

by ALEXANDER UHL

REVIEW

Uhl, Alexander
The assault...
ADY 1750

364 199

THE
ASSAULT
on the
UN



PUBLIC AFFAIRS INSTITUTE

312 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, S.E. • WASHINGTON 3, D. C.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/assaultonun00uhla>

**THE
ASSAULT
on the
UN**

by **ALEXANDER UHL**

PUBLIC AFFAIRS INSTITUTE

312 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, S.E. • WASHINGTON 3, D. C.

COPYRIGHT 1953

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE NO.
Foreword	iii
The United States and the United Nations	1
The "Hate" Groups	2
More Moderate Critics of the UN	7
UN Agencies and Conventions Under Attack	10
The Bricker Amendment	20
The Bricker Amendment as an Anti-UN Instrument	25
The Assault in Congress	28
Legislation	28
The Congressional Record	30
Conclusions	31
Bibliography	33

FOREWORD

With the number of charges that have been levelled at the United Nations mounting, the Public Affairs Institute has been urged to examine their source and to describe them in an objective, factual manner. We concluded after a brief preliminary examination that this would serve the public interest. Accordingly, Alexander Uhl of the PAI staff was assigned the reportorial task. Mr. Uhl worked for many years in the international field as a foreign correspondent for leading American newspapers and press services. As a newspaperman he covered the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945 and has since followed UN activities closely. His experience equips him admirably for the task.

The United Nations holds the hope and fate of mankind for a peaceful and stable world. That it is presently unable to perform as efficiently as its critics believe it should, testifies largely to the frailties that beset so many people and their institutions. But this should not detract from the remarkable achievements that it already has accomplished in the field of collective security in many parts of the world. Nor should it destroy the validity of the purposes and the urgency of the need for an international body where the common settlement of international problems can be effected without wars or the use of coercion. If its detractors should succeed in destroying the present United Nations, the very necessity of international cooperation in an atomic world would force the establishment of yet another United Nations.

Believing this, the study made here seeks to present the views of the UN's leading critics in the United States in an entirely impersonal manner, hoping thereby to reach constructive ends that can strengthen the UN in its legitimate and necessary work. Simply to present to the reader the essential facts in the assault on the UN will, in our opinion, serve this purpose.

The Public Affairs Institute is a nonpartisan, nonprofit research organization seeking to promote wider public knowledge and appreciation of current problems. In choosing a competent person to conduct this research, making available the facilities of the Institute to aid in the research, and finally in publishing its findings, the Institute has discharged its obligation. It does not take responsibility for the individual facts or findings, believing that the true spirit of independent research is best found in enabling the author to derive his own conclusions from the assembled data.

DEWEY ANDERSON
Executive Director.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The great majority of Americans believe in the United Nations. Public opinion polls attest to this fact overwhelmingly. President Eisenhower and his State Department, no less than former President Truman and his State Department, have publicly reaffirmed the faith of the American government in the UN and have denounced the isolationist "go-it-alone" viewpoint as dangerous to American security. Educational, professional, scientific, labor, religious, and social service organizations throughout the country have repeatedly shown their support for the concept of international cooperation.

Yet eight years after the American people welcomed with enthusiasm American participation in this new international effort to establish world peace and order, the UN has come under a combination of open attacks and indirect efforts to restrict its influence which may seriously undermine American participation in its work.

Exaggerated nationalism, hatred of the foreigner, fears that the UN may be used to "impose" domestic legislation on the United States contrary to the "American way of life," the cry of States' Rights, suspicion of "do-gooders," and disappointment with the UN's record in Korea are all elements in a campaign which in one degree or another would alienate the American people from international cooperation and set them back on the road to isolationism.

Many of the forces which accepted the United Nations unwillingly or, at best, grudgingly, have little by little returned to the fray. Others genuinely disillusioned by what they feel are UN failures in Korea and elsewhere have become their allies. Allied also with them are many who see the UN and its specialized agencies, in particular the Social and Economic Council, as suspicious international counterparts at the very best of the New and Fair Deals and, at the worst, communism.

Only recently the Senate's most influential figure, Majority Leader Senator Robert A. Taft, openly disparaged the effectiveness of the United Nations in the Korean conflict, although being careful to say that the UN might be good for some purposes. In an address, the Republican leader who was General Eisenhower's chief rival for the Presidential nomination, declared that "we might as well forget the United Nations as far as the Korean war is concerned." He was supported, among others, by his fellow Ohioan, Senator John W. Bricker, who said that there were many members of Congress who felt that the United Nations had failed in the Korean controversy.

Although President Eisenhower quickly repudiated the Taft view-

point, the Senator's statement left little doubt that there are still powerful forces in Congress that would just as leave "go it alone" as continue in a world organization that does not come up to their expectations.

This combined assault on the United Nations must be met head-on in the United States if efforts to increase international cooperation are to succeed. An analysis of the groups and organizations which oppose or have been critical of the UN and the reasons for their attitude follows.

It would be factually inaccurate to say that all organizations and individuals who have been critical of the UN or of the work of its specialized agencies are necessarily opposed to the concept of an international organization of sovereign nations devoted to the cause of world peace. Many of them, in fact, deny taking an anti-UN position. It is clear, however, that most of them fear the development of the United Nations into a "world government" which would threaten a very rigid concept of American political sovereignty or fear that the UN's work in areas of social and economic reform may influence or intrude on American domestic legislation.

The combined assaults of extremists who are unbridled in their hatred of the UN and those who, while supporting the broad UN idea, have shown suspicion of some of its activities have been of deep concern to organizations specifically organized to promote understanding and acceptance of United Nations' ideals such as the American Association for the United Nations and the United States Committee for United Nations Day, as well as to organizations and individuals which, in a more general way, support efforts to bring world groups together on the basis of human brotherhood.

The struggle now in progress over the interlocking relations between the United States and the United Nations ranges from an open campaign to get the United States out of the UN to efforts to bar by constitutional amendment treaties or agreements which might impinge on American domestic legislation, thus limiting the power of the Executive in many areas of international cooperation.

What stage has this struggle now reached? What are the forces involved? What do they fear and what do they want?

THE "HATE" GROUPS

"Know-nothingism," characterized by "native" Americanism and anteforeignism, has always been more or less powerful in American

political life. It played an important part in the politics of the Nineteenth Century and in the isolationist movement before American entry into World War II. It has been revived in varying degrees in today's fight against the United Nations by "hate" groups which seek fanatically – and frequently profitably – a "fundamentalist" America politically, economically and socially. Distortion, the use of the "big lie" technique, the stirring up of racial and religious prejudices, the vituperative denunciation of all who oppose them are among the weapons used by most of them.

Today's "hate" groups use anticommunism and anti-internationalism as their chief stock in trade. By equating the two, they hit two birds with one stone. The United Nations, as a symbol of internationalism, has become one of their chief targets. Yet, while fighting the United Nations in the name of "patriotism" and the Bill of Rights, their words and programs frequently appear to betray their fears that the rights guaranteed under the first Ten Amendments may actually be strengthened rather than weakened through international cooperation.

Leading groups in the "hate" campaign against the United Nations are:

The Christian Nationalist Crusade (Gerald L. K. Smith)

Smith has always opposed the United Nations in the name of "patriotism" and "Americanism." He appeared at San Francisco during the organization meeting of the UN and sought to block it then with no success. Since then he has redoubled his attacks through his paper, "The Cross and the Flag," recklessly impugning in the most violent terms the patriotism of those who oppose him. Some idea of his unrestrained method of attack can be gained from a speech he made in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1948. As quoted by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Smith told his hearers that "the press, radio and motion pictures were controlled primarily by 'jews and communists' and maintained that through the United Nations a cabal of 'Jewish Communists' were seeking to rule the world."

After a visit to the UN in New York City, Smith in December 1951 wrote:

"Based upon personal interviews, the perusal of literature, and a deep study of background activities, we are now preparing an indictment of the whole UN program. It is our belief that it is a conspiracy to effect treason. It is a plot to lift a flag over the Stars and Stripes. It is an international machine devised to destroy American sovereignty."

The American Flag Committee (W. Henry MacFarland, Jr.)

The American Flag Committee was organized in Philadelphia in 1950 for the purpose of taking "specific action against widespread efforts to expand the power of the United Nations." The Committee was formed after disbandment of the Nationalist Action League, also headed by MacFarland, which was designated as "fascist" by the Attorney General in 1949. MacFarland and Gerald L. K. Smith have worked together on frequent occasions.

