing could be done.
4. Having no common goal it cannot go in one direction.
5. Its function as a useful forum is a myth.
6. It is not demonstrable that it has prevented or alleviated the disease it set out to conquer.

This analysis has only hit the fundamentals. Since these foundations have been found wanting, it would appear that revision is not feasible. The need is for a Charter Revolution. There is a sound, a studied and universally acclaimed precedent for this type of Revolution. This precedent is in the decision to scrap the Articles of Confederation. A mere revision was not enough. The Articles had to be scrapped so the immortal United States Constitution could be born.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Dr. Reynold Wik, followed by Mrs. W. B. Reynolds.

STATEMENT OF DR. REYNOLD M. WIK, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Dr. WIK. My name is Reynold Wik, and I appear here as an individual. In order to save time, I would like to summarize my paper by making three brief statements and submit the rest of the paper for the record.

NEW ISOLATIONISM NOTED

I would like to point out that the United States after the First World War followed a policy of isolationism. I think it would be hard to find a reputable historian who would not admit that this policy was a colossal failure.

Now, after the Second World War, it appears to me that there are people in the United States who seemingly want to repeat the same mistakes made in the 1920's. These voices reflect a new type of isolationism which is as vicious as that of the old.

This false philosophy runs along these lines, as I see it:

1. The United Nations is a failure because it has not yet solved all international disputes;
2. The United Nations is dangerous because we might not always have problems settled 100 percent in our favor.
3. The United States should dictate international policies without the limitations imposed upon us by the process of cooperation with our allies.

That is, other nations should follow our lead. But if they disagree with our action, we should go it alone.

To compromise is a sign of weakness and should be regarded as appeasement to the potential enemy.

This new 1955 isolationism makes selfishness the cornerstone of international relations, not morality or ethics. It suggests that there is only one way to approach specific problems, and that is the one we happen to be supporting at the moment.

It was a repudiation of this unilateral approach to international questions which formed the basis for the establishment of the United Nations in the first place. Here cooperation was to be the keynote, and as President Eisenhower called it, man's best hope for world peace.

In conclusion, I would just like to say that the United Nations, because it can help educate the American people by presenting issues, is in itself a valuable feature. A public poll taken in 1948 revealed that only 1 in 10 of American citizens know the meaning of the word "reciprocal trade." One half of the Americans polled had never heard that the United States refused to join the League of Nations, and one-half of the American citizens had never heard of the U. N. meeting in San Francisco.

I submit again, if the United Nations does nothing more than perform a channel through which controversial issues can be discussed, this in itself would be a valuable contribution to the solving of future problems in this country.

I thank you.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Wik is as follows:)

WHY WE SHOULD SUPPORT THE UNITED NATIONS—STATEMENT BY
DR. REYNOLD M. WIK

The hope of the American people has always been to secure peace, prosperity and individual freedom for the citizens of the United States. These goals have not always been easy to secure in the past, nor are they easy to achieve in the present age made explosive by new technology and by the emergence of undemocratic ideologies. As we face the crucial international problems of today we should reexamine the past to see if we can avoid duplicating mistakes. Part of statesmanship lies in the refusal to repeat errors. There is little excuse for being burned in the same place twice.

In retrospect it is difficult to find a reputable scholar who would not admit that the policy of isolation in the 1920's was a colossal failure. The refusal of the United States to join the League of Nations, the economic nationalism reflected in high tariffs and in unfortunate reparations programs, and the unwillingness of American people to make real sacrifices to promote the cause of world peace played a major role in causing the collapse of collective security in the 1920's and early 1930's. By failing to meet political, economic, and international problems realistically the United States actually encouraged the growth of Fascism in Italy and the rise of Nazism in Germany; sinister forces which helped bring on the slaughter of World War II. It is true that other nations must share our guilt in this regard. As Sumner Welles, acting Secretary of State wrote on July 22, 1941, "The League of Nations failed in part because of blind selfishness of men here in the United States, as well as in other parts of the world. It failed because of its use by certain powers primarily to advance their own political and commercial interests, but it failed chiefly because it was forced to operate by those who dominated its councils, as a means of maintaining the status quo. It was never enabled to operate as its spokesman had intended as an elastic and impartial instrument in bringing about peaceful and equitable adjustments between nations as time and circumstances proved necessary * * *."

Now, as we encounter the problems following World War II, there are people in the United States who seemingly want to repeat the same mistakes decried by Sumner Welles. These voices reflect a new type of isolationism based on the

principles of national arrogance, national selfishness, and a desire to create an inflexible, unilateral system for dictating the course of international affairs. Thus the new isolationism is as vicious as the old. It too is oriented toward the magnification of international tensions rather than their solution. It is a false philosophy. The arguments of the new nostrum run along these lines:

1. The United Nations is a failure because it has as yet not resolved all international disputes.

2. The United States is dangerous because we might not always have problems settled 100 percent in our favor.

3. The United States should dictate international policies without the limitations imposed upon us by the process of cooperation with our allies. That is, other nations should follow our lead, but if they disagree with our program of action, we should go it alone.

4. To compromise is a sign of weakness and should be regarded as appeasement to the potential enemy.

This new 1950 isolationism makes selfishness the cornerstone of international relations, not morality or ethics. It suggests that there is only one way to approach specific problems and that is the one we happen to be supporting at the moment. It was the denunciation of this suicidal, unilateral approach to international questions which formed the basis for the establishment of the United Nations. Here cooperation, mediation, and arbitration among the nations of the world were to be given a chance to operate. The United Nations pledged itself to promote negotiations between governments, to encourage respect for human rights, to advance economic welfare among all peoples of the world, and to represent as President Eisenhower called it, "man's best hope for world peace."

As Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., stated on October 22, 1953, " * * * how else can we organize for peace, except on an international basis? And if we do not use the United Nations, what instrumentality do we have? Today it may be well to recall that the major aggression of recent years was caused by nations which were not members of international organizations. Germany under Hitler in 1939, and Japan at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbor were outside the League of Nations. In spite of this kind of evidence there are those who advocate the United States repudiation of the United Nations.

Obviously our task is not to turn the clock back to international anarchy, but rather to work in a positive fashion to improve the work undertaken by the United Nations. We need patience to observe the process of trial and error. We need to act in a positive way to facilitate the work of the organization rather than scuttle it. Although the United Nations may not be able to solve all problems it has demonstrated its ability to cope with critical issues. The solution of problems in the Near East and in Kashmir may have prevented major conflicts. Dr. Benjamin Cohen, United Nations Under Secretary for Trusteeship, stated on April 5, 1955 that the United Nations action to stop aggression in Korea was the first time in history in which collective action had been taken against an outright act of military aggression.

Then too, the United Nations by spreading information concerning international disputes can help educate the peoples of the various nations. With added knowledge people can act upon reason rather than emotion; upon valid judgments rather than blind hysteria. A public-opinion poll in 1948 revealed that only 1 in 10 knew the meaning of reciprocal trade; one-half of the Americans interviewed had never heard of the Atlantic Charter and 50 percent did not know that the United States never joined the League of Nations. One-third of the people had never heard of the United Nations meeting in San Francisco in 1945. As Disraeli once said "Ignorance never settled a question."

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. W. B. Reynolds, followed by Mr. Kamini K. Gupta.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LENA H. REYNOLDS, BERKELEY, CALIF.

Mrs. REYNOLDS. Gentlemen of the subcommittee on Foreign Relations, I thank you for this opportunity to appear before you, my name is Mrs. W. B. Reynolds. My statement is signed as that of Lena H. Reynolds.

If I leave out any part of my prepared statement, it will be due to the fact that I wish to stay within the 5 minutes' limitation.

If we are to consider revision of the United Nations Charter in the interests of the United States and of world peace, should we not know exactly what it is that we are being asked to revise?

CHARTER DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGED

Staff study No. 2, page 2 (How the United Nations Charter Has Developed) tells us:

We are by no means examining the charter that was drafted at San Francisco in 1945.

What, then, are we preparing to amend? On page 1 of staff study No. 2 we read:

Some important articles have fallen into disuse. Others have been applied in a way that the San Francisco drafters did not contemplate.

Yet it is the actual version of the San Francisco charter which the general public believes is the instrument under discussion.

On page 2 of the same study we are told that:

We are examining the charter of 1954 as it has been amplified by custom and usage, resolutions of the United Nations organs, and treaties like the Atlantic Pact which are consistent with the charter and have a heavy impact on the United Nations system.

Now, if "some important articles have fallen into disuse" and "others have been amplified in a way that the San Francisco drafters did not contemplate," is it not futile to attempt to revise or amend the present charter? For what assurances have we that future charter provisions will be more faithfully observed than have been the original ones? Will not those in charge of United Nations operations continue to ignore or distort and apply any provisions as it may suit their fancy?

Since the interests of the United States are at stake, it is certainly logical to ask that the Government of the United States use the same discretion, in so vital a matter as a treaty—may I say here, which the charter intends to be—as would a private citizen in the execution of a contract. No individual citizen would ever consider himself bound by a contract important articles of which had not been fulfilled or which had been distorted through their application at the mere will of the other parties to the contract. Certainly, no man of any intelligence would dream of entering into a new contract with the same parties when experience had taught him that they were wholly lacking in integrity.

The United Nations organization was sold to the American people as an institution for securing peace between nations. We were told that membership in the United Nations would in no way jeopardize our American institutions nor permit United Nations interference in our purely domestic affairs. As proof of this assurance, paragraph 7 of article I of chapter I of the charter was quoted. Paragraph 7 reads:

Nothing contained in the present charter shall authorize the United Nations to interfere 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.

U. N. ACTIVITIES CRITICIZED

However, through the subterfuge of using United Nations agencies, such "covenants" as the Genocide Convention and the Covenant of Human Rights are being used to circumvent paragraph 7 of article I of chapter I. And these "covenants" and "conventions" are, according to Staff Study No. 2, part of the charter of 1954.

Further, in circulating a Declaration of Human Rights as a mere statement of principles for which to strive and in presenting a different version, the Covenant of Human Rights, for ratification as a treaty, a deception was practiced on the American people. If this is the way in which "custom and usage" develops in the United Nations, let us take heed before it is too late.

A clipping from the San Francisco Examiner of September 10, 1954, dated Rome, September 9, throws additional light on the "amplification" of the charter. The title of this item is "Baby Costs Estimated Before U. N. Conference." How many of the United States Senators who voted to ratify the United Nations Charter then contemplated that they and their colleagues in the House would be voting vast appropriations from the pockets of the American worker in order to finance a Roman holiday for United Nations agents to hold a conference on baby costs as one means of preserving world peace?

I have before me a United Nations leaflet bearing the caption "What the U. N. Is Doing About the Roots of War."

THE ROOTS OF WAR

The alleged roots of war are then listed as "hunger, disease, poverty, ignorance, mistrust, and tyranny." If it were true that the first four conditions were the primary causes of war, we would have every reason to expect that old China with its teeming, hungry, diseased, ignorant, and poverty-stricken millions would have headed the list of aggressive warmakers. But between the years 1500 A. D. and 1942 China engaged in exactly 11 wars, not all of which were aggressive. During the same period England indulged in 78 wars and France in 71. Who is there to contend that it was hunger, ignorance, disease, and poverty which drove the people of England and France to war?

Why not be honest and admit that the above-named ills of mankind are usually the result of overpopulation? Where mistrust of one's neighbors prevails, overpopulation is deliberately stimulated for the purpose of producing more cannon fodder than that of one's neighbor.

That emigration to less populated areas will solve the problem of overpopulation is another United Nations fallacy. Italy is a case in point. Italy has been exporting Italians for three-quarters of a century and Italy is still overpopulated. She will continue to be overpopulated because of her religious ideology.

Honesty demands that we admit that the real causes of war are religious and political ideologies, greed, love of power, hate, revenge, and tyranny. The seeds of World War II were sown in the constant hymns of hate against Germany and the injustices heaped upon her after World War I. If world peace is our real objective, we need to analyze most carefully those loud pleas for "strengthening the United Nations" until it becomes a world government with world law directly applicable to the individual. In all plans suggested for a world gov-

ernment some part of the schemes call for a world parliament with representation on a population basis. In any such a projected parliament Moslems would predominate. Were their delegates to be swayed by an intense, missionary zeal to remove the curse of drunkenness from all mankind, we might have a worldwide prohibition law. Remembering our own painful experience, let us try to imagine what kind and size of a world police force we would need to effect observance of such a law. And just how peaceful would be the results?

In conclusion, I would say that the best interests of the United States and of world peace will be served by the United States complete repudiation of the so-called United Nations Charter. For only on the firm rocks of truth, good faith, and the will to peace can we work for a peaceful world. As a symbol of that strong will to peace let us look to the Christ of the Andes as a glowing example of accomplishment.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Call the next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Kamini Gupta.

STATEMENT OF KAMINI K. GUPTA, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Mr. GUPTA. I am Kamini K. Gupta, practicing law in the city of San Francisco, with my wife, under the firm name of Gupta & Gupta.

We welcome the subcommittee to the birthplace of the United Nations. We are always happy to pay respects to one of the standard bearers of his political party. We are even happy to have the senior Senator from our State here with his ears open to what the grassroots of his legal constituency are saying.

I think it is a fitting thing for this commemorative day of holy vigil to be spent in contemplation and consideration of ways and means for making more effective human instruments to achieve the universal ideals of the Prince of Peace. It was this day years ago when the small band of the dedicated caused to be resurrected by their faithful and meditative vigil for the minds and souls of men everywhere He who said:

And, lo I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.

It is timely, too, in the words of the San Francisco Examiner editorial today that the great truth of the first Easter, the resurrection—

* * * gave the people of the world the beginning of an understanding that was never after to be entirely banished from the minds of men, that truth and brotherhood and peace are the imperishable things of the earth.

And it is not at all strange that in real essence this is the teaching of everyone of the great philosophers and religions of mankind from every age and every corner of this global home that the brotherhood of men temporarily inhabits.

It is hoped by this presentation at least to aid the subcommittee to keep in focus the panorama and plethora of impressions that are fed to it in its whirl about the Nation.

My wife and I have spent much time and interest in observing reactions of people of our State of California to the United Nations idea: Mrs. Ruth Church Gupta, in her past positions as district international relations chairman of the California Federation of Business and Pro-

Professional Women's Clubs, secretary of the Bay Area Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization, and chairman of the San Francisco United Nations Conference Group, and my own past positions as district United Nations committee chairman of 58 Lions clubs, chairman of the reorganization committee of the Northern California Council AAUN, and presently as a board member of the San Francisco Chapter, American Association of the United Nations.

Fortunately, our joint profession, that of the law, has made it possible to devote the time to observations of many people and organizations in the State. We, neither of us, testify as official spokesmen of the organizations, but rather as individual citizens who have along the way acquired, we believe, some qualifications to testify in the nature of expert witnesses on the subject of the United Nations idea and how it has in fact been taken to by citizens the length and breadth of this State.

MEASURES OF U. N. SUPPORT

These are some of the conclusions we would like the committee to hold in view.

