

# 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 11

---

APRIL 11, 1955  
DENVER, COLO.

---

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



UNITED STATES  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON : 1955

Dr. HIGMAN. I don't think there is any analogy whatever between poison gas and hydrogen weapons.

Senator SPARKMAN. I admit it is rather farfetched. I started off by saying that it was about the nearest that we had had yet. Of course, we have not lived in the hydrogen-bomb era yet. We are just beginning to live in it.

Dr. HIGMAN. If the power of destruction of these weapons is not what I am told it is, then I would not hold these views.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland here is on the Joint Atomic Energy Committee. I think he could tell you that it is all that you have been told, and perhaps more.

Dr. HIGMAN. I am scared.

Senator KNOWLAND. We will admit in evidence that it is a potent weapon.

Dr. HIGMAN. I think we ought to control it.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much, Dr. Higman.

Dr. HIGMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. GOOD. After Mr. LeFevre, the next witness will be Mr. Howard Wallace.

Senator SPARKMAN. We are glad to have you with us, sir.

Mr. WALLACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPARKMAN. Proceed as you wish.

#### STATEMENT OF ROBERT LEFEVRE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CONGRESS OF FREEDOM, INC.

Mr. LEFEVRE. Senators, ladies, and gentlemen, my name is Robert LeFevre. I am appearing as a representative of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., a nationwide organization which is a coalition of patriotic Americans drawn from nearly 500 different organizations, and groups throughout the United States. My position with the Congress of Freedom is that of executive director. I am on its board of directors and also serve on its executive committee.

I would like to take this opportunity of inviting those present to attend the convention the week of April 30. At that time, you will have the opportunity of seeing the grassroots Americans meeting in assembly to take up this very question of the United Nations.

#### UNITED STATES WITHDRAWAL URGED

I am appearing here tonight to urge that the United States withdraw from the United Nations organization with the least possible delay. I am in opposition to any moves which might tend to amend the charter of the United Nations. I believe that from an American point of view, any permanent alliance with foreign countries, in or out of a world government, are damaging to American ideals, the American heritage, and American freedom.

The U. N. was organized ostensibly to bring peace, but it began by placing an economic and social burden on all member governments which no government of a free people is properly equipped to carry.

## HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVITIES CRITICIZED

The Declaration, or Covenant of Human Rights, which is the very heartbeat of the U. N., sets forth a whole series of so-called rights, which are to be provided and guaranteed by these member governments. While this may be a step forward for other nations which have in truth not advanced very far into the realm of human liberty, it is a step backwards insofar as the United States is concerned.

Human liberty was the historic principle invoked at the starting of our country which found its most concise expression in the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. These amendments form a prohibition against government. These amendments do not pretend to declare what government shall do for people, but instead declare what governments shall not do. There are set out things the Government must not do either for or to people.

Now, the entire central theme of the United Nations Charter, with its alleged human rights, is an abrogation of the American Bill of Rights. According to the declaration of human rights, the member governments agree to all manner of fanciful benefits, including the right to social security for every human being, of every member nation, including China and Russia, plus a guaranty of a constantly rising standing of living.

We cannot support these United Nations concepts without betraying the concepts of the United States.

## FAILURES OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY

Now, the U. N. idea is not new. It has been tried repeatedly as a cure for war. More than 150 known attempts have been made to unite the world in a single political and economic entity to secure the peace. These date from the time of Pharaoh Menes, who succeeded in uniting the upper and lower Nile Valleys, down to the present time. That was about 3,000 B. C.

Now, every single one of these efforts has failed to bring peace.

Why?

Before we answer that question, please note, there is not any purpose whatsoever in the United Nations if it cannot bring peace. Peace is what we need on this planet more than any other single commodity. Now, why have all these efforts at bringing peace failed? Why has the U. N. failed, and why will it continue to fail despite any attempts to patch it up and make it work?

Gentlemen, we must learn to understand the tools that we use. We know that a shovel is a tool, and as such it does not transmit messages. We know that a broadcasting station is a tool and it doesn't dig ditches. Every tool has been designed for a specific task.

The United Nations is a tool, just as each government member of it is a tool.

Now, let us examine this tool to see if it has been properly designed and if it can reasonably be expected to perform the task assigned to it.

All governments seek to win obedience through three devices. First, they have consent from the governed. When that fails, they resort to threats. When that fails, they use force. There is no exception to these facts in all of history.

Force is a logical extension of political power. Governments understand force. They are tools and instruments of force. Every effort in history to create world peace has been made by governments which are instruments of force. That is why all of them have failed, and will continue to fail.

Senator SPARKMAN. Senator Knowland?

Senator KNOWLAND. No questions.

Senator SPARKMAN. Thank you very much.

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

#### STATEMENT OF ROBERT LEFEVRE

My name is Robert LeFevre. I am a news analyst and reporter, at present employed as an editorial writer on the staff of the Gazette Telegraph, a daily paper in Colorado Springs.

I am appearing as a representative of the Congress of Freedom, Inc., a nationwide organization which is a coalition of patriotic Americans drawn from nearly 500 different organizations and groups throughout the United States. My position with the Congress of Freedom is that of executive director. I am on its board of directors and also serve on its executive committee.

I am appearing here to urge that the United States withdraw from the United Nations Organization with the least possible delay. I am limiting my reasons, because of the small amount of time allotted to me, to those falling into three principal categories. They are: The record of the present United Nations, the historical record of the United Nations idea, and the fundamental philosophy and its fallacies behind any United Nations idea.