In 1951 MacFarland published a notoriously distorted version of the principles of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) which has been used ever since to smear that organization and the UN. The report, originally published in MacFarland's Philadelphia "Newsletter" in October 1951, was inserted in the Congressional Record by former Rep. John T. Wood, Idaho Republican, and so gained wide publicity. Wood was author of a bill calling for withdrawal of the United States from the UN. The report later drew a stinging rebuke from Rep. A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri Democrat, who cited numerous examples of the juggling of phrases and complete fabrications.

As an example, Rep. Carnahan cited from the MacFarland report a statement that UNESCO pamphlets were teaching:

"The teacher is to begin by eliminating any and all words, phrases, descriptions, pictures, images, classroom material or teaching methods of a sort causing pupils to feel or express a particular love for, or loyalty to, the United States of America."

This, Rep. Carnahan told the House of Representatives, was a complete fabrication. The statement, nevertheless, still turns up as a genuine quotation from UNESCO pamphlets and forms the basis for attacks on UNESCO and the UN.

National Economic Council (Merwin K. Hart)

Hart's slogans are "free enterprise" and the "American way of life," which are used to denounce all those who disagree with his particular versions of those concepts. Hart is a violent opponent of the United Nations and American participation in its activities. Accusing the Truman Administration of catering to the Zionists in its policy toward Israel in 1948, Hart wrote in his "Economic Council Letter":

"And all this started with the United Nations. Instead, it becomes increasingly clear that these un-American elements were the real architects of UN and its mischievous alphabetical agencies. They are back of

the attempted socialization of American industry, of the illegal immigration of perhaps a million of European and Asiatic undesirables, of FEPC and other vicious bureaucratic controls.”

In January 1951, Hart also wrote:

“We in the ‘Economic Council’ have all along opposed the yielding by the United States of any of its sovereignty to the United Nations or any other organization. We have asserted time and again that alien influence and false propaganda have been responsible for our public officials, and especially our Senate, going through the motions of ratifying the United Nations Charter. We have felt that nothing but harm to the American people could possibly come from such preposterous action — that it was a tragic betrayal in the guise of a benefit.”

The Constitutional Educational League (Joseph P. Kamp)

Kamp is the “martyr” of the Nationalist movement in the United States. He served four months in jail in 1950 for contempt of Congress for refusing to reveal the sources of his income. Kamp’s newspaper “Headlines” specializes in attacks on the United Nations, internationalists, trade unions and Jews. He also publishes pamphlets with such startling titles as “We Must ABOLISH the United States,” a document that was supposed to reveal the “hidden facts behind the crusade for World Government.”

Some idea of his technique can be gained from his “Open Letter to Congress” in which he wrote:

“The power of the people, acting through their Congress, will stop the Jewish gestapo, the Smear Bund and the Smear Campaign which threaten our American institutions of society and government.”

These groups represent the more notorious section of the 20th Century “Know-Nothings” who feed on appeals to supernaturalism and complete social reaction, whipping up fears of a gigantic conspiracy to subvert the United States Government. While their appeal is mostly to the politically naive, “fundamentalist” elements in the population, a great deal of their financial support comes from reactionary business interests which prefer to keep their names out of the limelight.

There are also a number of secondary anti-UN groups which appeal to much the same audience as do the leading “hate” merchants. These include Conde McGinley, publisher of a small paper, “Common Sense.” In 1951, for example, McGinley wrote:

“The Jewish plan for world conquest and for ruling the entire world is now well under way. There is every likelihood that the future

'World Government' will be the organization presently known as the United Nations. Already the world has been divided into two concentrations of power — one controlled by the Jews of Moscow under the Jewish seal of Solomon (Five Pointed Star) and the other by American Jewry of Wall Street under the U.N.O. banner of pale blue and white, the same blue and white used for the Israeli flag."

This similarity of colors in the Israeli and UN flags is a recurring theme in anti-UN literature. Other opponents of the UN, on the other hand, have managed to find a suspicious resemblance between the UN flag and that of the Red Army!

Another source of anti-UN propaganda deserves special notice. This is the "Georgia Farmers' Market Bulletin," published under the direction of Tom Linder, Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture. What makes the Bulletin unusual in the anti-UN field is the fact that it is the official organ of the Georgia State Department of Agriculture and, as such, is mailed free to about 25,000 Georgians each week. In the midst of advertisements extolling the merits of second hand farm machinery and the official text of the Georgia Livestock Law, the Bulletin, for example, on February 27, 1952 published an article, "The United Nations is Treason" by Frank B. Ohlquist:

"The most diabolical scheme ever hatched by the INTERNATIONAL ROTHSCHILD BANKERS to obtain control of the entire world, the most crafty conspiracy ever created to destroy the sovereignty of the Republic of the United States," wrote Ohlquist, "is that corrupt, dishonest twin-headed monstrosity known as the United Nations Organization and the World Bank."

Other groups which have been active in fighting the United Nations and in particular the work of its specialized agencies — all using the superpatriotic line as their names frequently indicate — are the National Blue Star Mothers of America, the Minute Women of the U.S.A., the Liberty Belles (headed by Vivien Kellems of Connecticut), and the American Heritage Protective Committee of San Antonio, Texas. Texas, central Florida and southern California have been particularly prolific in producing various local groups which attack the UN. It is significant that these States are centers of powerful reactionary and racist groups.

Still others who have attacked different phases of UN work are Friends of the Public Schools, the National Council for American Education, Freedom Clubs, Keep America Committee, Pro-America, the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, and numerous

individuals who follow the lecture circuit or publish privately printed newsletters and pamphlets.

MORE MODERATE CRITICS OF THE UN

On a different level from these groups are a number of more moderate and conventional organizations which have shown a highly suspicious if not hostile attitude toward further American involvement in the United Nations mostly in the name of patriotism and conservatism. They fear UN encroachment on American sovereignty or its development into a "World Government." They fear that the UN will be used to "socialize" the United States, that the foundations of free enterprise will be undermined and property rights thus will be jeopardized. They look with suspicion on any activities of the UN having to do with social, economic or political reform fearing that foreign concepts of the social order may creep into American life through treaty acceptance of UN conventions or agreements.

The American League

Among the veterans' organizations, the American Legion has been critical of some phases of UN activities particularly in the military sphere. "The United Nations, as at present constituted and operating," said a 1952 Legion resolution, "is ineffective as an instrument for world peace, and until fundamental changes are made we must rely for OUR security upon our own strength and the cooperation of other free nations."

While the official position of the American Legion is in support of American participation in the UN, there are strong forces within it that would like to see American withdrawal. Donald Wilson, past National Commander, in a speech on March 21, 1953, declared that the United States should get out of the UN because its membership was hamstringing the nation in Korea.

"The United Nations is dead," he said. "Let us not continue to be afflicted by the decay. It was a fraud in its inception, a hypocrite in its operation; but for the fact that it first reddened Korean mountains with sacred American blood, it would have been a farce in its demise."

Wilson said that withdrawal from the UN would be a major step to end the country's "appeasement" of Russia.

The American Legion Magazine leaves no doubt that while it follows the official Legion position its attitude toward the UN is somewhat less than enthusiastic. In November 1952, for example, it pub-

lished an article, "United Nations, Boon or Boondoggle" and, while the writer begins with reasonable objectivity, he rapidly warms to his task and in effect concludes that "boondoggle" is the answer.

One thread running through the article is the contention, common in anti-UN literature, that the UN is heavily influenced if not dominated by the Soviet Union and communism in general. Thus the author reminds us that Alger Hiss was an American official at the birth of the UN in San Francisco in 1945, makes the flat charge that "Communist influence was dominant at San Francisco," and for good measure declares that discarded American "leftist politicians" have "found employment in the vast Bureaucracy" of the UN as a lameduck sanctuary.

The UN is pictured as a "little principality" over which the United States has no control and as a possible nest of spies and saboteurs "who use the UN as a base of operations."

His conclusion?

"Many people profess to believe that the UN is the world's best hope for peace. Unless and until the organization shows considerable improvement, that hope is indeed a slim one; and the vast majority of Americans will prefer to depend for the peace of the world upon an America so powerfully armed that the strongest aggressor will not dare to challenge her."