1. We are convinced that the overwhelming number of people from all walks of life are sold in favor of the United Nations. Personal contact on this score is well bolstered by repeated public opinion polls. This is true to such an extent that it is senseless to worry or fear that the concept of a world organization of the peoples of all nations will ever be removed from our social structure. The issue now and forever more is how to make it more effective in its task of achieving the ideal "that truth and brotherhood and peace are the imperishable things of the earth."

2. Instances of proofs can be cited beyond number, but observe these few:

- (a) The cold facts are that whenever conflicts between nations who are members of the United Nations have broken out in this 10-year period the United Nations has effectively, though obviously not ideally, held the matter in check: Russia in Iran; Britain and France in Syria and Lebanon; Arabs and Israeli; Holland in Indonesia; the Kashmir; National China and Burma, to mention but a few instances which could easily have broken forth into full-fledged wars. The only instances of widespread blood-letting involved non-United Nations members or instances where the United Nations was not called in: Korea, Red China, Indochina, Morocco.

- (b) Even our good Governor who declined to declare U. N. Day in California, beat a fast retreat by immediately thereafter joining in the invitation to the United Nations to meet here this year. Even our Senior Senator who in his representations of points of view of private groups, has uttered opinions that the United Nations was a fraud and that the United States should withdraw from the United Nations, has changed his tune on occasion in recognition of the patent fact that even the United States cannot in these days think in terms of "going it alone." I cite the UP story of April 8 from Washington in today's San Francisco Chronicle, to the effect that we must rely and heavily on the manpower of allies to meet small brush wars.

3. There need be no fear or bitterness at those few who purport to hate and castigate the United Nations or the idea of the need for international cooperation. Even if they were inflammatory words and

terms of hatred, let me say that they in fact add strength to the idea of the international quest for truth, brotherhood, and peace. Ancient and mature philosophers have long recognized the fact that he who berates is slowly but surely convincing himself of the truth of that which he berates. For this view I am indebted to a prominent member of the oldest established institution of the Christian faith. I cannot remember his name, but he was a ranking Catholic Army chaplain who published an article in one of the veterans' magazines during World War II.

The tenor of this thesis was, "Give me the atheist, for that is the man who by his intense and constant denial is proving to himself and will eventually convince himself of the verity of Deity." This concept has been uttered by many in almost all of the world's great religions. I happen to know it from the precepts of Indian philosophy.

So I say, do not suppress, but encourage debate. I say to those who deny the concept of universality, keep trying; you are performing a good service; you sharpen the thinking of those who are on the fence; you strengthen the convinced and eventually, you, too, shall prove the truth to yourself and to your brethren. I fear only those who have "no opinion," and fortunately the polls show now less than 10 percent of these.

SUBSTITUTE FOR WAR

There is another pressing factor beyond the horizon. It is not being said, because it is an embarrassing position for chiefs of state and the thinking generals and admirals to be in, but I suspect that humanity is now at the threshold of a truly appalling and disturbing revolution: The Big War is out; its absolute and irretrievable result is Armageddon.

So the habitual thinking of our usually accepted leaders has met its dead end, and the problems of developing techniques of government and policy to handle the threat of "brush wars," or anarchy, if you please, has got to be faced. But the problem is how to develop objective mechanisms and procedures that will work to keep the equilibrium of society.

It is a staggering problem, and the answer by its nature cannot be developed within the confines of one state or even a group of states. I think Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's suggestion of establishment now of a United Nations International Legion is the first necessary practical step. But in the long view I am convinced that the answer has already been given to mankind, it is only a question of when and how human leadership is going to accept it and make it and not brute force the real technique of the science of politics and government: In the words of the Lord to all men, "This is my commandment, that ye love one another, as I have loved you."

REVIEW BUT NOT REVISION OF THE CHARTER

In conclusion and to the practical problem now of charter review, let me say that I concur with those who say that no basic revision of the charter presently appears necessary, as the United Nations has demonstrated that it is capable of the necessary flexibility already to the point that it can develop ways and means to meet any exigency just so long as it is put to use. Even to the problem of universal

membership in the teeth of the veto: It was only an opinion of the International Court that caused this present hiatus to resubmit the question.

No change or technical perfection of the charter can make up for a lack of international good faith. And good faith in all matters between and among men has ever been built only by development in practice of usages and processes to facilitate satisfactory and workable solutions to problems. So use of the existing framework is the only real answer to the development of international good faith.

But by all means, hold the revision discussion. We can always learn by participation in the democratic method of discussion, consideration, and its logical end, creation of an idea greater by far than the ideas of the individual participants. Also, so far as I know, the only significant opponents to discussing charter revision are the Russians. I'd like to find out why.

Senator KNOWLAND. I would just like to make the record correct, because I would not by silence want to appear to acquiesce in the witness' interpretation of the views of the senior Senator from California.

I wish to say that at no time and under no circumstance did I say that the United Nations was a fraud, which appears to be attributed to me. That is a gross misrepresentation.

I will say that I am not consciously a spokesman for private groups. I am a Senator from California. I try to represent the people of the State to the best of my ability. I at no time suggested we should peremptorily withdraw from the United Nations. I did express the viewpoint that if Communist China—which had been the aggressor in Korea, which was responsible for inflicting 145,000 casualties upon us, including 35,000 dead, and which was now holding American airmen, contrary to the terms of the armistice—that if they were admitted into the United Nations, I felt it would destroy the moral foundation of that organization, and under those circumstances we should withdraw.

I am willing to stand on my statements. I do not intend by silence to be misspoken.

Mr. GUPTA. I am very glad—

Senator KNOWLAND. I said that we should not have any indications of approval or disapproval. I am merely trying to keep the record straight.

Mr. GUPTA. I am very glad that the senior Senator clarified his position. And I will strike the word "fraud" from my statement.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Adeline H. Bianchi.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF MRS. ADELINE H. BIANCHI, CONCORD, CALIF.

Mrs. BIANCHI. I am Mrs. Eldo Bianchi, housewife and mother, of Concord, Calif.

The United Nations represents to me hope that my children's future will not be wiped out with an atomic war capable of destroying our civilization. It is obvious that traditional techniques of diplomacy, balance of power, and another arms race cannot give us peace. If man is to survive, he must find a way to substitute order for anarchy.

The United Nations is a beginning. But the United Nations is not strong enough to enforce peace. I would like to discuss several questions concerning the United Nations raised by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

MEMBERSHIP

The United Nations would be more effective if every nation were a member, represented in the councils of the United Nations and bound by its decisions.

SECURITY

It would seem more equitable for the General Assembly, with all nations represented, rather than the veto-bound Security Council to be the decision-making body. However, voting in the General Assembly should be weighted in order to reflect the differences in population and power.

ARMAMENT

Peace cannot be secured so long as armaments remain uncontrolled. The United Nations' chief function should be to enforce complete disarmament of all nations. Enforcement must be provided by a police force and inspection team.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Action in the United Nations must be based on law. It must have full power to pass laws in the limited area of disarmament and prevention of aggression. This would require adequate courts with compulsory jurisdiction to try violators of such laws.

I firmly believe the United States should support changes of this nature at a Charter Review Conference. We must recognize that nothing short of such a strengthened United Nations can give us permanent peace.

Even if such proposals are not immediately acceptable to some of the other powers, it is our responsibility to let the world know that we will constantly work for the only means that can bring lasting peace. The task of selling these ideas may seem overwhelming but it is far easier than the task we leave to our children if we fail and they must try to rebuild a world shattered by hydrogen bombs—if such a world can be salvaged.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you very much.

Call the next witness, please.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Alex Ayers.

Mr. AYERS. Here.

Senator KNOWLAND. Proceed.

Mr. AYERS. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF ALEXANDER C. AYERS, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Mr. AYERS. I am Alexander C. Ayers of 394 Alcatraz Avenue, Oakland 9, Calif.; occupation, small-business man, vending machines. It is with humility, but with sincerity of purpose, that I come before this learned committee to express my personal views on the United

Nations. Of course, I don't speak as an expert; in fact, I have no claim to fame, and about the only thing I can say for myself is that I am a member of the human race who has done some thinking about the problem of world peace.

Let me say at the beginning, I think man's best hope for peace is a strengthened United Nations. I have come to this conclusion for the following reasons: All history is evidence that the nations of the world have been unable to maintain peace on the international level; all means tried in the past have failed—preponderance of arms, treaties, power blocs, alliances, et cetera.

ENFORCEABLE WORLD LAW URGED

We know only too well our Nation has been involved in two world wars in a short period of time. However, the nations have on the whole been able to maintain order within their countries. The mechanism making this possible is enforceable law on individuals.

On local, State, and National levels the police forces do a good job of law enforcement seeing to it that the lawbreakers do not disrupt the harmony of the law abiding. This is true of our Nation and others, too.

It is clear to me that what is needed on the world level is enforceable world law applicable to individuals. The United Nations is the instrument through which this can be accomplished. Gen. Douglas MacArthur is correct in saying, "The universal wish for peace is becoming the universal necessity."

The League of Nations was an attempt to deal with the problem of war and peace, but it failed. Two reasons for its failure were that (1) it did not have power, and (2) our country failed to become a member. The United Nations is doing a wonderful job with what it has to work with, to wit what the nations have given it to work with.

I think the statesmen of the world erred in 1945 in not giving the United Nations the necessary tools and power to maintain world peace. They set up a boy to do a man's job. The main purpose the people of the world have in mind for the United Nations is to maintain peace, but in this field the organization is the weakest. Fortunately, this is 1955 and the nations have another opportunity to review the U. N. Charter and see if constructive improvement can be made.

In my opinion, charter review can be the most important event in our time. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles has said this country will support a review conference, and I trust a majority of other nations will, too. I am assuming a review conference will take place, but I suggest our United Nations representatives use their influence in lining up support for the idea to insure the nations do not pass up this great opportunity.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND VOTING

Now I come to a more difficult part of my remarks; that is, to make suggestions as to how the United Nations Charter can be changed to make it effective to do the job mankind wants and needs it to do: keep the peace and save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. I feel the General Assembly should have more power. In

all matters which are a threat to world peace the General Assembly should have final authority.

In order to give the General Assembly more power it will be necessary to change voting representation. The one vote per nation rule at present is both illogical and unfair. Probably some form of weighted representation considering several factors such as population, education, economic development, natural resources, et cetera, with all nations having at least one vote can be worked out giving all nations representation in accordance with their stature in the world today but with provisions for future changes. It seems to me the Security Council should become an executive department carrying out policy decisions of the General Assembly.

The veto should be eliminated or modified. The General Assembly should have the power to override the Security Council veto on matters of war, peace, and aggression, as well as on admission of new members. The U. N. should have universal membership. It is unfortunate the veto power in the Security Council has been used or would be used to block admission of members.

In addition, the U. N. should have an adequate police force of its own independent of the member nations and owing its allegiance to all mankind; needs an independent limited taxing power; and United Nations inspectors should have free access to all nations.

WORLD DISARMAMENT

I now come to what is probably the crux of the whole problem. It would be possible to bring about the changes I have suggested, but it is doubtful if a real solution can be achieved until world disarmament can begin to become a reality. History shows all arms races eventually lead to war, and there are no exceptions.

The U. N. is the place to handle the disarmament question. Granted the problem is very difficult; nevertheless, we must keep working at it and find a way for all nations to disarm to the level of internal policing. This must be multilateral, gradual, and carefully supervised. This is where the U. N. inspectors with free access to all nations become very important. The U. N. police force could be made in part from some of the arms relinquished by the nations in the process of disarming.

I realize it is easier to suggest changes than it is to bring them about even if it is agreed they are desirable. However, it is only a big order that will measure up to the big task of maintaining world peace and abolishing war. I haven't mentioned the weapon of mass destruction, but I think it is a fair statement that survival of civilization is at stake in our efforts to find a way to abolish war.

There are those who oppose a strengthened U. N., such as groups commonly called isolationists. Suffice it to say, I think it is both impossible and undesirable to think in such terms in the 20th century where it will have to be one world or none.

Others equally uninformed, or misinformed, oppose strengthening the U.N. on the ideas of so-called sovereignty. I think sovereignty is the myth of this century. It has no meaning when almost any country, large or small, can engulf all civilization in a world war.

The only thing I propose to give up is our right to make war, providing all other nations do likewise and we set up a system of checks

and guaranties plus inspection to make sure all are obeying. I can think of nothing more wonderful to give up than the destructive right to make war in return for a guaranty of peace. Then all nations can use their war budgets, which take most of the tax dollar, for peaceful purposes.

In conclusion I repeat: A strengthened United Nations is our best hope for peace. I should be proud to have our country to take the leadership in this direction. Let us set up a standard that will do the job. To do anything less is to do ourselves an injustice.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Thomas E. Kendall.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed, Mr. Kendall.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS E. KENDALL, WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity of appearing today to give a short statement.

Ten years ago I was a member of the First Army in Germany. I had the chance to visit Buchenwald when the First Army had gone over that area in Germany, and saw some of the people in the prisons, and they had heard about the United Nations—they had a crude paper—and these were Lithuanians, people of East Europe, and so forth.

The impression to me will always be there that the people who had suffered and seen some of this had real hope for world peace and security.

The United Nations now could not pursue a foreign policy alone. So 10 years ago our entrance into the United Nations signified to the world that we intended with other nations to pursue to the limit the opportunities for peace. Today we face a choice of coexistence or coextinction, of peace or war.

We all realize that we must remain strong militarily and economically. With superweapons now being tested and even more destructive weapons on the drawings boards, our problems in the past 10 years have multiplied and are quite different than before the first atomic bombs used in the war against Japan.

KEEP ON TALKING

It is better then, to create more opportunities to talk and to discuss world problems calmly with other nations, than to gird for war and refuse to meet.

It may well be that after all of the meetings and discussions war may still develop and exterminate us, but our generation might have it said that we tried many times to avert it.

TWO WORLDS IMPOSSIBLE

My humble suggestion then would possibly be in the future—of course, with all the problems of the veto that would have to be settled—would be to add Red China to the Security Council, as well as Burma and India.

Perhaps the United States should have a two-China foreign policy. The world is now so small because of swift air flight that we may as well get used to the very real fact that countries half way around the world are very close neighbors with whom we have to live peacefully.

There cannot be two worlds. Twenty-five years ago the fascinating Middle East and the mysterious Far East were not too well known by us. We are forced to know other countries now and to develop an appreciation for their respective cultures. We cannot take the world for granted.

In conclusion, I would like to quote a paragraph from Secretary of State George C. Marshall, in an address at Princeton University on February 22, 1947, in which he said:

We do not lack for knowledge of what to do for our future security. The lessons of history provide plain guidance. But can we tear our thoughts sufficiently away from the personal and local problems of the moment to see the world picture and our relation to it in proper perspective? * * * We no longer display that intensity, that unity of purpose with which we concentrated upon the war task and achieved the victory.

In conclusion, I feel that if we work for peace through the United Nations as hard as we worked in developing armaments in the past and preparing for war or preparing in the preparedness program, that we will succeed in this, and the United States should take the lead in studying that.

Thank you very much.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you. Call the next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Dr. Florence G. Harris.

STATEMENT OF DR. FLORENCE G. HARRIS, ALBANY, CALIF.

Dr. HARRIS. Senators Knowland and Sparkman, my name is Florence G. Harris and I live in Albany, Calif. I am a former school-teacher and have a doctor's degree in education from Stanford University. I appreciate the opportunity to present my views concerning charter revision to you here in this beautiful city where the United Nations was born.