On the record, here is what the U. N. has done. It was organized ostensibly to bring peace, but it began by placing an economic and social burden on all member governments which no government of a free people is properly equipped to carry. The Declaration or Covenant of Human Rights, which is the very heartbeat of the U. N., sets forth a whole series of so-called rights which are to be provided and guaranteed by these member governments. While this may be a step forward for other nations which have, in truth, not advanced very far into the realm of human liberty, it is a step backward insofar as the United States is concerned.

Human liberty was the historic principle invoked at the starting of our country, which found its most concise expression in the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. These amendments form a prohibition against government. These amendments do not pretend to declare what governments shall do for people, but instead declare that the Government shall not do certain things either for or to the people.

The entire central theme of the United Nations Charter with its alleged human rights is an abrogation of the American Bill of Rights. We cannot support these United Nations concepts without betraying the concepts of the United States.

Also on the record, the U. N. was conceived in part by convicted perjurer Alger Hiss. It has housed and continues to house a number of persons from this country whose loyalty to the United States is open to question. It advocates a loyalty oath for its employees which virtually removes them from a loyalty to America and the ideals we hold mutually as Americans.

In the realm of peacemaking the U. N. is a failure.

The U. N. made a declaration which was supposed to bring peace in Iran. In open defiance the Soviet Government refused to withdraw its troops from this country.

The U. N. attempted to solve a crisis in Greece. The U. N. representatives were not even permitted to cross the Grecian border. Instead, American general, James Van Fleet, and American money helped put down a Communist-inspired movement which came in part from Yugoslavia.

The U. N. declared a cease-fire in the U.N.-sanctioned State of Israel. Both sides here have continued to shoot at will despite the U. N.

America's U. N. allies in Korea, whose military contribution Gen. Mark Clark described as "piddling," were part of the reason for America's only military defeat as a nation. It was U. N.-inspired reasons which prohibited bombing north of the Yalu and prevented the blowing up of the bridges crossing this strategic river.

Further, Russia, a member of the U. N., took sides against the U. N. but has never been asked to leave the organization. Russia's continued role in the organization is sufficient in itself to cause America to withdraw.

When communism reared its ugly head in Guatemala, the only reason a great military disaster did not overtake American interests there is because Col. Castillo Armas, leader in Guatemala, refused to obey the U. N. advice.

At present, despite efforts made by the chief of the U. N., Dag Hammarskjold, American airmen are held prisoner in Red China, and a strong movement is underway for Red China to be admitted into the U. N.

Now to history:

The U. N. idea is not new. It has been tried repeatedly as a cure for war. More than 150 known attempts have been made to unite the world in a single political and economic entity to secure the peace. These date from the time of the great Pharaoh Menes, who succeeded in uniting the upper and lower Nile Valleys, down to the present time. They include the efforts of the great Chinese dictator Shi Huang-ti, Nebuchadnezzar in Babylon with its great tower of Babel, Alexander the Great, the union of the Greek city states under Theseus, the Great Roman Empire, the Napoleonic conquests, the Mongol and Tartar hordes under Genghis Khan and Tammerlane, and can include the efforts of Germany in World Wars I and II, together with the efforts of Hirohito, Mussolini, and many other one-worlders. These men were always for peace, because they told their followers that they were. The results of their efforts every schoolboy knows.

There was, beginning in 1898, what could be called the "modern" effort to form One World. It was instigated by the czar of Russia and culminated in the Hague Convention, World War I, the Kellogg-Briand pacts, the League of Nations, World War II, the United Nations, Korea \* \* \* and the brink of world war III, which is where we now stand.

Every single one of these efforts has failed to bring peace. But please note. There is no purpose whatsoever in the United Nations if it cannot bring peace. Peace is what we need on this planet more than any other single commodity.

Why have all these efforts at bringing peace failed? Why has the U. N. failed, and why will it continue to fail despite any attempts to patch it up and make it work?

Here is the philosophy:

Ladies and gentlemen, we must learn to understand the tools we use. We know that a shovel is a tool, and as such it does not transmit messages. We know that a radio station is a tool and as such it does not dig ditches. Every tool has been designed for a specific task. The United Nations is a tool, just as each government member of it is a tool. Let us examine this tool to see if it has been properly designed and can reasonably be expected to perform the task assigned to it. Because it must be apparent by now, that when mankind so longs for peace and is willing to go to tremendous lengths to get it, all the efforts of the past as well as today's efforts must be in error if we are not on the way to achieving our goal.

What is the United Nations? It is a union of various member governments. What are these governments? They are all of them instruments of force. What is government except force? The very meaning of the word "government" has to do with compulsion \* \* \* force.

All governments seek and win obedience through three devices. First they have consent from the governed. When that fails, they resort to threats. When the threats fail, they use force. There is no exception to these facts in all of history. Force is a logical extension of political power. Governments understand force. It is their natural function. Every effort in history to create world peace has been made by government. But all governments are instruments of force. Force cannot be used to bring peace. The use of force not only leads to war, it is war.

Thank you.

Senator SPARKMAN. The next witness is Mr. Howard L. Wallace.

Mr. GOOD. Following Mr. Wallace, the next witness will be Mrs. Sidney Milstein.

Senator SPARKMAN. Mr. Wallace, we are glad to have you with us.

Mr. WALLACE. I am glad to be here, sir.

Senator SPARKMAN. Proceed, sir.