Three months later in February 1953, the American Legion Magazine published a virulent attack on the United World Federalists and at the same time again indicated an anti-UN bias. In an article, "Now Hear This!", a number of American lecturers and lecture bureaus who do not appear to accept fully the writer's concepts of "traditional Americanism" are smeared, either directly or indirectly, as being pro-Communist. UN supporters who are also professional lecturers are slapped by the author with the remark:

"Such orators, who never uttered a harsh word against the Soviet Union, were usually 'on the house' of some such powerful outfit as the Urban League or the United Nations Association."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has expressed disagreement with those who would take the United States out of the UN. At its 1951 annual Encampment the VFW specifically gave endorsement to "the fundamental theories of the United Nations Organization." At the same time the VFW was sharply critical of UNESCO, declaring that

UNESCO was advocating a study program designed to capture the minds of American children "for the cause of political world government." The VFW also is supporting efforts to amend the Constitution so as to prevent possible UN conventions from becoming American domestic law through the present treaty process.

The DAR

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has long shown hostility to further American participation in international world organization and has expressed fears that the UN may grow into a World Government. While the Daughters have not gone as far as to demand American withdrawal from the UN, they have hit out sharply at the activities of some of the UN specialized agencies. A leading speaker at the DAR's 1952 Continental Congress at Washington, D. C., for example, called the proposed UN Declaration on Human Rights a "blueprint for communism."

In its 1953 resolutions the DAR declared that "some of the agencies of the United Nations have initiated courses of action which threaten the Constitution of the United States and conflict with Federal and State laws." The Daughters reiterated opposition to the Genocide Convention, the Covenant on Human Rights "and all other United Nations agencies or treaties which would have the effect of superseding our Constitution or limiting our national and state liberties or freedoms." They further declared that no funds or personnel should be supplied to the UN without "first securing the approval of Congress," and that "the United Nations and all its affiliated agencies be taken out of the jurisdiction of the Department of State and made responsible to the Congress of the United States."

Spokeswomen for the DAR have been less than complimentary to those who seek further American participation in an international world order. The President-General, Mrs. James B. Patton, in 1952 called supporters of world government "unthinking humanitarians," "impractical idealists" and others whose motives were "less than honorable." She spoke of the "pleasing surface appeal" of their arguments and concluded that they were "jeopardizing our national sovereignty." Among policies which she feared might be forced upon the United States through the UN were tariff reductions, the lifting of immigration barriers, and the weakening of the free enterprise system.

Her conclusion was that "the greatest threat to American sovereignty is presented by those who seek a gradual approach to world government through the United Nations."

The Sons of the American Revolution

The National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, greatly more daring than the DAR, came out flatly for American withdrawal from the UN at its 1951 Annual Congress in San Francisco. The Sons declared that the UN had become a "sinister organization, seeking to control the economic conditions of the world"; that the UN was "usurping and will eventually usurp the vested rights and privileges of American citizenship"; that the entry of the American government into the UN had "forced upon the American citizen heavy confiscatory taxes"; that the UN "under power delegated to it by our National Congress actually changes international law affecting the individual rights of the American people"; and that the UN's actions "have been without asking for Divine Guidance and its sessions are opened without prayer to Almighty God to guide the membership in its deliberations and its acts and its deeds."

The Sons of the American Revolution, as do the Daughters, also want a constitutional amendment that would prevent enactment of treaties that would change or delimit "the Constitution or any part thereof, or the Constitutions or laws of the several States."

UN AGENCIES AND CONVENTIONS UNDER ATTACK

While the United Nations in general has come under attack, heaviest fire has been directed on a number of UN agencies and international conventions which touch on different social and economic areas of American life. Here the basic fear expressed is that social and economic measures which various groups in the United States have long fought on the domestic level, by some trickery or lack of alertness on the part of the President and the Senate, may be imposed upon the American people through "treaty legislation." The fear is that such treaties would be ratified by the Senate and thus become the supreme law of the land under Article VI of the Constitution.

Here are the most important of the UN agencies and conventions which have been denounced:

The International Labor Organization

American business interests, represented in large part by the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce, have strongly opposed the activities of the International Labor Organization, originally set up by the old League of Nations, but now an agency of the UN. These groups as well as employer repre-

representatives at International Labor Conferences who are appointed by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce express the fear that the ILO is seeking to set up international labor, economic and social standards which should be a matter of purely domestic concern to the United States. ILO conventions agreed upon at these conferences are looked upon as "socialistic" in philosophy and as threatening the free enterprise system in the United States. Employer representatives have been severely critical of the positions taken by American labor and public representatives at conferences in the past and the conventions that came out of them.

An example of this criticism is contained in testimony presented in 1952 before a Senate Committee by W. L. McGrath, member of the employer delegation to the ILO. Mr. McGrath discussed a number of ILO conventions which he felt were not proper subjects for agreements which might through treaties become American law. He listed such conventions as those dealing with safety provisions in the building industry; the gathering of statistics on wages and hours; government regulation of written contracts of employment of indigenous workers; regulation of night work of women and children in industry; government regulation of free employment agencies, which he said "was designed by the ILO Socialist majority in the hope that it would lead to the outlawing of private employment agencies"; minimum standards of social security which he said proposed "practically every type of social security of which human imagination can conceive, including socialized medicine and a provision for a 5-percent increase in family income for every child born after the first."

"If a man is sick, or laid off, or grows old, or cuts his little finger, or his wife has a baby — or even if he has what is called a morbid condition — he gets money from the Government," Mr. McGrath said.

"The ILO," he contended, "has apparently abandoned the concept of the treaty as an instrument dealing with international affairs. It seeks, instead, to inject the principle of internationalism into domestic legislation and to destroy the principle of local self-government."

Mr. McGrath, discussing an ILO draft convention on the rights of individuals to join a labor union, told how the American employer delegate wanted also to guarantee the "right not to join" a union.

"We didn't challenge the right to bargain collectively," he said. "That is a recognized right. But, on the other hand, in America a man might want to bargain individually. He might not want to bargain collectively. We felt that right should be maintained." The American labor and public delegates did not agree with him.

The ILO also has come under heavy fire from the American Medical Association which fears that compulsory health insurance, which it has fought so bitterly in the United States as representing "socialized medicine," may creep into the country by means of the ILO "Social Security Minimum Standards Convention." This Convention was supported by the American labor and government delegates but was opposed by the employer delegate. During 1952 the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association by resolution strongly opposed what it called the attempt of the ILO to "socialize medicine."

The AMA in particular objected to a section of the Social Security Convention which provides for minimum medical standards including a general practitioner's care in case of illness, specialists' care at hospitals, free medicines, hospitalization where necessary, and maternity care. All these were looked upon as interfering with free enterprise medicine. In an article in the Journal of the American Medical Association, the AMA said that "the distortion of the treaty power by the ILO could place not only American medicine, but national freedom and the Constitution in jeopardy."

American labor delegates to the ILO have pointed out that all the ILO seeks to accomplish is to establish minimum standards in many countries which do not have the social and industrial legislation that already exists in the United States and some other highly developed industrial States. Many ILO conventions consequently have never been presented for ratification by the United States. Of 99 ILO conventions drawn up from its beginning through 1952, only six have been presented to the United States Senate and actually ratified. Five of these deal with maritime questions involving international agreements.

"The rights of the individual States certainly have nothing to fear from the ILO," George P. Delaney, International Representative of the American Federation of Labor told a Senate subcommittee. "It is the only major international organization whose charter at the present time recognizes the federal-state relationship existing in member states having a federal type of government. The ILO constitution specifically provides that the government of such nations shall itself decide whether a convention is 'appropriate under its constitutional system for federal action' or whether it is 'appropriate, in whole or in part, for action by the constituent states.'"

Rudolph Faupl, international representative of the AFL Machinists, told a Senate subcommittee in 1953 that business interests were using "outright distortion" in their attacks on ILO. He pointed out

that many of the ILO standards attacked by business representatives "as horrible socialist practices" in reality have already been established in the United States "through Federal or state legislation or collective bargaining or both, resulting in the highest standard of living in the world for the American worker."

Faupl denied that American labor delegates to ILO conferences "have gone on a rampage, bent on destroying all that is good in America and embracing all that is evil in the rest of the world." He declared that the ILO had worked for thirty years to improve the living standards of the world's working people and that to paint its efforts as "socialism" was simply distortion.

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

UNESCO, as has been previously noted, has been the object of particular abuse with strong indications that it has been singled out as a special target for wider attacks on the United Nations as a whole. In their more virulent forms these attacks also have been used as a weapon against the American public school system itself.

Writing in *McCall's* for October 1952 under the heading, "Save Our Schools!", John Bainbridge analyzed the violent attacks being made in many parts of the United States on the public school system and linked them with a parallel drive against the UN.