I am speaking as an individual.

I like to think of the United Nations as a permanent structure erected by man for the purpose of bringing peace and security to a world wearied by war and faced with the threat of total destruction. While it is true that any man-made institution can be improved, and Americans have demonstrated an innate ability in this regard, yet, while considering changes in the structure, caution must be exercised lest the basic framework be weakened, rather than strengthened.

A review conference could perform a great service by focusing the attention of world opinion on areas where, in the light of present day knowledge, the charter could serve its purposes more realistically.

PROBATIONARY PERIOD FOR NEW MEMBERS

In my opinion, the United Nations Charter can be strengthened within the framework of the present charter. The uniting for peace resolution is a case in point. Now, a threat to the peace can be acted upon in the General Assembly even though action is vetoed in the Security Council. Similarly, that is by resolution of the General Assembly, the question of universal membership could be resolved. My suggestion on this question would be to have the General Assembly establish probationary membership for countries not now member states.

They would not have noting and other privileges of full membership, but would be permitted to have representatives to sit with the delegates around the conference table. Then, if they conform to the purposes and principles of the charter for a stipulated period and their application for membership is vetoed in the Security Council, it could be referred to the General Assembly where they could be admitted by a two-thirds majority vote.

Under chapter I, article 2, section 6, the purposes and principles of the charter imply the need for universality of membership, since peace is not divisible.

GREATER USE OF LAW AND COURTS

Because the United Nations is strengthened by use, it is essential that a more complete codification and interpretation of international law be made and that member states be urged to utilize the International Court of Justice more frequently to adjudicate disputes which threaten world peace.

VALUE OF SPECIALIZED AGENCIES

Of supreme importance in evaluating the worth of the United Nations Organization are the specialized agencies. They seek to promote the well-being of the peoples of the underdeveloped areas and by so doing contribute to world peace. In this connection I would like to mention the Salomon report which investigated the criticisms of UNESCO. Its favorable, unbiased report has been accepted by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

At this point I would like to quote from a speech by Secretary of State Dulles on United Nations Charter review. (Department of State, Public Service Division, Series S, No. 3, p. 8.)

It is in my opinion important that the United States should approach this problem of charter review with recognition that the charter as it is can be made to serve well the cause of international peace and justice. The defects in the charter can to a considerable extent be corrected by practices which are permissible under the charter * * *. It is also necessary to bear in mind that much can be done within the framework of the charter, but without actual dependence upon the procedures of the United Nations itself.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. John Scaglione, followed by Mr. Richard B. Johnson.

STATEMENT OF JOHN SCAGLIONE, MARTINEZ, CALIF.

Mr. SCAGLIONE. I am John Scaglione, from Pleasant Hill, Calif.

I would like to preface my remarks by a reference to Senator Knowland's remarks about the arsonist, if I may.

I agree that there is danger in permitting arsonists to participate in our free society, but we do protect ourselves from the fires that are being set, by our fire department and our police department, and also by insurance, Senator, and by sheer coincidence, that is my business.

We can be protected from loss by a proper fire policy. For the benefit of information, I would like to point out that this is accomplished by every participant giving a little so that all may be secure.

Senator KNOWLAND. Without coming out of your time, I might say that the statement was not that we did not have arsonists in the community. My statement was that as a general rule, I did not think that we selected an arsonist to head our fire department. I had reference to the Soviet Union turning up as chairman of the Security Council during the period of the Korean war, when they admitted that they were helping the aggressor.

I quite recognize that we have insurance, but it might be a little difficult, or the rates might be a little high, if the insurance companies knew that an arsonist was helping the fire department and participating in the building of the fires.

Mr. SCAGLIONE. I agree with you, Senator.

Congressional committees usually deserve commendation for coming before the people to ascertain their views on matters concerning the national welfare.

However, the question of whether or not we should support the United Nations ultimately resolves itself into whether or not we will create a more effective organization for the maintenance of peace.

GRASSROOTS HEARINGS ATTACKED

The committee has far more knowledge of the situation than we. Certainly some of that information is essential for making valid appraisals and judgments. If this committee has asked people to come before it in order that it might be influenced in its decision according to the views of political novices as myself, I think this committee would be guilty of playing politics and shunning its moral responsibilities. Is the committee willing to accept our views based on misinformation or lack of information?

At a time like this the people are asking: "Is our leadership so vacillating and weak that it must canvass the nation for lobbyists to induce it to act in behalf of peace?"

This is certainly not the occasion for interminable discussions with us, the politically illiterate, for we can be caught discussing navigation while the ship is sinking.

In my estimation it is not an agreeable spectacle at a time like this to see some of our Nation's top Senators reduce themselves to the rank of passive observers sitting in audience to hear the "common man's views".

This committee owes it not only to the American people but to the entire free world to clearly present the alternatives as they really exist. This committee should define the necessary compromises and then come boldly before the American people and give us our choice.

We are confident that this committee knows, far better than we, that to survive we, as a nation (or we as individuals), cannot afford to do other than strengthen the United Nations to make it a more effective instrument for peace.

This committee knows far better than we just how best that can be accomplished; it knows that as the world's most powerful free nation we have the moral obligation to set the pace for the others.

This committee knows that if other nations do not appear to be so concerned with the role of the United Nations in world peace, we must remember that the almost universal and immediate problem of daily

providing the necessities for life is still the only significant problem to most of them.

And most significant to us, these nations, if more vulnerable to Communist aggression, are not the target that we are in event of an atomic war.

To operate outside the United Nations and, although we espouse freedom at home, to compromise with tyranny abroad is as utterly shortsighted as it is inconsistent and dangerous, for continued compromise with tyranny abroad requires us continually to depend upon our military power to overcome consequent suspicion and resistance even among the friendly free nations.

The most effective organ available to us to expand freedom abroad and consequently make freedom more secure at home is the United Nations.

Certainly this committee knows there is no finer goal toward which we might well devote our energies than that manifest in the United Nation's Declaration of Human Rights.

PURPOSE OF GRASSROOTS HEARINGS

Senator KNOWLAND. I would like to say—I hope I am not being unfair to the witness in the slightest degree—that he appeared to be critical that the committee has come, not only to San Francisco, but to other sections of the country, to hear those people in the country who might care to present their viewpoint to the committee.

It is clear that the responsibility for finally making the decision of the Senate of the United States rests, of course, on those of us who happen, for the time being, to hold positions in the Senate of the United States. We are still there, however, in our representative capacity. If that same theory applied, there would be no meaning for the Finance Committee to hold hearings on tax legislation, nor the Appropriations Committee on appropriations legislation, because there, too, the Senators have direct responsibility. They do it because they feel that under our free system of government, the people do have a contribution to make. We believe that the Congress should pay heed, and at least understand the point of view of those who have honest differences of opinion, and might have some constructive suggestions to make which we could carry back to the Congress in our deliberations.

I say that in the friendliest of spirits, because the witness is certainly entitled to his view on the matter. But I can assure you that during what to some might be an Easter recess period, the senior Senator from Alabama and I are giving today a very full day to this hearing and are going to do the same on Monday in Denver. We will be back in Washington at 7 Tuesday morning in order to carry on our responsibilities.

But the reason we have done it is that Washington is 3,000 miles away from here, and many of you people, because of the expense involved, would not be able to go to the Nation's Capital.

Mr. SCAGLIONE. May I state, Senator, that I think there is a distinction between coming before the people and asking them whether or not they prefer such things as Government ownership of power, for instance, and coming before the people and asking them if they desire to survive or will attempt to survive an atomic war. I think it is a little different, Senator.

Senator KNOWLAND. Of course, I do not want to argue with the witness today. That is not the question. There may be a very honest opinion as to how you could best survive. There might be a difference of opinion whether the United Nations as presently constituted might be so paralyzed by Soviet vetoes that they could conduct a filibuster in the General Assembly among the Communist nations, and by the time the United Nations was prepared to act under the present charter, the freedom of literally tens of millions of people might be endangered. We know that Nazi Germany overran Holland in 5 days and Belgium in several weeks.

Consequently, I think that this is a point which is not quite as simple as the witness would have us believe.

Mr. SCAGLIONE. Thank you.

VALUE OF GRASSROOTS HEARINGS

Senator SPARKMAN. Sir, before you go, may I add just this word, too, that the question is whether or not the United States shall support a conference for the review of the charter, and, if so, what we should recommend.

Now, certainly 96 Senators should not assume that they are likely to have all the good suggestions that may be available. I might say to you that my own experience from these hearings has been that we have received some very fine suggestions. I have been impressed with suggestions that have been given here today. And I will tell you one thing that has also impressed me, and I think it would impress every Member of the Congress if he could see it: The fact that people are here today from all walks of life and have stated frankly their opinion regarding the U. N. Many of them have given what I consider good suggestions.

A great many of them have been duplicated many times over. But we do get new suggestions as to how we should proceed in this.

This is not a question of, shall we or shall we not? It is not a question of, shall we retain the United Nations or shall we not?

The question is, first, shall we review the charter? And if so, what suggestions shall we make as to how to remedy it.

And I say to you in all fairness that the people of the country are entitled to an opportunity to present their own views. I may say in all kindness that so far as I am aware now, you are the first witness that has directed any criticism at the committee. I think I would say almost unanimously the committee has been commended for having gone out to give the people an opportunity to express their views.

I want to say that the purpose of it is not altogether to give the people a chance to express their views, but it gives us a chance to hear the views that the people have.

I think it is worthwhile both ways.

Senator KNOWLAND. I might also say that it is in no sense meant to be a form of Gallup poll. I quite agree with the witness that if we were counting noses here, and using the committee meetings for that purpose, it would be trying to pass our responsibility on to someone else. That is not the purpose. We do not count the number of people for or against, and so on.

We want to get the ideas of people who have been giving thought to this problem, and who have been concerned with it. After all,

under our system, I still believe that several hundred minds are perhaps better than 96, and even 96 United States Senators can learn something from getting out and meeting the American people.

Mr. SCAGLIONE. I am confident, Senator, that will be the case. In our past history we have had leaders set forth and lead us to the proper path, and I presume that will be the case at this time, and I hope, of course, that it will occur before it is too late.

Thank you very much.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Richard Johnson.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD B. JOHNSON, SONOMA, CALIF.

Mr. JOHNSON. Senator Sparkman, Senator Knowland, the gentleman preceding me seems to like a system in another country rather than a system in this country, where we are sovereign people and you gentlemen are our public servants.

My name is Richard B. Johnson. I am a former social-science teacher. I live in Sonoma at the present time.

I appear in behalf of a conceived but as yet unborn universal political party, designed to end the Communist Party's universal political monopoly and to win a world majority from advancing communism to the common universal aspiration of equal opportunity through direct representation in a democratic United Nations, a federal republic similar to our own time-tested form of government.

Incidentally, I consider a worldwide competitive political party environment as a prerequisite to any effective form of world government.

If peace is democracy, world peace must surely require world democracy.

WORLD DEMOCRACY REQUIRED

If this committee would guide Congress and the administration to revision of the U. N. into a democracy, then it should suggest the initial revision of the U. N. Assembly into a House of Representatives, similar to our own, and directly and proportionately elected by the world's people. We know that system works. If it did not, we would have amended our Constitution.

This would be a compromise approach similar to what our Founding Fathers devised in order to satisfy both the State governments and the sovereign people, the two checking and balancing each other so that only legislation mutually acceptable could become law. In the case of the U. N., the Security Council would function as did our early Senate before the 17th amendment, representing national governments equally.

Our national experience has proven how well equal representation of governments versus proportional representation of peoples solves problems of size and populations. And I would like to add that weighted representation in any form would favor the favored, whereas it is the unfavored we must win from communism.

This compromise revision would serve to solve the basic cause of conflict, the Malthusian pressure of populations against artificially restricted production by major powers for self-sufficiency in times of war. Since "times of war" are caused by the artificial restrictions, the

vicious circle must and can be broken by the check and balance of hungry people, represented in the Assembly.

The sense of security created by the developing democracy would further tend to neutralize, if not reverse the Malthusian cause of conflict by creating a proper environment for long-term investments and industrial developments throughout the world, that unrestricted mass production and mass distribution could compound the world economy toward the square of the sum of the united economies, as indicated is approachable by the compounding of our own national economic union of 48 States.

Finally, revision of the Assembly into a House of Representatives would put the Communist Party in the dilemma of permitting U. N. sponsored elections in Communist countries or of watching the people revolt.

In India, elections for the illiterate have not only been successful, but have caused a marked decline in Communist successes.

Therefore, if the committee would do its part in solving the basic Malthusian cause of war and promoting the basic democratic cause of peace, it should suggest revision of the U. N. Assembly into a House of Representatives, a minimal action that should be acceptable to a majority of nations and peoples, if not to the minority that is the Communist Party.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Call the next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Lillian M. Wilt, followed by Mr. Jerry Jackson.

STATEMENT OF MRS. LILLIAN N. WILT, LAFAYETTE, CALIF.

Mrs. WILT. I wish to thank the committee for allowing me to speak today. I represent 350 people, women, in Contra Costa County, a private organization that has studied for the last 15 years the legislation in connection with the United Nations and other problems, and since 1944 have constantly made a thorough study.

I could go into great detail on this, but I am a woman of a few words. So I am going to give you just a short résumé of what we have been doing.

The United Nations, which was organized to insure peace and security, has not only failed in that respect, but, through its agencies, has already taken away great segments of the liberties and property of the people and has diminished the powers of our own Congress and that of our Constitution itself.

We don't even know to what extent this has been done. We do know that the changes already made make it easy to visualize the loss of all our priceless liberties, the complete wrecking of our Constitution, a total change in our precious form of government and a total loss of all property itself.

WITHDRAWAL URGED

These things are exemplified by the insults and vilifications heaped on us in the halls of the institution, the crying need for mental treatment and institutions for the care of people of lost hope, the widespread delinquency of our children about whose mortgaged lives we are so greatly concerned, the child-care centers and nursing homes

and schools being established to take our children away from their homes, the fluoridation of the very water we drink by artificial means, the changing of our histories, the changing of our Bible to take away from us the sacredness of our only hope. Already, indeed, volumes of indictment could be prepared.

Volumes could be written of the brainwashing of the American people being accomplished through the processes of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. These agencies nursed at the breast of tax-exempt foundations are preparing without a bullet being shot the children of this and the future generation of the children of the entire world; this being the object and intention of the Kremlin itself.

Let's get out of the United Nations or furnish not one cent more of American money to support any so-called special agencies. If we stay in the United Nations, let's make sure that the activities are confined to those authorized for peace and security in the world and that all other considerations, domestic or otherwise, be prohibited.

Let's save for our children and for ourselves our own country, our well-earned and priceless liberties; let's save our own religions, our own form of government, and our own Constitution.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Jerry Jackson, followed by Miss Helen Graydon.

Senator KNOWLAND. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF JERRY JACKSON, PRESIDENT, JUNIOR STATESMEN, OAKLAND HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. JACKSON. Senator Knowland, Senator Sparkman, and guests, I am Jerry Jackson, a senior at Oakland High School and president of the Junior Statesmen there. Today I am speaking officially on behalf of the Oakland High School Junior Statesmen. Junior Statesmen is a statewide organization founded in 1934 by Prof. E. A. Rogers.