"These attacks," he said, "which are another facet of the program to destroy our freedom, are continuing. They have met with great success in Texas and Southern California. Last March high school students in Houston were barred from participating in the annual UN Essay Contest (sponsored by the American Association for the United Nations) because a group of anti-UN residents had complained. Until this year the Los Angeles public schools had been using an illustrated booklet entitled 'The E in UNESCO' which had been prepared by the school's own curriculum department. Bowing to exceedingly heavy 'irresponsible attacks', the superintendent last January ordered the booklet withdrawn from use. In addition, Los Angeles school children were prohibited this year from competing in the UN Essay Contest, and all films relating to the UN have been withdrawn from use in the Los Angeles schools."

The Liberty Belles, whose attacks on the UN have been mentioned previously, have distributed a folder urging parents to attend Parent-Teacher Association meetings with the following warning:

"PARENTS—Read Your Children's Textbooks!

"Check them for subversive and partisan propaganda. Demand to see the books and teaching materials used in the teaching of the SOCIAL STUDIES and the UNITED NATIONS in particular!

"REPORT YOUR FINDINGS TO THE LIBERTY BELLE OFFICE."

Suzanne Silvercruys Stevenson, National Chairman of the Minute Women, went even farther in a speech in 1952, declaring:

"For 20 years, the Communists have been at work in the schools and colleges. You would be amazed and shocked as I was if you read the UNESCO books which are published in Paris and distributed to our teachers. In these books are out-and-out Communist teachings; destroy nationalism, family interest, love of country. Remove the child from his parents as soon as possible because they 'infect'—that is the exact word used in the book—the child with nationalism."

Among groups which have been critical of UNESCO are the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars in a resolution adopted at its 1952 Encampment condemns the UNESCO study program on grounds that it seeks the "destruction of our public schools by indoctrinating teachers, and through the teachers, the children with the idea that their first loyalty is to a world government, and that they must think of themselves as world citizens . . ."

The Veterans demanded an investigation into UNESCO activities and asked for a "survey" of the United States Commission for UNESCO, the State Department UNESCO staff and the United States Office of Education, all of whom have commended the UNESCO programs.

A 1952 resolution of the DAR strongly opposed the use in public schools and public libraries of a series of booklets "Toward World Understanding" published by UNESCO. The resolution declared that the booklets propose "to educate the child to be a world citizen in preparation for world government."

Both the VFW and DAR resolutions are strongly reminiscent of the American Flag Committee report denounced by Representative Carnahan in the House of Representatives as distortions of UNESCO policies. This Flag Committee "report," in fact, has become a major propaganda weapon in the fight against UNESCO being presented in various newspapers and magazines as an authentic statement of what UNESCO is teaching and what it seeks to accomplish.

Attacks on UNESCO, many of them based on gross distortions, have become so frequent that the Committee on International Relations of the National Education Association, in its publication UNIT in 1952, took occasion to refute the most erroneous ideas of UNESCO that were then being spread. It pointed out that UNESCO does not advocate world government and that it cannot "in any way interfere with the essential domestic policies of any of the member countries."

The United States National Commission for UNESCO, an official American Government body, has protested against published distortions of the UNESCO program and has reiterated its support of UNESCO and its program "for the education of peoples to live as citizens of sovereign states in a community of all mankind, preserving the values of diverse cultures and the rights and responsibilities of national citizenship."

The charge, commonly made, that UNESCO is Communist inspired has brought flat denials based on easily ascertainable facts. Thus Walter H. C. Laves, chairman of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, pointed out in a talk in January 1953 that the Soviet Union had never joined UNESCO and that Poland and Hungary recently resigned from UNESCO charging that it was a "tool of American imperialism."

Basically it has been contended by a Los Angeles educator that the broad lines of the attack on UNESCO correspond to the fight of some organizations in the United States against "the whole concept of world cooperation and international understanding."

Among groups which have reaffirmed their support for UNESCO objectives in the face of these attacks are:

American Association for the United Nations; American Association of School Administrators; American Association of University Women; American Council on Education; American Federation of Labor; American Federation of Teachers; American Federation of Soroptomist Clubs; American Jewish Committee; Collegiate Council for the UN; Church Peace Union; Congress of Industrial Organizations; Department of Class Room Teachers; Cooperative League of the U.S.A.; General Department of United Church Women; General Federation of Women's Clubs; General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church; League of Women Voters; National Academy of Science; National Catholic Educational Association; National Catholic Welfare Conference; National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; National Education Association; National Federation of Busi-

ness and Professional Women's Clubs; National Social Welfare Assembly, and the United States National Students Association.

The Genocide Convention

The UN Genocide Convention makes it an international crime to attempt deliberately to exterminate a people because of their race, religion, national or ethnic origin. It is largely an outgrowth of world indignation at the deliberate attempt of Hitler to destroy the Jews and of a determination to prevent a repetition of such a crime in the future.

Criticism of the Genocide Convention in the United States stems from two main sources—those who fear that race riots or lynchings might be construed as genocide and so become international crimes rather than local offenses to be handled by local courts, and those who fear that an International Criminal Court might be established to extradite Americans charged with genocide to a foreign jurisdiction where they might be tried without the legal safeguards of the American Constitution and American law.

Frank E. Holman, Past President of the American Bar Association and a vociferous critic of UN conventions, has put it this way:

“Suppose there occurs again an unfortunate situation in some part of the country as actually occurred several years ago with the race riots in Detroit and some years ago occurred in New Orleans in connection with the Italians and as might have occurred during the last war in connection with the Japanese on the West Coast, and the city and State authorities attempting honestly to suppress such riots are charged with not having taken adequate measures to protect the racial group involved because some members of this race were killed. Under the Genocide Convention these public officials could be charged with ‘complicity in genocide’ and brought to trial as individuals upon complaint by persons or groups in this country or by persons or groups in other countries such as Russia.”

Again, it has been claimed that under the Genocide Convention Americans charged with genocide would be taken out of the jurisdiction of the United States, tried before international judges without the right of trial by jury and similar American protections.

Some opponents of the Genocide Convention are not willing to accept the idea that genocide is necessarily an international crime. For example, Orié L. Phillips of Washington, D. C., expressing fear that an American citizen might be tried in an international court,

told a Senate Committee that he felt genocide dealt "with many things that are domestic and not international."

Actually the Genocide Convention regards genocide as a crime of huge magnitude such as it was practiced by Hitler and is not regarded as covering purely local and individual breaches of the law even though they involve racial and religious hatreds. The Convention makes no provision for an international criminal court but provides that persons charged with genocide be tried in the national courts of whatever country was the scene of the crime. Individual cases of homicide, assault and battery would continue to be tried in State Courts. It would thus appear that participants in race riots or lynching parties need not be unnecessarily alarmed that they might be taken out of a local jurisdiction and tried in a foreign land.

While the Genocide Convention thus makes no provisions for an international criminal court, opponents of the Convention talk of it as though it did. They base their arguments on a preliminary draft Convention establishing such a court drawn by a UN committee. No action has been taken on this preliminary draft, and if such a Convention establishing an international criminal court were ever accepted by the UN, it would still have to be ratified by the United States as a separate instrument from the Genocide Convention itself.

This is unlikely. Indeed, it is unlikely that the Genocide Convention will be ratified by the United States in the immediate future. It was sent to the Senate for ratification by President Truman in 1949. A Senate subcommittee, after holding hearings, reported it favorably, but the Convention was never reported out of the full Committee and is now lying dormant. There is little chance that it will come before the Senate soon, since the present Administration has clearly indicated that it has no intention of pressing for its ratification.

This Administration decision not to press for ratification brought an expression of "great regret" from Senator Herbert Lehman (D., N.Y.) who told the Senate that the decision was a "retreat" and that it represented "a victory for isolationist forces."

The UN Covenant on Human Rights

As in the case of the Genocide Convention, the proposed UN Covenants on Human Rights and Equal Rights for Women have been used largely as a convenient stick with which to beat the UN itself. The draft Covenant on Human Rights in particular has been

used as an argument that the UN is seeking to invade the power of the States and to override American social and economic concepts.

Senator John W. Bricker (R., Ohio) has told the Senate:

“The idea that a universal Bill of Rights can be imposed on several billions of people with diverse customs, political institutions, religions, and standards of living is utter nonsense.”

Senator Bricker said that he feared that the Covenant if accepted by the United States “might repeal a substantial part of the McCarran Internal Security Act.” It might open the way for an American President to proclaim a State of Emergency and suspend the Bill of Rights. He would then be in a position to ignore constitutional prohibitions “against arbitrary arrest and detention; the right to public trial; the right to have legal assistance; freedom of speech and of the press; the right of peaceful assembly; the right of association; and many others.”

Not satisfied with this horrendous catalogue, Senator Bricker also expressed the fear that the Covenant might force American newspapers to print Communist propaganda, that Communists might gain the right to teach in any American institution of their choosing, and that the United States might be brought before the bar of international justice because the Russians might claim that the Taft-Hartley Act was a “slave-labor” law.

The Senator also expressed his belief that the UN drafters of the Human Rights Convention were dominated by a “socialist-communist” majority and that the purpose of the Covenant was to introduce Marxist philosophy into American life. “The United Nations,” he has said, “is attempting to prepare a blueprint for world socialism. You will find that blueprint in the UN draft Covenant on Human Rights.”

Of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, former American delegate to the Human Rights Commission, Senator Bricker wrote:

“We need not pause to consider whether this (her acceptance of certain clauses) is due to Mrs. Roosevelt’s lack of legal training or to a conscious effort to appease Socialist and Communist Nations.”

Frank E. Holman, who, as previously noted, has attacked the Genocide Convention, also has expressed fear that the proposed Human Rights Covenants would upset American State laws on mixed marriages or State bars against the alien ownership of land. Listing the various “human rights” enumerated in the proposed covenant such as the rights to social security, just and favorable conditions of work, protection against unemployment, just and favorable remuneration, housing and medical care, Mr. Holman concluded:

“Put these, or similar pronouncements, into treaty form, ratified only by the Senate, and you have by a few pages of treaty language transformed the government of the United States FROM A REPUBLIC INTO A SOCIALISTIC STATE.”

Alfred J. Scheppe, chairman of the Committee on Peace and Law Through the United Nations of the American Bar Association, has expressed fear that American acceptance of the Human Rights Covenants might wipe out a great body of American law especially as civil rights are concerned. Far from thinking that civil rights are a matter for international concern, Mr. Scheppe thought that not even Congress itself might have the authority to enact civil rights legislation on a national scale, declaring that many Americans felt that civil rights were a “subject matter that is the concern of the several States under the Tenth Amendment.”

Similar criticism of the Human Rights Covenants has been expressed by other groups such as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

In answer to criticism of this nature, the State Department in September, 1952, pointed out that the Covenant was a “common standard of achievement,” whose chief value was educational and promotional.

One of the criticisms that has been made of the Human Rights Covenants is that certain provisions do not go as far as the American Bill of Rights and that consequently American rights will thereby be diminished. The State Department with reference to these criticisms said:

“Limitations on rights permitted under the Covenants which are broader than those in the Constitution will not lessen rights enjoyed in the United States. In the first place each draft Covenant contains a provision that the Covenant is a minimum standard and may not be used to lower the rights in any country where they are greater than those in that Covenant.”

Nevertheless, the attacks on the Conventions have continued, and the new Administration through Secretary of State Dulles has now announced that it will not present the Human Rights Covenants to the Senate for ratification. Instead it will limit its activities to encouraging “methods of persuasion, education and example.”

There can be little doubt that the position of the Administration both as to the Genocide Convention and the Covenants on Human Rights has been heavily influenced by the campaigns carried on against

these conventions during the past years and that to this extent, at least, the American support of the UN has been considerably weakened both at home and abroad.

Analysis of the arguments that have been used against the work of the four UN specialized agencies discussed above reveals that they break down into the following broad categories:

(1) Fears that a generally narrow concept of American national sovereignty will be impinged upon.

(2) Hostility to the development of "internationalism" and a longing to get back to American isolationism of the past.

(3) Fears that "un-American" concepts in economic and social areas may be imposed upon the United States either directly by "treaty-law" or indirectly by the dispersion of ideas not rigidly in conformity with various individual and group conceptions of the free enterprise system.

(4) Strong efforts to safeguard "States' Rights" reflected not only in hostility to international "encroachment" but to Federal Government "encroachment."

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

Critics of the United Nations agencies, running all the way from the super-nationalist "hate" groups to the more moderate organizations that have expressed worry about American sovereignty, States' Rights or foreign "isms" that might threaten the "American way of life," have found common ground in the so-called Bricker Amendment to the Constitution.

This amendment, first introduced by Senator John W. Bricker (R., Ohio) in the 82nd Congress, was reintroduced in revised form in the 83rd Congress. It seeks to amend the treaty-making sections of the Constitution so as to limit substantially the subject matter of treaties that can be made by the United States Government, the process by which they can become the "supreme Law of the Land" so far as domestic law is concerned and the authority of the Executive Department in negotiating executive agreements.

Supporters of the amendment—and it would be inaccurate to lump them indiscriminately as supernationalists or isolationists—express the fear that the United States, under its present constitutional treaty-making processes, is headed toward "legislation by treaty." They contend that there is danger that legislation affecting the social and political practices of the States and local communities may be im-

posed upon the American people through treaties rather than through the normal procedures of ordinary domestic legislation either on the Federal or State level. They claim that the Constitution as written does not protect the American people adequately against this "danger," and they express fear that some future President, with either the connivance or through the carelessness of some future Senate, may turn the United States, through treaties, into a "socialized" state. Under all their arguments runs a common thread of fear that the United States will be dominated by an international government which will destroy American freedoms guaranteed under the Bill of Rights.

The essential basis for these fears, they declare, lies in the fact that under Article VI of the Constitution treaties, now simply ratified by two-thirds vote in the Senate, become the "supreme Law of the Land" overriding State Constitutions and laws. They contend that in recent years the scope of treaties has become so widened that treaties can be used to enact "domestic legislation," and they point with considerable horror to the fact that a State Department publication in 1950 declared that "there is no longer any real distinction between 'domestic' and 'foreign' affairs."

Broadly speaking the idea behind the Bricker Amendment presents two main streams both of which converge on the future position of the United States as an independent sovereignty within the structure of an interdependent world. These are its effects on American domestic policies and its effects on American cooperation with the rest of the world, or more concretely the UN and its specialized agencies.

Senator Bricker has been the leading figure in the effort to restrict the treaty making power of the Executive. But, in addition to his proposed amendment of the Constitution, the American Bar Association has been working on a somewhat similar one. While the Bar Association amendment represents the official position of that body, it should be noted that its proposed amendment by no means represents the unanimous thinking of the American legal profession. Thus the ABA's own section on International and Comparative Law opposed it as has the powerful Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

In June of 1953 the Senate Committee on the Judiciary which had held hearings on the Bricker and ABA amendments finally reported favorably, 9 to 5, a proposed amendment which conforms closely with the ABA version of the amendment but follows the general purpose of the Bricker amendment. It was reported as Senate Joint Resolution I, the same number as that borne by the original Bricker amend-

ment, and is still known as the "Bricker" amendment rather than the ABA amendment. Its three key sections read:

(1) A provision of a treaty which conflicts with this Constitution shall not be of any force or effect.

(2) A treaty shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty.

(3) Congress shall have power to regulate all executive and other agreements with any foreign power or international organization. All such agreements shall be subject to the limitations imposed on treaties by this article.

Generally speaking the proposed amendment must carry a strong surface appeal for many Americans. The possibility of a treaty undermining the Constitution, especially the Bill of Rights, is obviously a repugnant thought. Nevertheless, the proposed change in the Constitution would open a Pandora's box of problems, might seriously undermine the balance of power between the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government, and would pose the question of the relationship between the United States and the United Nations. So important would be the Constitutional change be that it is worth-while examining some of the pros and cons in the debate.

SECTION I. Senator Bricker and the American Bar Association contend that while no treaty in the history of the United States has ever been declared unconstitutional, the Constitution should have a definite provision directly barring treaties that conflict with the Constitution. They declare that the statement in past Supreme Court decisions that "it cannot be argued that treaties can accomplish what the Constitution cannot" is not enough since it is only a dictum and not nailed down in any specific opinion on the point. They argue that even if this section is not essential, it can do no harm and therefore should be expressly stated in the Constitution.

Opponents of the section contend that the Supreme Court dictum has never been challenged and that after a century and a half of the successful working of the present treaty-making system, it is unwise and dangerous to insert such a clause in the Constitution. They contend further that this section, harmless though it may appear, in reality may hold the possibility of serious mischief. The State Department, both under the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations, has opposed the section on the grounds that it lends itself to widely varying interpretations which may seriously limit the making of valuable

treaties. The State Department legal brief pointed out that under the Constitution Congress has the right to declare war. Yet the United Nations Charter to which the United States is a party outlaws aggressive war limiting to that extent the power of Congress to declare war. Is the outlawing of aggressive war "to be invalid under the amendment?" the brief asks.