I imagine that for most of you it has been at least 15 years since any of you have had to face the threat of war, the threat that can take you away from your family, your home and your life.

Today we are faced with a third World War, a war that can start in Formosa, or Germany, or Israel, but no matter where it starts, I and my friends will be fighting in it. I'm afraid of war, I like my life, and I cannot see why I should have to give it up because of the blundering of the United Nations; so I will tell you about an amendment to the United Nations Charter which I am proposing, an amendment calling for a peace council.

This council would outlaw war and they would call for a disarmament of all nations for, you see, it is either coexistence or no existence.

PEACE COUNCIL RECOMMENDED

My amendment of the United Nations Charter will read as follows:

CHAPTER XX. THE PEACE COUNCIL

Article 112. Composition: The Peace Council shall consist of the following members of the United Nations:

- a. Representatives of the Security Council.
- b. Five Nations elected for 2-year terms by the General Assembly.

c. Those nations who were neutrals in either the First or the Second World Wars.

Article 113. Functions and powers: The General Assembly and, under its authority, the Peace Council, in carrying out their functions, may:

a. Abolish war with the understanding that any nations that do not follow this procedure will be expelled from the United Nations, if a member, and will be subject to trade embargoes from members of the United Nations.

b. Call for the general disarmament of all members of the United Nations. This procedure is subject to all nations preparing for admission to the United Nations.

c. Distinguish the difference between a minor dispute and a war.

d. Report all findings of this Council to the United Nations General Assembly.

Article 114. The Peace Council shall send a questionnaire to each nation involved in a dispute or war and shall then present the questionnaire and the Council's findings to the General Assembly.

Article 115. Voting: Each member of the Peace Council shall have one vote. Decisions of the Peace Council shall be made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Article 116. Procedure:

a. The Peace Council shall adopt its own rules of procedure including the method of selecting its own president.

b. The Peace Council shall meet as required in accordance with its rules, which shall include a provision for the convening of meetings on the request of its members.

Article 117. The Peace Council shall, when appropriate, avail itself to the assistance of the Security Council and of the specialized agencies in regard to matters with which they are respectively concerned.

AVOID WORLD WAR III

This amendment is at the present time the only solution to avoiding world war III. To quote from the Charter of the United Nations:

We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind * * * to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to insure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest * * * have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims

Quoting Prof. J. H. Merryman of Stanford University, who spoke this morning:

If these words are to mean what they say, the charter must be amended to give the United Nations the authority it requires to cope effectively with the problems of the atomic age. It is to our interest as individuals and as Americans to give it this authority.

Thank you.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Miss Helen Graydon, followed by Dr. Yale Maxon.

STATEMENT OF HELEN GRAYDON, PASADENA, CALIF.

Miss GRAYDON. My name is Helen Graydon, and my address is Pasadena, Calif.

Ten years ago at the inception of the U. N. my concept of the undertaking was that its merit lay not in forcing the nations into agreement with each other, but in allowing each its full freedom to develop according to the dictates of conscience, only guaranteeing that this right would be respected equally for all. This, I believe, is the only basis for a world forum which is consonant with the American Constitution and our national sovereignty.

This was the premise which I naively believed would be the determining factor governing the U. N. I thought of it as a body of the nations' representatives at that time—not as an organization in itself, demanding of its Secretary General and staff the allegiance which they should rightly pledge only to the countries empowering them. I am sure that this must have been the concept of many of the Senators who ratified the treaty by which our country became a member of the U. N. I recall that I read what I could find in the newspapers on the charter, but probably I did not discern its true significance.

There were, of course, many individuals of more mature judgment who knew that this was not the concept of those who worked so assiduously for the establishment of the U. N. Many knew, but not the general public, that it was being planned as the nucleus of a world government. The Yalta disclosures confirm that this was so. The U. N. was ushered in by secret agreements of those who would control the world in a manner reminiscent of the Holy Alliance, albeit in the name of democracy instead of the divine right of kings as at the Congress of Verona in 1822.

WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES ADVOCATED

I believe the U. N. as now constituted is inimical to the interests and inherent meaning of our country and that we should immediately withdraw from it and remove it from our shores. I state this in order that my testimony cannot be construed as approval of the organization. I cannot think of the U. N. without recalling the poignancy of the flower of American youth and the youth of other countries who lost their lives at Korea, and the many still held captive behind the Asian Iron Curtain, because their efforts were thwarted by insidious U. N. directives formulated by interests abetting the enemy they were fighting because of those interests' inclusion in the the councils of the U. N.

U. N. STAFF PROVISIONS CRITICIZED

However, if rather than a clean-cut break with the U. N. our country must be freed from its tentacles by a gradual process of reversal, and since in order that my testimony be considered it must point up actualities in the U. N. Charter and their need for revision, I will confine it to articles 100 and 101.

The portions of these articles I call to your attention are as follows:

ARTICLE 100

1. In the performance of their duties the Secretary General and the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any government or from any other authority external to the organization. They shall refrain from any action which might reflect on their positions as international officials responsible only to the organization.

2. Each member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General and the staff, and not to seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

ARTICLE 101

1. The staff shall be appointed by the Secretary General under regulations established by the General Assembly. * * *

The above articles preclude the U. N. from being an organization of representatives of the nations, in other words, a united nations'

organization. If the words mean what they say, the only possible conclusion is that the U. N. Organization is a sovereignty within itself—a supra form of government of the nationals of various countries all of whom must relinquish their national loyalties and interests to be employees of this so-called united nations organization.

Although many well-intentioned individuals loyal to the United States are undoubtedly working at the U. N., if they understand the U. N. Charter they cannot remain loyal to our country without abrogating the U. N. Charter. It is unthinkable that they would not prefer to do this than to jeopardize their American citizenship. These articles, however, make it one or the other.

It is very doubtful, therefore, that Americans who understand and cherish the American Constitution would want to work for the U. N. Then, the great danger, and one which has been wielded by the enemies of our country is that U. N. positions will be attractive only to subversive elements in our country.

The staff is appointed by the Secretary General, who, unless he were an American with an understanding of our Constitution, would have no gage of values to determine the qualifications of an individual from the standpoint of his love of his own country, while after he is appointed he is precluded from acting from the standpoint of his own country's good.

Probably, therefore, reverence for his own country would be a detriment to his appointment as a servant of the U. N. since every member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively international character of the responsibilities of the Secretary General and the staff.

REVISIONS OF ARTICLES 100 AND 101 OF CHARTER

To me the portions of the article quoted above need to be revised into an opposite context which also would require the revising of other parts in the charter to be in harmony with them.

They should be stated as follows:

ARTICLE 100

1. In the performance of their duties the Secretary General and his staff shall not interfere with the instructions to the representatives of the various member nations from their own governments or endeavor to keep them from acting in the best interests of their own governments. They shall refrain from any actions which might reflect on the positions of the countries' representatives as national officials responsible only to their own governments.

2. Every member of the United Nations undertakes to respect the exclusively national character of the responsibilities of the various countries represented in the U. N. and shall not seek to influence them in the discharge of their responsibilities.

ARTICLE 101

1. The staff shall consist of individuals appointed by the legal processes of the nations represented in the U. N.

Such a procedure if logically carried out in every phase of the charter would make the charter the embodiment of a truly representative organization which is all the U. N. should ever have been to be consistent with national sovereignty. Sovereignty in our Nation is vested in the people, and when the people understand the issues involved they will never surrender their sovereignty to a world government.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

Call the next witness.

Mr. GILBERT. Dr. Yale Maxon, followed by Mrs. Guy P. Wallick.

STATEMENT OF DR. YALE MAXON, OAKLAND, CALIF.

Dr. MAXON. Gentlemen of the subcommittee, I should like to say that I am full of admiration for the patience, tolerance, and judicious manner in which these hearings have been conducted.

My name is Yale Maxon. I live at 1902 Vine Street, Berkeley. I am a political scientist and hold a doctorate in international relations from the University of California.

I am also a commander in the United States Naval Reserve.

I have 3 points in my prepared statement, and since 2 of them are cumulative, I will simply state the conclusions and not argue them.

The first point is that we must provide for the common defense by strengthening the U. N. Organization in its limited function of preserving world peace. I will omit the argument on that point, because many others have agreed with it.

MODIFICATION OF THE VETO

The second point in my submission is that the veto must, in my opinion, be eliminated. In my estimation, the time has now come to modify article 27 in this respect.

I will make this one statement on that point. It seems to be that the requirement of a 7 out of 11 vote on substantive measures makes it next to impossible, under the political system, which in practice has prevailed for selecting the nonpermanent members of the Security Council to envision any situation in which the United States and its friends would be unable to summon up the necessary 5 votes that would be required to defeat any substantive measure contrary to our vital national interests.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, without taking this out of the doctor's time, I would like to ask a question at that point, because I think perhaps the most difficult question of all to deal with is this very question on the veto power.

You are familiar with the Vandenberg resolution, are you not, which briefly, in substance, provided for the elimination of the veto power except when the use of the Armed Forces of the country concerned were involved. I believe that is the language.

Would you eliminate that?

Dr. MAXON. No. I would go along with the Vandenberg resolution.

Senator SPARKMAN. You are not advocating completely the omission of the veto?

Dr. MAXON. No, sir: not necessarily.

Senator SPARKMAN. I am glad to have that straightened out.

INDIA TO BE A PERMANENT MEMBER OF SECURITY COUNCIL

Dr. MAXON. Point 3 I should like to state in a little more detail, because although it has been mentioned briefly by two former speakers, it seems to me that it is perhaps a new idea, which the subcommittee might wish to consider.

In my estimation, India should replace Nationalist China as the permanent representative of Asia on the Security Council. I believe that article 23 should be changed to provide for the inclusion of India among the members in place of Nationalist China.

Speaking realistically, the latter Government certainly cannot be regarded as a great power, and I question whether it is in the long-term interest of this country or in the interest of world peace that we continue to insist that she be so regarded.

The Nationalist Government in China has effective political authority over fewer than 10 million people; yet at present, she is the sole permanent spokesman in the Security Council for some 1,200 million Asians.

I do not mean to suggest that we should permit the Communist Chinese government to absorb Formosa—only that the Nationalist Government should not continue to pose as the spokesman for Asia. I think we all recognize that Formosa has a different history from the rest of China. For 50 years, from 1895 until 1945, she was under Japanese control, and the Formosan people do not feel like mainland Chinese in many respects, and our Government has taken a firm position that we do not want to see Formosa absorbed.

I am speaking of the question of how this affects the U. N. Charter, and it seems to me that to continue to insist that Nationalist China should hold a permanent seat on the U. N. is something again quite different, and I question whether it is to our advantage to do.

As a matter of elementary political justice, it seems apparent to me that inasmuch as approximately half the people of the globe are Asians some Asian country should be represented on the Security Council, as a permanent member. When we come, however, to the problem of which particular country should represent Asia, the solution does not at first seem apparent.

On a basis of population the Asian "Big Five" are Communist China with 465 million; India, with 365 million; Japan, with 85 million, and Indonesia and Pakistan with 75 million each. (Turkey, Iran, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines each have about 20 million, and may be considered in the second rank, populationwise.)

In industrial power and organization the "Big Five" countries are extremely diverse. On this score alone Indonesia ought to be disqualified to speak for Asia, for Indonesia is weak and disorganized. Japan, too, though temporarily weak and discredited by defeat, is still feared elsewhere in Asia. Communist China is presently in the throes of revolutionary consolidation, but she too is feared by her neighbors in Asia. Communist China, moreover, opposed the U. N. in Korea. For all these reasons Indonesia, Japan, and Communist China are not presently suitable to represent Asia on the Security Council, nor is it in the long-term American interest that they do so.

We are thus left with Pakistan and India.

I quote some figures here to show that in economic strength, India is very much stronger than Pakistan, in almost every way.

I will omit those figures.

May I just say that my final point is that India, in addition to this economic strength, in addition to her large population, also is a country with a great moral prestige in the world, and for that reason, which

is expanded more fully in my complete statement, I think that India would be a suitable long-term representative on the Security Council.

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

(The prepared statement of Dr. Maxon is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF YALE MAXON, OAKLAND, CALIF.

My name is Yale Maxon. I am a political scientist, and hold a doctorate in international relations, Far East, from the University of California. I also hold the permanent rank of commander in the United States Naval Reserve; during World War II, I was a Japanese language officer, and for some 3 years after the conclusion of that war I was attached to the staff of the International Prosecution Section of SCAP, and in various capacities assisted in preparing and prosecuting the cases against the major war criminals of the Far East. Hence, though I speak only as a private citizen, I feel that I have had a rather long experience with the problems of war and peace which, in the last analysis, the Senate subcommittee has been set up to deal with.

I wish to make three points, and I shall attempt to make them as briefly as possible:

Point 1. We must "provide for the common defense" by strengthening the United Nations organization.

I am afraid that some people do not realize that "defense," in the literal sense, is no longer possible of achievement by military means. Our Army, Navy, and Air Force can fight back against our enemies, but they cannot "defend" millions of civilian inhabitants of our great cities from the sort of airborne attacks of which our potential enemy is capable.

For 2 years (1938-40) I was a teacher in a Japanese Government college in western Japan, and I can still remember the air-defense drills that I witnessed during that period—Japanese Army sergeants instructing kimono-clad Japanese housewives how to put out fires by the bucket-brigade method. As a method of dealing with enemy-dropped incendiary bombs I do not know whether these drills were more ludicrous than they were pathetic, or vice versa. But no one at that time in Japan thought of them as either. Each family was also required to keep a bucket of water and a box of sand on the front porch for use against incendiary bombs.

When the war came, what happened? As you all know, the Japanese cities were simply burned to the ground. The basic reason was that Japan was wide open to attack from the top—from the air. The same thing is now true for the whole world. Let us not delude ourselves about this civil defense. The kimono bucket brigades of the Japanese in 1940 were no more realistic than is the thinking of some people today who believe that civil defense measures will protect city populations from wholesale slaughter in the event of atomic war.

The only possible defense today is and must be political. We must "provide for the common defense" of civilized mankind by strengthening the tentative draft for a political world order represented by the U. N. Charter. Modern full-scale wars are now too costly to be endured; the alternative to them is to perfect the machinery for peaceful adjudication and conciliation of disputes. In a word, we must strengthen and perfect the machinery of the U. N.

Today's problem is similar to—but more serious than—the problem faced by the 13 American States in 1787; either to resign themselves to increasingly chaotic mutual relations, or to set up "a more perfect union" in the shape of a Federal Government with limited powers which could "provide for the common defense." We must have the political courage that our forefathers had. The U. N. must be strengthened.

Point 2: The veto must be eliminated.

The greatest weakness of the U. N. is, at present, the veto power enjoyed by the Big Five under article 27. Like the earlier, unworkable Articles of Confederation in our own national history, the U. N.'s predecessor, the League of Nations, operated under a system of unanimous votes. In the present U. N. Charter this requirement has been largely eliminated in both the General Assembly and the Security Council; however a "vestigial remnant" of the old unanimity requirement persists in the article 27 provision for the "great power" veto in the Security Council.

In my estimation, the time has now come to modify article 27 so as to eliminate the veto in the Security Council. The requirement of a 7 out of 11 vote on substantive measures makes it next to impossible (under the political system

which, in practice, has prevailed for selecting the nonpermanent members of the Security Council) to envision any situation in which the United States and its friends would be unable to summon up the necessary 5 votes that would be required to defeat any substantive measure contrary to our vital national interest.

Point 3: India should replace Nationalist China as the permanent representative of Asia on the Security Council.

I believe that article 23 should be changed to provide for the inclusion of India among the permanent members of the Security Council in place of Nationalist China. Speaking realistically, the latter government certainly cannot be regarded as a great power, and I question whether it is to the long-term interest of this country or the interest of world peace that we continue to insist that she be so regarded.

The Nationalist Government of China has effective political authority over fewer than 10 million people: yet at present she is the sole permanent spokesman in the Security Council for some 1200 million Asians! (I do not mean to suggest that we should now permit the Communist Chinese Government to absorb Formosa; only that the Nationalist Government should not continue to pose as the spokesman for Asia.)

As a matter of elementary political justice it seems apparent to me that inasmuch as approximately half the people of the globe are Asians some Asian country should be represented on the Security Council as a permanent member. When we come, however, to the problem of which particular country should represent Asia, the solution does not at first seem apparent.

On a basis of population the Asian Big Five are Communist China, with 465 million; India, with 365 million; Japan, with 85 million, and Indonesia and Pakistan with 75 million each. (Turkey, Iran, Burma, Thailand, and the Philippines each have about 20 million, and may be considered in the second rank, populationwise.)

In industrial power and organization the Big Five countries are extremely diverse. On this score alone Indonesia ought to be disqualified to speak for Asia, for Indonesia is weak and disorganized. Japan too, though temporarily weak and discredited by defeat, is still feared elsewhere in Asia. Communist China is presently in the throes of revolutionary consolidation, but she too is feared by her neighbors in Asia. Communist China, moreover, opposed the U. N. in Korea. For all these reasons Indonesia, Japan, and Communist China are not presently suitable to represent Asia on the Security Council, nor is it in the long-term American interest that they do so.

We are thus left with Pakistan and India as the two most logical contenders for the post of permanent member on the Security Council for Asia. Between these two nations there is, in my view, no comparison. India has 4 times the population of Pakistan; imports and exports thrice the amount of goods; has about 9 times the holdings of gold; consumes the energy equivalent of 10 times as much coal; produces 68 times as much coal, nearly twice the amount of crude petroleum, and 6 times the volume of cement. India produces some 2½ million tons of iron ore and 1½ million tons of steel annually. Pakistan produces none. (All figures from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for 1953, p. 954.)

Despite the overwhelming evidence in favor of India shown by these figures, it is my belief that the case for admitting India to a permanent seat on the Security Council rests on even stronger grounds—on moral grounds. Here I must confess that as a political scientist I do not and cannot hold the view which was fashionable in the 19th century: that nations—or to be more precise, the leaders of nations—are not bound by the ordinary concepts of right or wrong.

On the opposite theory that there is a right and a wrong in international relations, the United States Government after World War II tried and hanged a considerable number of top-rank German and Japanese leaders who, it was contended, had "planned, prepared, initiated, and waged" wars of aggression and wars in violation of treaties and agreements. In the early months of 1946, in connection with these proceedings, it was my privilege to participate—as interpreter—in the pretrial interrogations of General Tojo, ex-Premier of Japan. General Tojo was, after a long trial, hanged for his part in bringing on the Pacific war. I think that he should have paid this penalty, despite my conviction that he acted for what he conceived to be the national interest of his country.

My point is simply this: if it was right for this Government to exact the death penalty in upholding a moral concept of right and wrong relationships among nations, I believe that we must continue to uphold the same moral con-

cept in our other dealings. We must admit that nations have—or more exactly, that the leaders of nations have—moral character, just as individuals do. On this score, and by these standards, India deserves a high place among the nations of the world.

Indian history is notably pacific, and in recent years, moreover, she has been notably influenced both by English legal tradition and by the Gandhian teaching of nonviolence. All of these facts affect her suitability for playing a conciliatory role in world affairs. Her honorable part in bringing about the Korean cease-fire will be recalled. Also it is arguable that if her advice had been listened to earlier—after South Korea had been retaken, but before the 38th parallel had been crossed by the U. N. troops—the whole Chinese intervention might have been averted. But India was not listened to, and some people apparently are loath to regard her as a great power.

Nevertheless, if the normal tensions of international life can no longer be legally or—without too great cost—satisfactorily resolved by war, then they must be resolved by compromise and arbitration. And for this work it would, it seems to me, be of immense benefit to have a nation like India occupying a position of formal power. In the settlement of disputes by peaceful means, the presence of disinterested, uncommitted power in the Security Council will be the key, perhaps, to real solutions. For the precise difficulty of our present system of alliances and counteralliances is that the possibility of compromise decreases with every new nation that chooses sides. Each bloc of nations becomes so obsessed with building positions of strength and bargaining from strength that each fears to make concessions lest conciliatory gestures be mistaken for weakness; the result is that reasonable compromises become next to impossible. This is the tragic story of the pre-World War I and pre-World War II periods.

In sum, I believe that India is qualified by population, economic strength, and moral character to be a permanent member of the Security Council representing Asia, and I believe that it would be in the American interest and in the interest of world peace if this could be brought about. She would be a wholesome and conciliatory influence in the tensions between the Communist and non-Communist worlds, and in the differences—present and to come—between Asia and the West.

Senator KNOWLAND. Next witness, please.

Mr. GILBERT. Mrs. Guy P. Wallick, followed by Mrs. Tinkham.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH KEYS WALLICK, PALO ALTO, CALIF.

Mrs. WALLICK. I am almost last.

I am Kenneth Keys Wallick, Palo Alto, private citizen and a homemaker. I have been interested in the private citizens, because I have known a great many of them, and the organizations to which they are devoted.

Of course, as you know, in the subcommittee, a great many of them are devoted to the World Federalist Organization, and I am devoted to pro-America.

I, too, was an idealistic believer in the League of Nations, and, with that, to promote peace. I had not completely lost that idealism when I attended many sessions of the United Nations meetings in San Francisco in 1945. I sat and watched the delegates from all over the world with all shades of skin and prayed that they would be able to form an organization that would insure world peace.

I prayed that they meant what they said and I am almost sure most of them did. I have followed the United Nations actions with study in these years since that time, and have come to the sad conclusion that little has been accomplished.

Secretary Dulles said:

The Security Council has not been able to maintain peace and security.

Our representative, Mr. Lodge, points out erroneously the accomplishments in Iran, Greece, Israel, Kashmir, and as the most outstanding seat, Korea. Doesn't he realize that some Americans study and know the truth about these claims?

I was amazed when the Senate committee passed the United Nations Charter in 5 days and the Senate ratified it 12 days later. I feel sure that it would not have been ratified at all unless it had contained paragraph 7 of article 2, which says the charter would not intervene in domestic affairs.

But they failed to notice the last dangerous sentence of that paragraph 7.

U. N. TREATIES OPPOSED

Because of article VI, second paragraph of our own Constitution, treaties take on the effect of supreme law overriding our Constitution and congressional law. So that treaties are of supreme importance to us Americans.

Now, if United Nations restricted its activities to international problems, as it was purported to do, then I and my friends could continue to support it. It seems to me that it is of vital importance that we have an amendment, such as the Bricker amendment, to safeguard our internal freedoms.

I would prefer strengthening the Constitution of the United States.

The charter had barely been ratified when it began to formulate, under specialized agencies and commissions, plans for detailed interference with domestic rights. The Genocide Convention, the Covenant of Human Rights, and some ITO and ILO treaties, go into almost every detail of our lives. We haven't signed all of these as yet, but the United States is operating in some areas as if we had signed the ITO and the ILO.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senators the question, because in the Document 87 regarding the review of the U. N. Charter, collection of documents of the subcommittee, it says on page 255 that the present convention, meaning the Genocide Convention, shall come into force on the 90th day following the date of deposit of the 20th instrument of ratification.

Then on page 88 of this same volume, it says that on January 12, 1951, the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide comes into force.

Is that true, that we have already, as signers of the U. N., and 20 other signers—are we already under this Genocide Convention? May I ask that question?

Senator KNOWLAND. I think you can ask the question, all right. The answer is "No."

Mrs. WALLICK. All right. Thank you.

I have also studied the five leading world-government plans. They differ very little and have agreed to be in complete accord when the conference for revision of the United Nations takes place. From study, I know that the theory of an international socialistic government has developed steadily from 1918 to 1945, and since.

SAFEGUARD AMERICAN FREEDOMS

I think this Senate subcommittee wants to know how the United Nations Charter, its principles and power, effects (1) the citizen of the United States and his constitutional rights; (2) the principles of our Constitution and the powers of Congress; (3) our American system of free enterprise.

Each Senator has sworn to protect our Constitution and I am convinced intends to do so, but I am also sure that under tremendous pressures, often time is not taken to analyze meanings of documents submitted to it.

I pray that they will not sign away any further bits of our sovereignty. Sovereignty is the supreme power. It means the power to make our own laws to govern ourselves, laws to protect ourselves, and freedom to call ourselves Americans rather than French or Chinese.

Our unique freedoms from our Creator are little understood by the rest of the world. We do not have them from any government of man. Surely this committee knows that if we give up these freedoms to international organization, there will be no one to help us to regain them. World-government plans provide that all nations must join and no nation can withdraw.

Under the United Nations Charter as it is now, our freedom has been infringed upon. Congress has already contradicted our Constitution as to its military powers under article I, section 8, and given to an international organization too much (see U. N. Charter, chs. VII and VIII).

Strengthening the United Nations means to give up more of our sovereignty, more of our ability to protect ourselves, and concede to the will of the General Assembly. It means the weakening of the Security Council where we can use the veto and giving the power to the General Assembly where we have 1 vote in 60.

I do not want to be emotional, but after long study it seems to me we must decide whether we want to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United Nations or continue to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States.

I sum it up in that one vital question.

Will you help us save our sovereignty?

Senator KNOWLAND. Mrs. Tinkham, the next witness.

STATEMENT OF MILDRED TAFT TINKHAM, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Mrs. TINKHAM. Senator Knowland and Senator Sparkman, I would like to make a little statement in regard to the attitude that I have toward the United Nations, possibly because I was here in 1945 at the inception of the United Nations, and the spirit of the Soviet Union represented by Molotov was against the spirit that I believe is necessary to formulate a peaceful organization. In the same way, in the United Nations in Lake Success, Malik, in his attitude toward the United States, was anything but the right attitude to have been expressed.

I speak as an individual.

First I would like to point out that the United Nations Charter is not, and never was—a legal agreement between nations. As the Hon-

orable Usher Burdick said on April 28, 1954, before the House of Representatives:

* * * 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.

There is an intent at this time to establish a world government by simply amending the charter of the United Nations. Let us go back to its beginnings.

DRAFTERS OF THE CHARTER

When the United Nations was established at San Francisco in 1945, who had the most to do with shaping its provisions?

The answer to that question is significant in the light of later developments. The man who had a major part in organizing the United Nations, together with the Russian Communists, was Alger Hiss. Hiss and the Russian Communists were the prime movers and schemers in arranging its provisions. This is the same Alger Hiss who was convicted of perjury when he denied sending secret material to the agents of the Soviet Union.

Alger Hiss was Secretary General of the U. N. Conference at San Francisco, with a staff of 300 hand-picked assistants on the Secretariat. At that time, Time magazine reported, and I quote:

Alger Hiss will be an important figure there as Secretary General, managing the agenda. He will have a lot to say behind the scenes about who gets the breaks * * *

That he certainly did.

It is my conviction that the U. N. Charter, so largely contrived by Alger Hiss and the Russians 10 years ago, must be repudiated, abandoned, and forgotten before the free world can make even a start toward peace.

THE CHARTER, TREATIES, AND THE CONSTITUTION

If the real purpose of the U. N. 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? There is no greater document in existence for the purpose of insuring the freedoms and the peaceable government of any people on earth.

The real purpose of the U. N. Charter is to build a world government controlled by Communists and their collaborators in the United States and abroad.

Let us look at this charter from the point of view of treaty law. We are the only major power in the United Nations where treaty law can become the supreme law of the land, superseding our domestic laws, through article VI in our Constitution.

Can anyone fail to see that Alger Hiss and his fellow conspirators have availed themselves of this loophole in our Constitution to bring us under the heel of United Nations control? And this even though the United Nations Charter is not a legal treaty, but is and always has been an agreement between agents of the several governments, and, what is more, agents in bad faith. Why must we allow our great Constitution to be overruled and abrogated by those who have avowedly plotted our destruction?

The United Nations Charter is not a treaty and should never have been ratified as a treaty, because it never was a treaty, and I defy anyone to prove before our Supreme Court that it is a treaty.

No treaties or covenants passed in the United Nations should have any effect on the domestic law of any member nation, regardless of whether or not there is a loophole which invites such conspiracy.

It was under this so-called treaty that President Truman usurped power to commit us to war in Korea—I repeat, war in Korea—without the authority of Congress.

MILITARY PROVISIONS OF THE CHARTER

Articles 42 to 51 in the U. N. Charter give complete and detailed authority to the United Nations, an illegal body, to take armed measures against any nation deemed an aggressor. But who has defined the term "aggressor"? Is the aggressor to be named by another aggressor? If the act of aggression is committed by a powerful member against whom smaller countries would be afraid to take action, it could well leave us alone to defend the nation which is attacked, as we have defended such nations in the past, and as I hope we will have the courage and the principle to defend them in the future, regardless of United Nations edicts to the contrary.

Senator KNOWLAND. The balance of your statement may go into the record in full.

Mr. TINKHAM. May I just quote one part, Senator Knowland?

I would like to refer to article 47, paragraph 1, of the U. N. Charter:

There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments, and possible disarmament.

At this point it is interesting to note that the Secretary of Security Council affairs is and always has been a Russian. Three Russians held this office. They are Arkady Sobelov, from 1946 to 1949; Constantin Zinchenko, from 1950 to 1953; and Illya Tchernychov from 1953 up to the present time.

(The prepared statement of Mrs. Tinkham is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. MILDRED TAFT TINKHAM, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., CHAIRMAN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA DIVISION, GOOD GOVERNMENT GROUPS OF THE UNITED STATES; LEGISLATIVE CHAIRMAN, STUDIO CITY CIVIC CLUB; EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, 57TH DISTRICT REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY; MEMBER OF THE FRIDAY MORNING CLUB, HOLLYWOOD WOMAN'S CLUB, PRO-AMERICA

I speak as an individual.

First I would like to point out that the United Nations Charter is not, and never was, a legal agreement between nations. As the honorable Usher Burdick said on April 28, 1954, before the House of Representatives: "* * * 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."