SECTION 2. Under this section a treaty can become domestic law "only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty." This was the heart of the American Bar Association text and is by far the most controversial part of the proposed amendment. Under Article VI of the Constitution treaties, when properly ratified by two-thirds of the Senate become the "supreme Law of the Land." Under Article X those powers not specifically granted Congress are "reserved" to the States or to the people. Proponents of the Bricker Amendment profess fear that some future president and Senate may seek to get around the limit placed on the power of the National Government under Article X to enact "domestic legislation" by way of treaties. Their prize example is a case under which the Supreme Court found unconstitutional Federal legislation regulating the hunting of migratory birds because such regulation was "reserved" to the States, but that Congress could nevertheless control such hunting through a treaty, because of the international character of the movements of migrating birds.

Proponents of the amendment thus argue that any kind of legislation normally reserved to the States or local communities might be "slipped over" by simple Senate ratification. Treaties or Conventions drawn by the United Nations or its specialized agencies might thus become part of domestic legislation. This theme has been used repeatedly to create fears that the United States might be "socialized" by the treaty route, that the Bill of Rights may be undermined and that the country might even surrender its sovereignty to an international body.

Opponents of Section 2 contend that such fears are absurd. They point to the fact that the Senate, far from rushing into treaties carelessly, has long been known as the "graveyard of treaties." They contend also that the section is not necessary since the Supreme Court already has indicated through dictum that a treaty cannot override the Constitution and that American freedoms and rights are thus guaranteed. Most importantly, this section would destroy the power of the National Government to make international agreements. As the State Department legal brief pointed out:

“One of the primary objects of our Constitution is to permit the United States to speak as a sovereign State with one voice in foreign affairs. This proposal would destroy this; it would create a no-man’s land in foreign affairs. It would require in certain broad fields of foreign relations not only a treaty consented to by the Senate but an act of Congress and legislation by each of the 48 States. Our nation would, thus, instead of speaking with a single voice in foreign affairs, speak with 49.”

Opponents of Section 2 point out that it was the defiance by the States of the treaties drafted by the National Government at the time of the Confederation that led to inclusion in our Constitution of the clause declaring that treaties became the “supreme Law of the Land.” To overthrow this doctrine would be to turn the clock back to the days when the National Government was so weak and impotent that there was real danger that the Confederation formed after the Revolution would fly apart. Article VI of the Constitution was the answer of the Founding Fathers after long debate on the conflict of State and National powers. To destroy the principle of Article VI, worked out after long discussion and debate more than 150 years ago, would threaten to undermine the authority and prestige of the National Government and turn the country back to a loose association of States characteristic of the weak and unsuccessful Confederation.

SECTION 3. Section 3 hits at “executive agreements,” seeking to give Congress the power to “regulate” them. The negotiation of such agreements has long been a sore point with the Senate. Democratic presidents have made many executive agreements which the Senate felt ought to have been referred to it for approval. The destroyer-bases agreement of President Roosevelt is one example. The sending of troops to Korea by President Truman is another. Yalta and Potsdam are frequently cited.

Undoubtedly there is always danger that a strong president may take the bit in his teeth and make executive agreements that might better have been made through the normal treaty process. On the other hand Congressional limitation on the power of the executive branch to make executive agreements has dangers of its own. In emergencies during an atomic age presidents can’t always stop to wait for Congress to act. As the New York Bar Association has pointed out: “Those who believe that the present relationships of constitutional powers should be left alone argue that they would rather run the risk of the president’s having too great power to act than to run the risk of his having too little.”

In addition, Section 3 would inject Congress into literally thousands of executive agreements that are being made constantly by the Federal Government in wide areas of international relations. For example, Secretary of State Dulles told a Senate Committee that at least 10,000 executive agreements had been entered into as a result of the North Atlantic Treaty and suggested that it would be absurd to expect the Executive Department to run to Congress for approval of all sorts of minor but necessary agreements with other countries.

As is clear from these three sections of the proposed constitutional amendment, the balance of power in the treaty-making field would be sharply shifted from the Executive Branch to the Legislative Branch and so is part and parcel of the historic struggle between these two branches of our Government.

The Truman Administration was strongly opposed to the Bricker and ABA amendments. So is the Eisenhower Administration for precisely the same reasons that the proposed change in the Constitution would seriously hamper the Executive Department in the conduct of foreign affairs. The amendment which finally was reported to the Senate is watered down in some respects from the original Bricker proposal which would have banned the granting of authority to any international agency over matters "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." This would have barred American acceptance of international commissions in many fields and would seriously have hampered the working out of many controversies involving the rights of American citizens in matters having an international aspect. On the other hand, the present amendment contains the even more serious provision that treaties can become effective "only through legislation which would be valid in the absence of treaty." For this means that except in severely limited fields the States rather than the National Government would have the essence of treaty power.

Efforts to find a compromise amendment which would not destroy the President's treaty making power were in progress between the Administration and Congressional leaders early in July of this year.

THE BRICKER AMENDMENT AS AN ANTI-UN INSTRUMENT

Whether the Bricker amendment ever enters the Constitution is, of course, a question for the future. Supporters of it contend that it is designed essentially to "protect" American domestic rights and freedoms and is not concerned with international relations. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the 1952 and 1953 Senate hearings on the Bricker

and ABA amendments have served as the vehicle for a huge amount of direct and indirect Anti-UN criticism and hostile propaganda.

Senator Bricker himself has repeatedly insisted that his amendment was not designed as an anti-UN move, that it would even help save the UN. Yet a cursory examination of the many speeches he has made in its behalf reveals an obvious anti-international and anti-UN bias. He doesn't like the United States to enter into treaty arrangements with more than one country. Thus he once said that he would be inclined to support the American Bar Association amendment if it limited "multilateral" treaties. There would then, in his opinion, be no difficulties "in making bilateral treaties of friendship, commerce and navigation." This, of course, is directed against the whole concept of broadly based international agreements while supporting the older concept of bilateral treaties between independent sovereignties.

There is a wide difference of opinion in the United States as to the wisdom of the United States entering into a possible Federation of nations. There is little likelihood that the United States would enter such a Federation within the foreseeable future. Opponents of the Bricker amendment do not feel, however, that the door should be deliberately closed. Senator Bricker, on the other hand, has said that the door should be closed.

Some of his comments on the UN are as follows:

"At present the United Nations appears inspired by an ambition to define and to enforce by treaty the economic and political rights and duties of every human being in the world."

"The United Nations has been depicted in the heavily financed propaganda of public and private agencies as the only political institution in the history of mankind incapable of malfeasance."

"Those who want to make an international redistribution of wealth have been handicapped by the lack of a permanent program. The Marshall Plan was sold as a temporary, postwar emergency measure. The Mutual Security Program must come before Congress each year for approval. International socialism, like its domestic counterpart, requires permanent legislation vesting broad powers in a centralized authority. The United Nations is attempting to prepare a blueprint for world socialism. You will find that blueprint in the UN draft Covenant on Human Rights."

"The UN's treaty-making ambitions are appalling to everyone who cherishes the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States."

“A majority of the UN members are nations which have succumbed to communism, socialism, or some form of dictatorial rule. The common characteristics of all these countries is that they exalt the power of the State over the individual.”

“My diagnosis of the United Nations, which I assure you has not been casual, is that it is suffering from a disease which afflicts every bureaucracy. It is an insatiable lust for power.”

In addition Senator Bricker has taken occasion to express warm appreciation of the work of Frank Holman, Past President of the ABA, in fighting for a constitutional change in the treaty-making procedures. Holman in May of 1952 told a California audience that he had not fully made up his mind as to the value of the UN, but then continued:

“We now have had considerable experience in the Korean War and other disturbing international developments, not connected, mind you, with our domestic rights. So that, without reaching a final conclusion, I put the question. I do not yet quite cross the bridge, but I put the question as to whether or not—the United Nations is a hope or menace. (Audience: ‘MENACE.’)

“Now I want to give you a few facts to support your views.” (Laughter).

Again in September 1952, Holman published a vitriolic attack on the State Department for its publication, “Questions and Answers on the UN Charter, Genocide Convention, and Proposed Covenant on Human Rights.” He described it as being filled with half truths and false assurances adding that it was a propaganda effort at the taxpayers’ expense “to misinform and mislead the American people in a matter affecting their basic rights and freedoms.”