There is an intent at this time to establish a world government by simply amending the Charter of the United Nations. Let us go back to its beginnings. When the United Nations was established at San Francisco in 1945, who had the most to do with shaping its provisions? The answer to that question is significant in the light of later developments. The man who had a major part in organizing the United Nations, together with the Russian Communists, was Alger Hiss. Hiss and the Russian Communists were the prime movers and schemers

in arranging its provisions. This is the same Alger Hiss who was convicted of perjury when he denied sending secret material to the agents of the Soviet Union. Alger Hiss was Secretary General of the U. N. Conference at San Francisco, with a staff of 300 hand-picked assistants on the Secretariat. At that time, Time magazine reported, and I quote: "Alger Hiss will be an important figure there as Secretary General, managing the agenda. He will have a lot to say behind the scenes about who gets the breaks * * *." That he certainly did.

It is my conviction that the U. N. Charter, so largely contrived by Alger Hiss and the Russians 10 years ago, must be repudiated, abandoned, and forgotten before the free world can make even a start toward peace.

If the real purpose of the U. N. 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? There is no greater document in existence for the purpose of insuring the freedoms and the peaceable government of any people on earth. The real purpose of the U. N. Charter is to build a world government controlled by Communists and their collaborators in the United States and abroad.

Let us look at this charter from the point of view of treaty law. We are the only major power in the United Nations where treaty law can become the supreme law of the land, superseding our domestic laws, through article VI in our Constitution. Can anyone fail to see that Alger Hiss and his fellow conspirators have availed themselves of this loophole in our Constitution to bring us under the heel of United Nations control? And this even though the United Nations Charter is not a legal treaty, but is and always has been an agreement between agents of the several governments, and, what is more, agents in bad faith! Why must we allow our great Constitution to be overruled and abrogated by those who have avowedly plotted our destruction?

The United Nations Charter is not a treaty and should never have been ratified as a treaty because it never was a treaty and I defy anyone to prove before our Supreme Court that it is a treaty!

No treaties or covenants passed in the United Nations should have any effect on the domestic law of any member nation, regardless of whether or not there is a loophole which invites such conspiracy. It was under this so-called treaty that President Truman usurped power to commit us to war in Korea—I repeat war in Korea—without the authority of Congress.

Articles 42-51 in the U. N. Charter give complete and detailed authority to the United Nations, an illegal body, to take armed measures against any nation deemed an aggressor. But who has defined the term "aggressor"? Is the aggressor to be named by another aggressor? If the act of aggression is committed by a powerful member against whom smaller countries would be afraid to take action, it could well leave us alone to defend the nation which is attacked, as we have defended such nations in the past, and as I hope we will have the courage and the principle to defend them in the future, regardless of United Nations edicts to the contrary!

Let us suppose, for instance, that Russia should become the aggressor. It was reported in the Manchester Guardian in 1947 that a secret agreement exists among the five major powers, pledging them not to engage in war against each other. If this is true, who made such an agreement? Was this a part of the Hiss plan to maintain the Security Council of the United Nations always under the control of the Russians? For that is exactly the situation which exists in the Security Council of the United Nations today. I refer to article 47 paragraph 1, of the U. N. Charter: "There shall be established a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's Military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulations of armaments and possible disarmament." At this point it is interesting to note that the Secretary of Security Council Affairs is and always has been a Russian. Three Russians have held this office. They are Arkady Sobelov, from 1946 to 1949; Constantin E. Zinchenko from 1950 to 1953, and Illya Tcheknychev from 1953 up to the present time.

The U. N. Charter further stipulates, article 47, paragraph 3, and I quote: "The Military Staff Committee shall be responsible through the Security Council, for the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council." This means, let it be clearly understood, that the Security Council, through its Military Staff Committee, originates strategy, and that its Secretary—a Soviet citizen—has knowledge of this strategy before it is trans-

mitted to commanders on the battlefronts. In other words, while we were fighting the Communist forces in Korea, the Russians, through the Security Council of the United Nations, knew every move of our troops and every detail of our strategy before our own officers received their orders! Can you think of a more diabolical situation than to have the friends of our enemy in such a position?

The continued presence of a Soviet citizen in the office of Secretary to the powerful Security Council is alarming enough. But let me read further. Article 47, paragraph 2 reads: "The Military Staff Committee shall consist of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Security Council or their representatives." Who are the permanent members of the Security Council whose officers participate in and are aware of all decisions? One of them is Soviet Russia * * * And which is the country that seems most likely to go to war with us? Russia and its friend and ally, Red China.

Many of our generals have testified regarding Korea, that if the order had not come from the United Nations Security Council that the Yalu bridges could not be bombed—except on the bias—the American forces would have been victorious in the heart-breaking battle of Korea.

Now let us look at article 109 of the U. N. Charter. The plan is now imminent, under article 109 of that charter, to amend this document into a world-governing constitution. And who would dominate that world government? Russia! With 5 votes to our 1, and the veto to frustrate our every action, she would be in a position to legislate us off the map—through the world government of the United Nations! Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson, said, in 1920: "The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith, the negation, in short, of every principle upon which it is possible to base harmonious and trustful relations, whether of nations or individuals." Have we found her to be any different since 1920?

The United Nations, purportedly organized to stop aggression, has not stopped aggression. It has not stopped cold war. It has not stopped infiltration, sabotage, and subversion the world over. On the contrary, it has increased and fostered them. It has given prestige to communism through Russia's influential position in the United Nations. It has contributed considerably to the suffocation of freedom movements in the satellite countries. It has served chiefly as a sounding board for Soviet propaganda against free governments. The sinister and degrading accusations hurled by the Soviet spokesmen from the rostrum of the United Nations are broadcast by press and radio to the remotest corners of the world. These same accusations uttered in the Kremlin itself, without the prestige of the U. N. forum, would merit no second thought anywhere. But it has been able to use the United Nations forum as a permanent international loud-speaker, and thus the principal world impact of the United Nations activities has been to increase the prestige and vocal range of the Soviets around the globe. When the U. N. was established in 1945, communism controlled only 200 million people, in and around the Soviet Union. Today, communism strikes terror in some 800 million souls in Europe and Asia. Roughly, one-third of the world's population is now under Communist influence and control. Is this the peace guaranteed by the United Nations?

The Korean war, which ended precisely where it began, has cost us 143,000 battle casualties and some 20 billions of dollars. Today, the U. N. and Korean freedom still stand frozen and frightened at the 38th parallel. Is this the peace guaranteed us by the United Nations?

Since 1945 the Soviet Union has frustrated our constructive efforts toward world understanding by the exercise of 67 vetoes. Is this the peace guaranteed by the United Nations?

The United Nations building stands on our soil and its premises are a hotbed of foreign espionage. From it agents can operate freely, with immunity from our domestic laws. A U. N. decision tells us that we cannot remove traitors from their organization without paying them an indemnity. Where is the gallant spirit that cried out: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute!" What has happened to our American independence, so valiantly won by our forebears?

Americans are drafted without the constitutionally required consent of Congress, to fight in foreign wars under a U. N. flag and under U. N. command. American forces engaged in combat have been prevented from achieving victory on the battlefield, by order of the U. N. command. The United States, under the direction of the U. N., has suffered the first military defeat in its history. And what of our Americans, military and civilians, who are languishing in Red

China's prisons today? Has the U. N. secured peace for them? And still we pay, and pay and pay. Over one-third of the cost of maintaining the U. N. to say nothing of the hidden costs which they are not required to account for, all this is bled out of the pay envelopes of American taxpayers, by those who are plotting the destruction of their freedom and their Constitution.

Fellow Americans, I am not here to fight this conspiracy for my own sake. What is done here to safeguard the ideals and principles upon which our country was founded, against such dangerous and sinister machinations as are involved in the covenants of the United Nations, will determine the future of our families, of our loved ones. It is too late to do anything for the young men who died despairingly in Korea. But for the sake of those they have left behind, we must place a check on an organization which can throw Americans into battle, and deny them the right to victory!

As for the revision of the United Nations Charter, I say that it should be revised out of existence! The American Constitution is still good enough for me!

Senator KNOWLAND. Now, there are two additional statements that may be printed in the record at this point, one by Mr. Norman A. Olson and the other one by Mr. M. C. Neel. They will be printed in the record.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF NORMAN A. OLSON, BERKELEY, CALIF., FOOD TECHNOLOGIST
WESTERN BRANCH LABORATORIES, NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

It seems to me that two situations, one old and one new, combine to threaten American liberties. One is the existence of a strong nation that declares itself our enemy, and the other is the development of means to destroy a major part of our people overnight. The United States and every other nation has had enemies before, though perhaps none as immoral as ours is today. But destruction in war has never been as easy before as it is now.

I believe that the threat of war prevents settling differences of every kind between nations. Worse than this, it creates necessities of armament and security that waste our lives and resources and erode our liberties. We will continue to seek our defense by our own power and by allies, and we must not neglect either. But I believe we must recognize that these measures are temporary.

Disarmament of all nations under the United Nations appears to be a practical solution. This will require drastic revision of the United Nations Charter. When we transfer to the U. N. the authority to make and enforce laws dealing with armaments and war, we will have to reorganize it in other ways. The U. N. should have its own army, with constitutional safeguards to prevent usurpation. Large nations like the United States should have more votes. The veto should be abolished, and can be safely when each nation is protected from the others. I believe that the U. N. should not be given jurisdiction in economic or other fields outside of those directly related to war.

Such a reorganization of the U. N. will take years to complete. The conference to review the U. N. Charter is the logical place to develop detailed plans.

I hope this committee will recommend United States support for granting real powers to the United Nations.

STATEMENT OF M. C. NEEL, MODESTO, CALIF.

I am a veteran of World War II. I am married, have 1 child, and own and manage 2 retail stores. I am not representing any one organization, but am testifying as an individual citizen.

As a member of the younger generation who was denied the opportunity of participating in laying a foundation for peace, and who was shocked at the United States position at Dumbarton Oaks, I now ask that you gentlemen avail yourselves of this singular opportunity to initiate American action in revising the Charter of the United Nations, making it an instrument of law rather than an ineffectual pact.

The problem is world anarchy and none other. There can be no security in a state of anarchy in which absolute weapons exist. And there can be no true freedom where there is no security.

Security now hinges on universal disarmament. This can be safely achieved only under law universally applied.

For those of us who grew up in the shadow of a generation that failed to meet the issue, we look to you for leadership. I do not believe there is anything the American people cannot achieve, providing leadership and opportunity join hands.

Just this one time, honorable sirs, please aim high and straight.

Senator KNOWLAND. The last witness will be Mr. George O'Brien. Will you give your name and address.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you, Senator.

**STATEMENT OF GEORGE MICHAEL O'BRIEN,
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.**

Mr. O'BRIEN. My name is George Michael O'Brien. I am a resident of San Francisco, Calif. I live at 225 11th Avenue.

Before proceeding, I wish to thank you for letting me express this thought.

Senator KNOWLAND. I want to say on behalf of Senator Sparkman and myself that I did not want a young man to come to a meeting of the Senate of the United States, and even though he had not gotten his application in in time, feel that the plea that he sent up would not be given consideration.

So you may proceed.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Thank you very much.

Every person of reasonable understanding and intelligence is aware of the Communist desire to world conquest, though the word "desire" is a misnomer. The Communists know just as we know that the sun will rise in the east and set in the west—they know that they will conquer and unite the world into a classless society by the very law of inner dialectical necessity.

Now, the Communists have two plans with which to forward this goal of world domination.

The first plan we have taken cognizance of: Divide and conquer. That is to say that the opinions of the masses must be divided and that the nations of the Western World not only be the mutual causes of confusion and apathy in the economic, political and philosophical orders, but also the victims of that confusion and apathy.

The second plan is: Unite and conquer. This plan is a living being; it is organic; it is in reality the United Nations, to say nothing of the infamous and ignoble NATO, SEATO, status of forces treaty, the Genocide Convention, and the Covenant of Human Rights. I am diametrically opposed to the United Nations. I am opposed to it because it helps the Communist objective of world domination.

Now, how does it help this Communist objective? First of all, by tearing down nationalism and patriotism; by paying indemnities to United States citizens citing the fifth amendment; by not recognizing God; by looking at the Communist nations as peace-loving nations; by viewing communism as a political system.

I might add parenthetically that communism is not a political system basically, but a philosophical system based on the false expectation that man can become perfect and turn himself even into a god.

Continuing, by ignoring the Communist aggression in the world.

Now, if the U. N. really wants peace, will it continue in its fallacies? If the U. N. wants peace, why does it not expel the Communist nations? Oh, I forgot. They are peace-loving.

PEACE COMES FROM GOD—NOT FROM THE U. N.

If the United Nations wants peace and freedom, why does it not recognize the ultimate giver of peace and freedom—God?

Did you ever get gasoline from a drinking fountain, or did you ever get California oranges from a Florida orange tree? Certainly not.

Hence, you can never get real peace and freedom unless you get it from God. And the peace and freedom of God is certainly not delegated to the Commies to give to us through appeasement. It is not given to us by the United Nations to ignore the American flyers captive in Korea.

Freedom is the right to do what you ought, not the right to do what you please.

These one-worlders will never get freedom and peace through the U. N. because it harbors ideologies and concepts which are antithetical to true peace.

Now, if the U. N. wants peace, from whence does it get the power to say that property is not a basic human right, a right which God gave to every man? A man is free on the inside because he can call his soul his own. A man is free on the outside because he can own property.

Now, if the U. N. takes away the outside freedom, will it not proceed to take away man's inside freedom?

The U. N. certainly helps the Communist objectives. How more clear can it be?

As I have said before, the U. N. tears down nationalism and patriotism.

Now, all you Americans ask any exponent of the United Nations or any of the one-worlders, "To what flag do you owe your allegiance? To the flag of the United States of America or to the flag of the United Nations?"

I owe my allegiance to our flag of America under God.

Fight comm-UN-ism.

Thank you.

CLOSING STATEMENTS

Senator KNOWLAND. Thank you.

That terminates the list of witnesses today. I would not want this meeting to adjourn without expressing on behalf of both Senator Sparkman and myself our deep appreciation to the staff, to the local community, including the mayor of San Francisco, the board of supervisors who made this meeting place available, and the chamber of commerce and the other organizations that participated here in making the arrangements for this meeting.

We feel that it has been helpful to us.

Senator Sparkman, do you have any final words before we adjourn, prior to our meeting in Denver on Monday?

Senator SPARKMAN. I think I have nothing to add. I have throughout the day expressed my good feelings with reference to the meeting and the fine cooperation that we have had. I think it has been a fine thing.

Senator KNOWLAND. And to the radio, press, television, San Francisco and the bay area, I also wish to extend our appreciation for their long devotion to duty here in covering this rather extensive hearing.

We have some statements which have been filed for the record.

(The statements referred to are as follows:)

STATEMENT OF MRS. KAYA APAYDIN, HOUSEWIFE, OAKLAND, CALIF.—MEMBER, AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASSOCIATION, PARENT TEACHERS ASSOCIATION, UNITED WORLD FEDERALISTS, MENTAL HEALTH SOCIETY OF NORTH CALIFORNIA, AMERICAN LEGION AUXILIARY

I am speaking as an individual. As an average American citizen. I am in favor of reviewing the United Nations Charter. I believe that the United Nations is helping to solve many of the problems of the world and that it is time to give it more recognition and more strength.

Ten years ago we turned toward the idea of a United Nations because we were suffering from the real tragedy of war. The response of the average American was favorable, but it was emotional. The concept of a world government was something vague and intangible.

Now, 10 years later, we have seen the beginnings of this idea and we have seen that it has tangible effects.

It seems to me that now we can approach the charter more intelligently. We have found that there are areas of weakness, such as the veto, and the makeup of the Security Council, the problem of membership.

We need a review conference. We need to approach it, knowing that we must take into consideration the suggestions of many other nations in an atmosphere of working together for a common goal; not just to seek our own ends.

With this positive attitude we can show the world that we prefer to solve problems around a conference table, rather than by using arms.

STATEMENT OF MRS. DOROTHY ANDRUS, HOUSEWIFE, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

Because it describes so well my own feeling I would like to take the liberty of opening my plea for a strengthened United Nations by referring to President Eisenhower's "Chance for Peace" speech of April 1953. You may remember that in his reference to the accelerated arms race the President said the worst to be feared under such circumstances is atomic war. But what impressed me more was his next statement: "the best to be expected would be this: a life of perpetual fear and tension; a burden of arms draining the wealth and labor of all peoples, a wasting of strength that defies the American system or the Soviet system or any system to achieve true abundance and happiness for the peoples of this earth."

In my opinion this inspiring speech which was hailed throughout the world placed squarely before us the problem of devising an effective plan for disarmament and I believe it is desirable to emphasize that this country should take the lead in evolving such a plan.

The President has demonstrated his continuing concern with this matter by creating a new position of Special White House Assistant for Disarmament carrying Cabinet rank. This latter can be the first step in the formulation by our Government of a blueprint for a truly disarmed world.

However, it is discouraging to note that according to reports of recent United Nations disarmament conferences the nations are evidently again talking in terms of partial and possibly even unenforceable disarmament which has been tried before and has failed. Fears, distrusts, and jealousies cannot be lessened by the establishment of quotas on a permanent basis—nor is there any reason to expect that disarmament by gentlemen's agreement will be any more successful in the future than it has been in the past.

I, for one, feel strongly that we need disarmament on a worldwide basis, accomplished by degrees and under strict safeguards, and culminating in total disarmament enforced by law. I believe this program could best be accomplished through the United Nations. It must be recognized that the U. N. as presently constituted cannot perform this difficult task. However, I feel that the United States should take the lead in proposing amendments to the charter which would make it possible, at the same time exercising extreme caution that only those

powers absolutely necessary be granted, and taking every precaution to guarantee each nation complete control over its own domestic affairs in all fields except the single one having to do with the making and possessing of armaments.

The difficulty of disarming the world should not be minimized; but it can and must be done; and I submit that at its hardest it will be easier and infinitely more rewarding than the restoration of civilization after another world war—should such restoration be possible.

STATEMENT OF G. LAFAYETTE BRYANT, SACRAMENTO, CALIF.

The following statement contains my views for presentation in San Francisco on April 9, 1955, at the subcommittee hearings on foreign relations of the United States Senate concerning the review of the United Nations Charter.

First, this subcommittee is not getting the grassroot opinions of the American people regarding the proposed revisions of the United Nations Charter. How many people in the bay area know that these important United States Senate hearings are being held in San Francisco the day before Easter? One-hundredth of 1 percent would be a high estimate. The average American is completely uninformed and greatly misinformed. In this condition is our great hazard and peril.

The proposed revisions of the U. N. Charter pose great dangers to our national sovereignty because of past and future amendments drafted by our executive departments and confirmed by decisions by our Supreme Court.

The plan of the world government proponents is to amend the U. N. Charter into a world-ruling document through the "treatymaking power" under the Constitution of the United States. How? Under article 6, which states, in part: "* * * and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the *supreme law of the land*: * * *, anything in the Constitution or *laws of any State* to the contrary notwithstanding." [Emphasis added.]

The United States is a country of laws. We must restrict the power of treaties through law. Approximately 2 years ago, the NATO Status of Forces Treaty was adopted, which allows Americans to be tried in foreign countries without the protection of the Constitution of the United States. Do the American people understand the implications of this NATO Treaty? No.

The first safeguard needed to protect our Nation is the passage of the Bricker constitutional amendment to restrict treatymaking powers and executive agreements.

The very important treaties with Turkey and Greece were passed with only three Senators present and voting. In the case of executive agreements, we do not have that slight protection. The President, or one of his aides, writes a letter, the President signs it, and we have another law.

Another choice we have to immunize us from the greatest subversive plot in the history of our country is to sever diplomatic relations with Russia and her satellites.

How can we afford to ignore the valuable testimony and warnings of our many great generals in the Armed Forces who willingly testified before congressional committees, under oath, as soon as they were "out of wraps," when they might have remained silent, and advocated severing diplomatic relations with the Communist-controlled countries, or to withdraw from the United Nations?

I hope this subcommittee will read and heed the testimony of these great patriotic Americans, instead of being influenced by the statements uttered by one-worlders, do-gooders, and internationalists who would sell America down the river for a mess of pottage in the interest of "peace at any price."

In the fall of 1954, Gen. Mark W. Clark testified, under oath: "* * * I have not had much respect for the United Nations. * * * I believe to permit the Soviet Union to have its large number of spies and saboteurs over here spawning in our country is wrong. * * *". He further stated that the U. N. is a great asset to the Communists and a great detriment to us.

Dr. Marek Stanislaw Korowicz, Polish diplomat who fled for his life from the Communist Polish U. N. delegation, testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee in September 1953 that the U. N. Organization offers a parliamentary platform to the Soviet politicians, and from this platform they may preach to the populations of the entire world and carry on their subversive propaganda.

How can the United States continue to recognize a government that openly seeks to overthrow and destroy it? The United States should take the lead in this moral cause and act of self-defense in severing diplomatic relations with Russia and her satellites. This step would lend encouragement to other free countries and help to prevent the encroachment by Communist agents in their attempt to enslave and conquer the world. By this action, we can help stop the flow of money to the many Soviet consulates and agencies in various countries which are the centers of subversion and espionage. (See subcommittee reports of the Internal Security Act, Interlocking Subversion in Government Departments and task force reports, Strategy and Tactics of World Communism.)

The American people have been duped. Let us confess it. We have been sold a bill of goods.

I need not go into minute detail, analyzing each chapter and article of the United Nations Charter, to suggest to this subcommittee that all available evidence indicates the U. N. Charter was conceived in Moscow and that its chief architect was the convicted perjurer, Alger Hiss.

I recommend to this subcommittee a resolution similar in text to the Senate Resolution 247, introduced last year by Senator William Jenner and the late Senator Pat McCarran, that the Government of the United States should sever diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia and with the alleged governments of the countries which have been enslaved by the alleged government of Soviet Russia.

Let us keep the United States "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Thank you.

STATEMENT BY E. D. OSGOOD, SAN FRANCISCO

The chance provided the United States to make recommendations relative to possible changes in the United Nations Charter next year presents this country with a great opportunity. In fact, it is the greatest opportunity provided us since the formation of the United Nations in San Francisco some 9 years ago, when the United States put its weight behind the noble purposes of the United Nations.

Our first consideration should be to maintain and improve to the best of our ability that body of sovereign nations toward the end that it may better serve mankind. We here all realize that the U. N. has accomplished great good in many areas, and it would indeed be a tragedy for it to be weakened or bypassed. The necessity for an enforceable code of international law was again forcibly brought to our attention during the Nuremberg trials of the last world war, and, as many other witnesses have said before me, the development of international law is becoming more and more imperative in this present atomic age. International law can best be accomplished through careful, intelligent revision of the U. N. Charter. Criticism of the United Nations has occurred because in many instances the people felt that the United Nations was more than a league of sovereign states, and accordingly could guarantee peace, or accomplish in the international field what the United States Federal Government can accomplish in our domestic affairs. But this is like giving a man's job to a boy, and a boy just can't do it. But as a boy grows up and is able to handle a man's job, so will the United Nations if properly supported and revised to include legislative, judicial, and executive powers limited to prevent war, be able to keep the peace with adequate police forces.

That great difficulties obscure and make hard the accomplishment of this is known to us all. Russia will certainly oppose it and other progressive charter changes, because the United States will not make proposals without complete assurance of adequate safeguards such as inspections and other checks and balances. But the challenge being what it is today with atomic wars in the offing the challenge and response which according to historian Arnold Toynbee is the final arbiter of the success or failure of civilization will provide us the courage and determination to succeed.

So let us make a cornerstone of our foreign policy that we positively stand for the U. N. and such measures as will strengthen it into a body, not of completely sovereign states, but of participating members able to prevent aggression by police action if necessary. Then watch the nations of the world respond to this type of leadership as against the hollow promises of International Communism. The appointment of Henry Cabot Lodge to cabinet rank in what is in effect a Secretary of Peace was a master stroke by our greatest president since Abraham Lincoln, Dwight Eisenhower. The people of the world as well as the people of United States are crying, not for peace at any price, but for peace arrived at

through justice and order, and this, our greatest desire can be only accomplished through an international organization given the power the U. N. should be given in charter review to perform: Its avowed aims and purposes.

STATEMENT OF TOTTON HEFFELFINGER

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, your witness is Totton Heffelfinger. I reside at 2400 Steiner Street, San Francisco, Calif. I am an attorney.

I come before you as an individual, taking advantage of an unusual opportunity for the layman to be heard on a matter in which every one of us has a stake. I have developed some thoughts on the subject of United Nations Charter review and I hope that I can successfully share these with you in the time and space allotted.

I hope that this Committee has found, in the course of its study, that responsible American opinion does not support the extremist views which are all too loud and all too often in matters of the United Nations. It seems to me too plain for comment that in 1955 we do not want a charter review conference, which will be turned into a sewing circle on world government. Further than this, I do not believe that a conference of this type can make much headway with the subject of disarmament, unless some prior agreement has been achieved by the big powers. On the other hand, let us not advocate the withdrawal of our support from the United Nations because, for example, the Administrative Tribunal has awarded damages to discharged employees of The International Staff. Let us recognize that an effective international organization must render some decisions which are unpopular in this country.

Between the extreme views, there exists, in my opinion, a body of tangible U. N. problems which could be the subject of productive discussion at a charter review conference, and the solution of these would constitute more solid progress than the mere crossing of t's and dotting of i's in the charter. It is well to remember that article 109 of the charter provides that charter revision recommendations may be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the conference, although they do not take effect until ratified by two-thirds of the members including all of the permanent members. As a practical matter, therefore, the recommendations adopted by such a conference might not be ratified for many years. And yet if reasonable revisions were adopted by the conference, it would place the Soviet Union in the position of having to ratify, or to reject, what had been ratified by the other members. In addition, a charter review conference might provide a desirable form for the solution of U. N. problems which lie outside of the framework of formal revision. I, therefore, submit that, when the question of a charter review conference comes up on the agenda of the General Assembly, the United Nations should be heard in favor thereof. I have chosen some points which I believe might be raised at such a conference. It does not purport to be an exhaustive list, but I believe that the achievement of these points would strengthen the United Nations and improve the atmosphere for peaceful settlement of international problems.

First, although I do not believe that abolition of the veto in the Security Council is a realistic or even desirable subject of discussion at this time, I am of the opinion that abuse of the veto could be reduced in some ways. The double veto is not necessary to the preservation of any nation's sovereignty, and we should press for its elimination. Also, the promulgation of a nonexclusive list of subjects which would be deemed procedural and not subject to the veto would, to my mind, be desirable. A frequently cited example, and one which I feel should not be subject to the big-power unanimity rule, is the question of membership and its corollary, the matter of recognizing and seating the representatives of a government. Pacific settlement of disputes has been mentioned as an area wherein the veto might be eliminated, and I feel this would also be a desirable objective.

Another subject of possible charter review and amendment, in my view, would be to give to India a permanent seat on the Security Council. Recognizing that none of the present permanent members is likely to abdicate voluntarily for this purpose, I recommend that an additional permanent seat be created. It is not likely that India will consistently vote with the western position in the Security Council, but the prestige of the Security Council will be enhanced by extending permanent membership to a country with prestige among the Asians, whose vote will not be invariably aligned with either the Communist or the non-Communist world.

I do not believe that major revisions in the Security Council which go beyond those proposed above, can be realistically proposed, nor do I consider it to be within the best interests of this country to propose changes which have absolutely no possibility of success, thus opening the conference to unproductive diatribes of propaganda. The international organization is changing through a process of evolution. Perhaps the form of its effective action is shifting to the General Assembly in compliance with the pressures of necessity. No doubt these changes are inevitable in view of the attitude which has been adopted by the Communist world. It would not serve to attempt by revision to reverse or hasten these changes, if such an attempt were foredoomed to failure.

I would like to make a final point which may not directly relate to charter revision, but which certainly involves the prestige and effectiveness of the United Nations. Recently the multilateral technical assistance program undertaken by the U. N. has been criticized for its inefficiency and for the fact that the United States' contribution thereto is too heavy compared to the amounts contributed by other participants. There may be much merit in this criticism. On the other hand, I am convinced that technical assistance rendered under the auspices of the U. N. is a highly potent tool in the cause of peace. I, therefore, recommend that an effort be made during a reconsideration of United Nations matters to streamline the administration of multilateral assistance, and eliminate some of the objectionable features. It is not possible for a layman to make detailed recommendations on this complicated matter, but I feel that reforms could be devised which would eliminate some of the expense and inefficiency of multi-agency and multicountry coordination in this field.

I conclude by expressing the hope that this government will formulate, with the help of representative opinions expressed to this committee, a United States position which does not despair of improvement, but is aimed at patching up the somewhat battered machinery of international cooperation.

STATEMENT BY MRS. GEO. M. SIDENBERG, JR., SANTA BARBARA, CALIF.

I speak to you as an individual.

I am Mrs. George M. Sidenberg, Jr., of Santa Barbara, the wife of a former captain in the Naval Aviation Reserve who received the Legion of Merit, with Combat V, and two Air Medals. My husband's recent death has been directly attributed to the service he gave his country. I am also the mother of four children, including a son, an aviator, Regular Navy, and have three grandchildren. So you see that my interest in what this committee is doing is of very real concern.

We must concede that to date there is no adequate civil or military defense against the destructive force of nuclear weapons. And history has shown that world forums, regional alliances, treaties, and military strength have never brought security from war. We speak of disarmament, but disarmament unaccompanied by authorized and adequate enforcement and inspection has been proven both meaningless and dangerous in the past.

The League of Nations died because of unwillingness to give it the power it needed to arrest aggression and keep peace. Today the same negative thinking which contributed to the demise of the league is again in evidence—but this time relative to the United Nations.

Such negative thinking can, I believe, be placed in two categories—those who fear that any attempt to change the charter would disrupt the United Nations; and those who fear that additional authority for the United Nations would infringe on our national freedoms, and individual rights.

History, and present trends make it apparent that the survival of the United Nations, "our last best hope for peace," depends upon its capacity and ability to establish and maintain peace. The late Senator Taft called for "the principle of justice under law to be substituted for the U. N.'s method of peace keeping by expediency." But it is paramount that any proposals to strengthen the U. N. be such that no nation sincerely espousing a just and lasting peace could raise serious objections without arousing strongly unfavorable reactions from its own and other peoples throughout the world.

To be acceptable all such proposals should be definitely limited to the area of peacemaking and peacekeeping, and should include such safeguards as would make impossible any infringement on any nation's internal affairs or any established rights of its citizens, unless specifically related to the aforementioned area.