The Bricker amendment also has attracted support from the extreme nationalist groups. W. Henry MacFarland of the American Flag Committee appeared as a witness in favor of it. Gerald L. K. Smith has used the “treaty-making” theme as one of his principal arguments in characteristically unrestrained fashion against the United Nations.

More importantly the Bricker amendment, even if never accepted, has served to give extreme nationalists, States’ Righters and isolationists an important victory in the decisions of the Eisenhower Administration not to push for American ratification of the Genocide and proposed Human Rights Conventions. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, former American delegate to the Human Rights Convention conference, expressed regret for the decision, declaring that while the Covenant

would not take away American social, political or civil rights, there were "many areas in the world where our leadership, even if it had been confined to civil and political rights, might have helped vast numbers of people to gain these rights."

"We have sold out to the Brickers and McCarthys," she concluded. "It is a sorry day for the honor and good faith of the present Administration in relation to our interest in the human rights and freedoms of people throughout the world."

THE ASSAULT IN CONGRESS

That Congress itself is touchy on UN subjects has been repeatedly indicated. The large proportion of UN expenses that are borne by this country is frequently mentioned in disparagement of the financial load borne by other countries. The heavy proportion of troops furnished by the United States in Korea and, in consequence, the heavy proportion of American casualties is another Congressional stand-by used by critics of the UN. Whether the United States has the right to bar for "security" reasons officially appointed nondiplomatic delegates of other countries to UN meetings is an active source of controversy. And, finally, only recently it was necessary for President Eisenhower to intervene personally to prevent Congress from enacting legislation under which American funds would be withheld from the UN should Red China be admitted to membership. All these indicate UN-United States tensions that are constantly exploited by active opponents of American cooperation with the United Nations.

There are three Congressional areas in which those who would either destroy the UN or greatly weaken it operate: (a) introduction of bills or resolutions which in one way or another would curtail American cooperation with other nations, would accentuate American nationalism, would seek to place barricades against the "encroachment of the UN" or, in extreme cases, would have Congress take us out of the UN altogether; (b) harassment of the UN based on Congressional investigations into the loyalty of American UN employees, and (c) broadcasting of anti-UN propaganda through the Appendix of the Congressional Record.

Here are some samples:

LEGISLATION

H. J. Res. 13 (Burdick, R., N. Dak.): This provides for a constitutional amendment under which no American citizen could be com-

pelled to serve in a UN army unless Congress itself declares war on the aggressor country. It also provides that American soldiers could not serve under any insignia than the American flag.

H. J. Res. 20 (Coudert, R., New York): A resolution providing that no additional military forces be sent abroad without the prior authorization of Congress.

H. J. Res. 56 (McDonough, R., Cal.): A resolution prohibiting the display of any foreign or international flag unless accompanied by the flag of the United States.

S. 3 (McCarran, D., Nev.): A bill to prevent citizens of the United States of doubtful loyalty from working for the United Nations. (This bill has been passed by the Senate.)

H. Con. Res. 3 (Burdick, R., N. Dak.): A bill voiding American approval of the charter of the United Nations and a companion bill, H. R. 105, rescinding American membership in the UN and its specialized agencies.

H. Res. 41 (Smith, R., Wis.): A resolution opposing any form of world government "or toward the establishment of any organization or the strengthening of any such organizations as may already exist, which would abolish, abridge, or otherwise limit any of the rights, privileges, or immunities now enjoyed by the citizens of the United States."

S. 694 (Martin, R., Pa.): A bill prohibiting the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except at the headquarters of the United Nations. (This bill has been passed by Congress.) The Washington Post characterized the measure as "chauvinism" and "provincialism."

It cannot be said, of course, that all these bills and resolutions are overtly hostile to the United Nations. Nevertheless, they indicate on the part of their sponsors a fear that the United States is in danger of losing its sovereignty, or that its flag will not be properly honored, or that the United States must not get too deeply involved in international organizations. Some, like the McCarran Bill, cannot be criticized because they demand that American employees of the UN be loyal American citizens. They, nevertheless, have been used to spread anti-UN prejudice especially among those Americans who resent the fact that American citizens in the employ of the United Nations must take an oath of loyalty to that organization.

The recent McCarran investigation into the loyalty of American employees of the UN can be cited as an example of the highly delicate problems posed by the relations between the United States and an international organization of which it is a part and for which it serves as the host country. Here again the investigation would appear perfectly legitimate. Yet to what extent should the United States dictate to the UN what Americans should or should not work for that body? Even non-Communist members of the UN have expressed uneasiness that the UN's employment policies may be influenced by the UN Secretariat's desire to assuage the anger of its American Congressional critics.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Finally there is a minority group of Congressmen who by their own statements or through insertion of anti-UN articles in the Congressional Record serve to keep the anti-UN pot boiling. Here are some examples:

"Advocates of supernational sovereignty particularly welcome an opportunity to promote supergovernment in the fields of education, science and culture through UNESCO." (Congressman Paul W. Shafer—R., Mich.)

"As it works out, UNESCO has its operating head in Columbia University. The Teachers College of this university has taken the leading role in carrying out the propaganda of our people for the United Nations." (Congressman Usher L. Burdick—R., North Dakota.)

"There is something terribly wrong with the Japanese Peace Treaty, and in NATO and in the UN and in UNESCO and in the Joint Chiefs of Staff . . ." (Senator William E. Jenner—R., Ind. The text of this speech was inserted in the Congressional Record by Sen. Homer E. Capehart—R., Ind.—on April 9, 1952.)

"We are gradually being taken over by UNESCO to put our minds in chains," said Mrs. Grace S. Bruseau, past President General of the DAR. (Mrs. Bruseau's article, "Journey into Chaos," in the DAR Bulletin from which this citation is taken was inserted in the Congressional Record by Rep. Daniel Reed—R., N. Y.)

"Watch well the United Nations for, as now constituted, it is enemy No. 1 of free America." (Rep. Usher L. Burdick—R., N. Dak.)

"On the basis of uncontroverted and overwhelming evidence it has been clearly established that Communist agents, saboteurs and spies have been gaining admission into the United States under the guise of

diplomats.” (Senator Arthur V. Watkins—R., Utah—in recounting differences between the State Department and the UN over the right of the United States to bar certain delegates from entering the United States to attend various UN meetings.)

CONCLUSIONS

All in all it is obvious that Americans who either disliked the idea of the UN heartily from the beginning or at best were lukewarm toward it are out either to kill it or prevent it from further development.

Legitimate complaints against the activities of the UN and its specialized agencies have been distorted in many cases or exaggerated to a fantastic degree in a widespread propaganda campaign that cannot be disregarded.

The attacks have stemmed from a variety of sources:

(1) Supernationalists—either professional or well-intentioned who want to wall themselves up in the United States and shut out social change of any kind.

(2) Old school isolationists who look longingly back to the days when the United States could live shut off from the rest of the world and did not find it necessary to become involved in international problems in order to protect its own interests.

(3) What might be called neo-isolationists who recognize the fact that the United States as a world power must accept a certain amount of international cooperation but who want to hold that cooperation to a minimum.

(4) Conservatives who are afraid that their interests in social, economic or political fields may be hurt through the United Nations. Many of these Americans feel that the UN should concern itself strictly with “keeping the peace” without conceding that many social and economic problems considered in the past as purely “domestic” questions in reality are directly tied in with the possibility of preserving world peace. To a considerable degree these critics are the same ones who saw in the New and Fair Deals efforts to “socialize” the United States.

(5) Those who were lukewarm to the UN to begin with and are now convinced that their attitude was justified.

There are no indications that the attacks against the UN are serious enough to warrant fears that the United States may withdraw

from the organization. They have been strong enough, however, to necessitate a campaign by pro-UN forces in the country including a statement by President Eisenhower himself that the United States must and will continue to support the UN.

Nevertheless, there remains the question of what would happen should the UN take a position on problems of the future that would be distasteful to powerful forces in Congress. As previously noted, it took Presidential intervention to forestall a Senate move to deny American funds to the UN should Red China be admitted to membership. It would appear certain that this effort will be revived should the question of Red China's entrance into the UN come up in the near future.

Actually, the assault on the United Nations on many fronts is part of the more general fight in the United States against the growth of the National Government itself. Just as the Federal Government has been pictured by many conservatives as a huge, bureaucratic monster seeking to enlarge its own power and to overwhelm the States, so the UN is depicted as seeking to set up a supergovernment which would dominate the world including the United States. There are many indications also that the fight against the UN has become involved in the historical struggle in the United States as to the balance of power between the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government. Repeatedly critics of the UN have suggested that Congress rather than the Executive should be the controlling factor in relations between the UN and the United States.