I, therefore, respectfully recommend that the United States support a United Nations conference to review the charter, and that if a conference is called consideration be given to such amendments as may be embodied in the following brief suggestions:

1. That the United Nations be delegated defined and limited legal authority adequate to control all atomic and conventional weapons; to establish progressive stages of disarmament for all nations, with the necessary machinery for enforcement and inspection.

2. That authority be delegated to the world court to settle disputes, and act on violations relative to the foregoing and within its limitations.

3. That a more equitable representation than the present one member per nation be established for the General Assembly.

As disarmament will only be practical if universal may I also suggest that any review of the charter include discussion of article 4, and ways and means to make it more effective.

May I point out, in closing, that an extended U. N. program of world reconstruction could be carried out with money saved by disarmament—a program which would not only counteract the spread of communism, and help remove the basic causes of war, but would also maintain our own country's high rate of production. With the threat of war removed, the U. N. could carry on much more effectively its work of solving other world problems in an atmosphere conducive to harmony. And last but not least, only when we are able to stop paying for wars—past, present, and future—will it be possible to reduce our present overwhelmingly high taxes. When this time comes I foresee an expanded economy, and a greater opportunity to meet human needs both here and abroad.

STATEMENT OF FELICIA G. BOCK, BERKELEY, CALIF.

THREE STEPS TOWARD WORLD SECURITY—A SUMMARY OF POSSIBLE CHANGES IN THE CHARTER OF THE U. N.

The Charter of the United Nations is a powerful instrument, dedicated to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war." Can the United Nations achieve this aim under the present wording of the charter? I think it cannot bring any guaranty of peace and security in this world unless the United Nations is empowered by the charter to bring about a program of disarmament and the placing of production of weapons of mass destruction under international control.

To accomplish this, I believe three changes in the charter would be desirable and would be the only means of bringing about the possibility of peace, freedom, and security for all peoples in this age of nuclear weapons, whose production has only served to increase fears, mistrust and tension.

The changes I would recommend are: first, an amendment regarding composition of the General Assembly. Article 9 of the present charter provides for an Assembly consisting of all of the member nations, with not more than 5 representatives for each. This puts small and large nations alike on an equal footing—a condition which could be ameliorated by changing the wording to allow for proportional representation, based on the population figures for each member nation.

The second amendment which I would like to see is one to enable the General Assembly, strengthened and enlarged as outlined above, to enforce a program of disarmament. Article 11 of the charter now provides that the General Assembly "may consider" principles of cooperation, including disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and "may make recommendations" concerning these principles to the members or to the Security Council. Is this enough to stop aggression? I think not. The General Assembly should be given the power to enact laws binding upon the member nations to carry out general disarmament, both in conventional and in nuclear weapons. While I realize the value of secret talks on disarmament by the great powers, thus far this type of negotiation has brought very little result, and all peoples of the world live under the threat of possible attack so long as individual nations have vast arms arsenals and the prerogative of deciding when or whether they will use them against an enemy. By putting the power of regulating and armaments in the hands of that larger body, the General Assembly, a greater force of world public opinion and sentiment against war may result in a concrete program of disarming na-

tions and allowing them only a minimum of armed forces within their boundaries to preserve domestic order.

And while the regulating and limiting of arms and armies to be maintained by each nation is progressing, we should hope for the establishment of a United Nations police force of sufficient size to be able to stop aggression anywhere in the world. The third recommendation I should like to make is an amendment to article 43 of the charter, which provides for member nations making "armed forces available" to the Security Council. If the General Assembly, again, would enact laws to levy quotas of troops from each member nation to be used in a large international army, stationed at bases throughout the world, it could be effective in preventing violation of the peace.

Finally, I believe that the United States of America should take a firm leadership in proposing the above charter changes.

STATEMENT BY ELMER BOOTH, ORINDA, CALIF.

In connection with your study of the future of the United States of America as affected by the United Nations Organization, I respectfully submit a statement of my opinions of this matter which is so vital to our welfare.

The No. 1 problem of our country today is survival.

The two great threats to our national existence are:

1. The Communist plot to destroy us and what remains of the free world to complete their objective of world domination.
2. The world government conspiracy to subvert our Republic and set up a supranational state.

We are overwhelmed with propaganda giving the alleged accomplishments of the United Nations, but let us examine the record.

In Korea we were engaged for 3 years in a costly war under the United Nations flag, presumably to stop the armed aggression, restore peace in that area and unite the Republic of Korea. The then Secretary of State declared that Korea was the test of the United Nations. A few small but heroic nations answered the call to arms in proportion to their responsibilities. We found ourselves taking the brunt of the fighting under a strange flag and being directed by an organization that comprised the instigator of the aggression, alleged allies who traded with the enemy, those who openly or secretly supported the aggressors, some who called themselves neutral, and many who did nothing except talk of the wonderful work the United Nations were doing in Korea. The few nations that honored their pledge and fought courageously were finally blackmailed by the United Nations into accepting a dishonorable truce. For us it was our first war without victory.

The United Nations Charter became another dishonored treaty, another scrap of paper. This was recognized throughout the world and particularly in the United Nations itself. Mrs. Pandit, at the time President of the U. N. General Assembly was reported as saying "The world today mocks the United Nations Charter * * *" (exhibit 1). We learned in Korea that there is no security for our country through the United Nations Organization.

The advocates of world government then intensified their propaganda stating the United Nations could not effectively function unless it was a world federal government, and they continuously conducted an insidious campaign in our schools, churches, international service clubs and throughout the nation to make this objective the fundamental purpose of the foreign policy of the United States (exhibits 2, 3, 4).

In the church they work for a violent world upheaval. They plan the destruction of patriotism, nationalism and the will to defend our country. The talk of chaos and confusion (exhibit 5). Chaos and confusion probably would result in communism, and it is not clear whether or not these world government proponents are unconcerned if their movement ends in communism or if this is their objective.

Our chief delegate to the United Nations states that "it is not a world government" but "it's a device, a contrivance, an instrumentality." Those who direct this plot to destroy our country recognize the United Nations as "a device" presently in operation out of which, by charter revision, or by devious procedures they can create a supranational state. Methods for representation in this world state which I have seen, give little protection to our country or the ideals on which it was founded. The Communists undoubtedly recognize a world gov-

ernment as "a device" through which they can obtain their objective of world conquest.

The United Nations Organization has been in operation for about 10 years. It has not maintained international peace and security, nor developed friendly relations among nations, nor promoted respect for human rights and freedoms, nor been a center for international harmony. We cannot place the security of this Nation with the U. N. Organization. Its world government threat is always a danger to our survival.

In support of this letter, I submit the following:

1. Copy of news item November 12, 1953, reporting speech of Mrs. Pandit.
2. The Policy of United World Federalists, Inc., June 1953.
3. Poster regarding meeting in a Lafayette, Calif., public school sponsored by United World Federalists.
4. Leaflet, Social Action in Your Church, published by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Churches.
5. Pamphlet, The Christian Faith and World Upheaval, by same Council for Social Action.

In accordance with your request, I forward 15 copies of this statement, but only one copy, each, of the exhibits listed.

[Oakland Tribune, November 12, 1953]

MME. PANDIT RECALLS TEARS OF JOY FOR U. N. CHARTER

NEW YORK, November 12, (A. P.)—The world today mocks the United Nations Charter, over which people once shed tears of joy, says Mrs. Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit.

Mrs. Pandit, current president of the U. N. General Assembly, was the Armistice Day speaker before a women's luncheon group.

"Men and women get together and create as a sop to their conscience a mass of words," she said. "One such mass of words is the Charter of the United Nations."

The Indian leader said she wept when she first read the charter's eloquent words.

"We don't cry at the charter any more, we laugh at it," she said sadly. It has been interpreted, misinterpreted and explained.

"It is the one thing all of us can hide behind when we do not want to fulfill our obligations—and that is not the way to peace."

She said, too, that India wants the right to remain neutral in the East-West conflict and live her own life.

(Additional exhibits submitted by Mr. Booth are on file with the committee.)

STATEMENT OF MRS. BETTY WINTER, SECRETARY, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA PEACE COUNCIL

The wide response to the invitation of this subcommittee shows the concern for peace which the people of the bay area share with the rest of the world.

The United Nations is an organ for peace. Can it be strengthened as an organ for peace by revising the charter?

I would like to call attention to the words of Osten Unden, Sweden's Foreign Affairs Minister, at the Eighth Session of the General Assembly. He said:

"The prospects for a lasting peace depend on the international policies pursued by the States, particularly the great powers, and not on the drawing up of perfect provisions in the Charter of the United Nations."

The growing debate on charter revision should not obscure the central issue of these times. President Eisenhower has said "* * * if this is not to be an age of atomic hysteria and horror, we must make it an age of international understanding and cooperative peace."

How is "cooperative peace" to be achieved?

Can it be achieved by reorganizing the United Nations "without the Communist nations in it" as Herbert Hoover proposes?

Can it be achieved by refusing to consider the admission of the People's Republic of China, thereby denying representation to some 600 million Asian people?

We think not.

If there is to be cooperative peace, there must be agreement mutually arrived at through negotiations among the sovereign nations without regard to their political systems.

General disarmament, with the prohibition of nuclear weapons, cannot be argued from behind the barriers of military blocs and alliances.

The peoples of the world ardently desire an "age of international understanding and cooperative peace," of peaceful negotiations, such as are now taking place in London where the U. N. Disarmament Commission is meeting. After a long lapse of time, Britain, France, Canada, the Soviet Union and the United States are again discussing the reduction of conventional and atomic weapons.

In August world scientists will meet, under the auspices of the United Nations, to discuss means of developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

These are steps to peace that all peoples welcome.

Agreements on disarmament and other great issues can be reached through the agency of the United Nations, supplemented by conferences of the major powers, as recently suggested by Senator George of this committee.

The Charter of the United Nations should not be amended. It should be used as a pillar to help construct a peaceful world.

STATEMENT BY LEMUEL H. MATTHEWS, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Preliminarily, I feel that the American people as a whole should be deeply grateful to the chairman and members of this subcommittee for giving so unselfishly of their time and effort in conducting these hearings to enable Americans, in all walks of life, to express their views to you directly concerning a matter of such vital importance as the future of the United Nations and participation of the United States in that organization.

The views which I am presenting herein are my personal opinions as a citizen of the United States. They are based to a certain extent, on my experience for approximately 1 year in Vienna as a member of the United States Allied Commission for Austria at which time I personally experienced the disillusionment and frustration of attempting to negotiate directly with representatives of the Soviet Union. As a result, I can well appreciate the tremendous difficulties which have confronted the representatives of the United States and other nations of the free world in attempting to carry out the basic purposes of the United Nations as set forth in Article I of the charter.

In Vienna in 1945, we quickly learned of the emptiness of a Russian commitment, of the impossibility of enforcing a Russian promise, of the futility of appealing to Russian good faith, and of the Russian duplicity which underlay their every move. But it was not until considerable time had elapsed that all of us came to one inescapable conclusion, namely: putting the Soviets in the spotlight of publicity and challenging them in the open concerning their conduct and motives was far and away the most effective method of getting results with representatives of the Soviet Union.

If for no other reason, I feel that this point alone requires our continued active participation in the United Nations and that United States policy continue to support the United Nations in every possible way.

The entire United Nations concept was predicated on the assumption that the so-called big nations holding permanent membership in the Security Council, would work sincerely together to establish peace in the world. The activities of the Soviet Union and Communist bloc have shown this assumption to be unfounded, and we would be unrealistic not to recognize that the United Nations has not lived up to our high hopes at the time it was created here in San Francisco.

All too many people think only of United Nations failures and forget its accomplishments. We must remember that United Nations pressure resulted in Russian withdrawal from Iran; United Nations direct participation resulted in settlement of the very dangerous crises in Greece, Palestine, Kashmir and Indonesia, and the United Nations has made wonderful accomplishments through technical assistance and the specialized agencies.

These accomplishments are all the more remarkable because they have been made despite Communist opposition and general mistrust and suspicion within the United Nations. Keeping this in mind, it is my feeling that it is inadvisable to take any action toward charter revision in the immediate future. If and when the time arrives that we can rely on the good faith and honor of all of the other

member nations of the United Nations, then will be time enough to consider revision of the United Nations Charter.

There is a small but articulate minority in our country, many of whom have appeared before you, which violently opposes our future participation in the United Nations. I have no doubt that these individuals are for the most part, completely sincere in their feelings. But I do feel that much of their opposition is based upon ignorance. In San Francisco, the most frequent accusation levelled against the United Nations is that it threatens our Constitution, it threatens our sovereignty and that it is merely a steppingstone toward a supraworld government. I do not see how anyone, in good faith, can urge these untenable accusations if he has ever read the Charter of the United Nations and if he is aware of the fact that the United Nations is a treaty. Any nation can withdraw at any time: no nation is committed or obligated in any way except one, namely: all members have committed themselves not to use force against the territorial integrity of another nation.

In other words, in joining the United Nations we have sacrificed our sovereignty in 1, and only 1 respect: we have agreed not to engage in aggression by force. Can any loyal American sincerely contend that this is a threat to our sovereignty, that this is a step toward a supraworld government?

Under the charter of the United Nations as it now stands the sovereignty and independence of every member nation is explicitly recognized. These critics of the United Nations seem to forget that any amendment of the charter or change in the United Nations structure which might tend to limit our independence or curtail our sovereignty must be approved by the Senate of the United States. Are these critics fearful that our Senate will turn the Government of the United States over to some new world government?

Those urging our withdrawal from the United Nations offer no alternative; the result will be flat division of the world into two armed camps. Our Government admittedly knows very little of what goes on behind the Iron Curtain, and the United Nations provides a window in that Curtain. For the United States to close that window by withdrawing from the United Nations unquestionably would aid the Communists in accomplishing future aggression and would be against the best interest of our Nation.

We already have had ample evidence in the United Nations of the advantages that can be obtained in favor of the nations of the free world by challenge of the Russians to refute their false propaganda. One of the outstanding examples was our challenge of their ridiculous libel that we were using germ warfare in Korea, and our demand that an impartial United Nations Commission be appointed to go into Communist China and North Korea to investigate the charges. When they refused to permit such investigation they tacitly admitted to the entire world that their charges were without foundation and falsehoods.

The forum of the United Nations is the only place in the world where we can meet the Communists face to face; where we can controvert their false propaganda with truth; where over 50 free nations can focus the spotlight of publicity on the Soviet and its half-dozen satellites, and where over 50 nations can present a united front against Soviet aggression.

In conclusion, with reference to charter revision I urge that our immediate policy be to let well enough alone, and take no action toward charter revision at this time. With reference to United States participation in the United Nations I pray that our Government will continue to actively support and participate in the United Nations, both from the standpoint of serving the best interests of the United States and as the only avenue remaining toward establishing international security and ultimate peace in the world.

(A pamphlet entitled "Suppose an H-Bomb Dropped" was filed by Mr. Jules Charbneau, Western States Atomic Vaults, Inc.)

Senator KNOWLAND. The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 6:40 p. m., the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 10 a. m., Monday, April 11, 1955, at Denver, Colo.)