Despite the assault upon the UN and its specialized agencies, there are, nevertheless, many signs of overwhelmingly powerful support for the UN among the American people. Church organizations, educational institutions, labor organizations and great numbers of rank and file Americans have expressed their continued faith in the UN. It is significant, too, that however critical of the UN or its specialized agencies members of Congress have been, few have had the political hardihood to suggest that the United States give up its membership.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Following is a selected bibliography of material on the United Nations for those who wish to make a more detailed study of the subject matter of this pamphlet than can be presented in this brief form. Much of the material can be found in official records of the United States Congress generally available in libraries or through the Government Printing Office. Where reprints or original documents can be obtained the name and address of the publisher or issuing office is included. There is, of course, a wide choice of material published by the United Nations itself. Publications of this nature have not been included because it was thought best to include only strictly American material. If the reader desires official UN material, however, it is suggested that inquiry be made at Columbia University Press, International Documents Service, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y. The source for United States Government publications is Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., or the State Department.

Probably the most important single document containing the arguments of critics of the United Nations and its specialized agencies are the hearings held by a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, in May and June of 1952 and February, March and April of 1953. Of these the 1953 hearings which run to 1,266 pages contain voluminous documentation dealing specifically with the Bricker Amendment and the Amendment of the American Bar Association. Of equal importance, they cover the whole field of criticism of the UN and the answers to that criticism. Almost every organization and individual prominent in the field, either for or against the UN, offered testimony.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Questions and Answers on the UN Charter, Genocide Convention and Proposed Covenants on Human Rights, Office of Public Affairs, Department of State, Washington, D. C., September 1952.

Treaties and Executive Agreements, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952.

Treaties and Executive Agreements, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1953.

PRO-UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations, Facts and Fallacies, The Church Peace Union, 170 East 64th Street, New York 21, N. Y.

Answer To The Critics of the U. N. by Ernest A. Gross, The New York Times Magazine, April 27, 1952. Reprints can be obtained from the American Association For the United Nations, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y.

Report of Talk by Walter H. C. Laves, Chairman, U. S. National Commission for UNESCO, before Greater Hartford Council for UNESCO, January 7, 1953, United States National Commission for UNESCO. (The United States National Commission for UNESCO was established by Public Law 565, 79th Congress and consists of 100 members who serve without pay. National organizations, Federal, State and local governments, and private members interested in educational, scientific and cultural questions are represented. The members are named by the Secretary of State. The Commission sponsors a national conference on UNESCO every two years. One will be held in Minneapolis in September of this year. The UNESCO Relations staff at the State Department serves as the executive secretariat of the Commission. The Commission's present chairman is Walter H. C. Laves, noted American educator, who has a wide background in international affairs.)

UNIT, United Nations Information for Teachers, published by the United Nations Education Service under the sponsorship of the Committee on International Relations of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

The United Nations, UNESCO and American Schools, Educational Policies Commission, National Education Association of the United States and the American Association of School Administrators. National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Spread The Good Word About the UN, A Workbook for Community Leaders, The American Association for the United Nations, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17, N. Y. (75 cents, 50 cents for quantity orders over 50 copies.) This workbook is an especially valuable document for those who wish to study the structure and operations of the UN and its specialized agencies. It contains publications on the work of the UN, material refuting the current attacks on UN and an outline of the goal and major activities of the UN. The workbook also contains an important directory of materials on the UN and a bibliography. The workbook lists eleven charges that are being made against the UN and its specialized agencies together with answers based on the facts involved.

The United States Committee for United Nations Day has available various publications dealing with the nation-wide celebration of United Nations Day in the United States. Among these are *Leaders Guide for UN Day 1953—Know Your United Nations*. One to ten copies free, additional copies 5 cents each. *A Speaker's Kit* containing speech outlines, charter of the UN and comprehensive information for the speaker, 50 cents. *Use the UN in your Teaching*—a comprehensive guide for teaching about the UN, 15 cents each, 20% off on lots of 10 or more. These and other pamphlets are available through the United States Committee for United Nations Day, 816 21st Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Our Enlightened Self-Interest And the United Nations by A. A. Berle, Jr., (reprint) The Reporter, 220 East 42nd Street, New York 17, N. Y.

PRO-BRICKER AMENDMENT

State Department Half Truths and False Assurances Regarding the U. N. Charter, Genocide Convention and Proposed Covenant on Human Rights, Frank E. Holman, Past President of the American Bar Association, Seattle, Washington, September 1952.

Constitutional Defense Papers, The Constitution and the United Nations, a public address by Frank E. Holman, Past President, American Bar Association, presented before 1,000 Los Angeles members of Americans For MacArthur, Inc., Ebell Theatre, Los Angeles, California, May 26, 1952. Constitutional Alliance, 1542 Glendale Boulevard, Los Angeles 26, Calif.

ANTI-BRICKER AMENDMENT

Statement in Opposition to S. J. Res. 1, 83rd Congress, 1st Session, of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. (Copies of this statement may be obtained at the office of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, 42 West 44th Street, New York 18, New York.)

Undercutting American Leadership, a series of four editorials in the Washington Post, Washington, D. C., March 23, March 25, March 30 and April 2, 1953.

ANTI-UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations is Treason, Georgia Farmers' Market Bulletin, February 27, 1952, Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets, 222 State Capitol, Atlanta, Georgia.

The Greatest Subversive Plot in History, Report to the American People on UNESCO, by Congressman John T. Wood of Idaho. The Cross and The Flag, April 1952, P. O. Box D-4, St. Louis 1, Missouri.

MISCELLANEOUS

1952 Resolutions of Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. Veterans of Foreign Wars, 610 Wire Building, Washington 5, D. C.

Hate Campaign Against the UN, by Gordon D. Hall, Christian Register, October 1952.

The Hate Campaign Against the UN, by Gordon D. Hall, Beacon Press, 25 Beacon Street, Boston 8, Massachusetts. (50 cents). This is an especially valuable source of information on the "Hate" groups.

Resolutions Adopted by the Sixty-First Annual Congress of the Sons of the American Revolution, July 11, 1951, San Francisco, California. National Society, Sons of the American Revolution, 1227 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Report of Committee, UNESCO in the Los Angeles City Schools, January 15, 1953, Board of Education, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Save Our Schools, McCall's, September 1952. *Dangers Ahead In the Public Schools*, McCall's, October 1952. Both by John Bainbridge. (reprint) McCall's, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

Summary of Proceedings, Thirty-Fourth Annual National Convention of the American Legion. The American Legion, 1608 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

Bricker Amendment to the Fore, The National Voter, March 1, 1953, League of Women Voters of the U. S., 1026 17th Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Target: 1955, The Need and Opportunity to Strengthen The Charter of the United Nations with limited powers adequate to prevent war. Institute for International Government, 11 West 42nd Street, New York 36, N. Y.

Resolutions adopted by the Sixty-Second Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, April 20-24, 1953. National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 D Street, N.W., Washington, D. C.

NEW PAI PUBLICATIONS

ISSUES IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS,

by JOHN SHOTT, 50 cents.*

An 82 page study of nine major issues which divide labor and management, by an experienced economist and labor law administrator. Each issue is examined for its bearing on the public welfare and the legitimate interests of both labor and management.

THE RUSSIA WE FACE NOW! *by* DR. ETHAN T. COLTON, \$1.25*

paper-back or \$1.75* cloth-back.

A panel of experts has collaborated to bring you this 100 page factual and penetrating report. Dr. Colton, former director of YMCA foreign programs and author of "Forty Years With Russians" and "The XYZ of Communism," heads the panel.

TRADE NOT AID? *by* STEPHEN RAUSHENBUSH, 10 cents.*

A 22 page digest in which the dollar gap, tariff and aid programs are examined by a former senior resource economist for the Department of the Interior and the United Nations.

A LOOK INTO HELL'S CANYON, *by* BENTON J. STONG, 10 cents.*

Hells Canyon in Idaho is the case study in the controversial issue of whether a great natural resource can be choked off by an inadequate development plan offered by a private utility. The author is an authority on TVA and closely acquainted with the Hells Canyon area.

*In quantities of 10 or more prices are reduced 30 per cent.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS INSTITUTE

312 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, S.E. • WASHINGTON 3, D. C.