

THE UNITED NATIONS:
THE IMAGE VS. THE REALITY

In examining the UN, we are faced with the problem of distinguishing between what the UN is and what most Americans think it is. The average American knows very little about the UN, but he has a set of conditioned responses to it: in his mind he might see the late Eleanor Roosevelt distributing milk to the natives; or Adlai Stevenson muttering high-type phrases about world brotherhood; or he beholds the benign countenance of that lover of mankind, U Thant, former Burmese High School teacher, working so hard for world peace at the paltry yearly salary of \$70,000 tax free. In addition to these lovely images, he associates such words as veto, nyet, Security Council, General Assembly, budget, membership, Congo, etc. It is all a big jumble which makes no real sense to him. To the average American, the UN is a series of impressions, feelings and responses, and that's about all.

But what happens when you decide to ask yourself what is the UN? Well, in order to define anything you have to take a good look at it. And after you've examined it, you must then use words to characterize it. Well, after having taken a good look at the UN, here is about as good a definition as I can come up with:

"The UN is a socialistically oriented quasi-world government, conceived by an internationalist clique and run by a coalition of political criminals, Western socialists and statistes, whose goal it is to impose by force over all of mankind a world totalitarian government."

Does that sound like an unfair or inaccurate definition? Well, let's

examine it. Let's take the first part: "The UN is a socialistically oriented quasi-world government." Is it socialistically oriented? Well, all of its three Secretary Generals have been Socialists: Trygve Lie, a Norwegian Socialist; Dag Hammarskjold, a Swedish Socialist; and U Thant, a Burmese Marxist. All have espoused the general doctrine of socialism. Mr. U Thant is perhaps the most outspoken Marxist to occupy the top seat in the UN. He shares the view of the Swedish Socialist Gunnar Myrdal that the Marxist class struggle can be applied to nations as well as to social classes. For example, in a speech he gave at Upsala, in which he presented his scheme for a "United Nations Development Decade," U Thant said: "The concept of taxing the rich according to their capacity to pay, in order to cater to the poor according to their needs, is now well established as a simple canon of social justice in all democratic countries. It requires only a little imagination to lift this concept to a higher plane, namely the international plane, and to extend ~~its~~ its scope from the country to the universe." In other words, the Marxist concept: from each according to his ability to each according to his need can now be applied among nations. So now we can expect a world income tax, and which nation do you think will be in the ninety per cent bracket?

In unmistakably Marxist dialectical terms U Thant has said: "I believe very strongly in the Hegelian concept of Thesis, Anti-thesis and Synthesis . . . I believe in the march of humanity towards a synthesis." That, of course, is the essence of Dialectical Materialism, in which the thesis is supposed to be Communism, the anti-thesis capitalism, and the synthesis something ^{analogous} ~~analogous~~ to Nelson Rockefeller.

Concerning individual rights, of which we Americans are so concerned,

U Thant has said: "The individual has to submit to the rules laid down by the authorities, and every one of us has to pay this price as a condition of living. . . . The sovereignty of each of us is limited to what is necessary in the interest of the Community. . . ." That concept, of course, is totally contradictory to the concept of individual rights which is the heart and soul of our system. To the Founding Fathers, a government's function was to protect individual rights. To U. Thant, the interest of the Community--which usually turns out to be whatever the government says it is--supercedes all individual rights. That is pure collectivism. You'll no doubt also be interested to know that U Thant's personal assistant at the UN is a Soviet national by the name of Victor Lessiovski, who holds the position of Personal Assistant to the Secretary General. So, between a Marxist as Secretary-General and a Communist as his assistant, there isn't much room for free enterprise.

Let us continue with our definition. "The UN is a socialistically oriented quasi-world government." By quasi-world government, I mean that it is sort of, almost, not quite a world government, but most certainly aspires to be one. Now there is some confusion in the minds of most Americans as to whether the UN is an organization dedicated merely to collective security, or an organization which intends to become a World Government. To those confused Americans let me say that in the minds of the men who conceived of and created the UN there has never been any confusion whatever; their goal was and still is world government wherein every nation, including our own, will be required to give up its independence and sovereignty and submit to the will of whoever runs the world government. If you read the autobiographies, the diaries, the speeches of the men who were busily creating the UN, you will find with no exceptions that

their goal is world government.

"The UN is a socialistically oriented quasi-world government, conceived by an internationalist clique." An internationalist clique. Does such a clique exist and did it conceive the United Nations? Most people, of course, have the benign impression that the UN just grew spontaneously out of the war, a sort of joint allied venture, the result of suddenly everyone having the same idea at the same time. Nothing could be farther from the truth. In the first place, nothing, but nothing, in politics is spontaneous. Political events are human events, and there is a mind behind every human event.

Anyone who starts to investigate the origins of the UN discovers that the clique which set the UN wheels in motion as early as 1939 was essentially the same clique which had created the League of Nations twenty years earlier in 1919.

And the man behind the League of Nations was ~~none~~ none other than the ubiquitous Col. Edward M. House, ^{that} ~~the~~ master conspirator of all time, who engineered Woodrow Wilson into the White House in 1912. You will find that it is virtually impossible to understand what is going on today without studying that crucial period in our history--for the Wilson Administration opened the floodgates of our Government to so many do-gooders, idealists and humanitarians that we shall continue to suffer the consequences of it for a good many years to come.

Now, Col. House was the most unspontaneous of gentlemen. A born schemer, he had fully worked out his plan for creating a socialist dictatorship in this country. The plan was published in 1912 as a novel, entitled Philp Drue Administrator. Wilson read it and ~~approved~~ approved of it. Now, while House only vaguely hinted about a Comity of Nations in his book, it wasn't until 1915 that the concept of a League of Nations as such was mentioned.

Now anyone who studies the doings of a man like Col. House can hardly

believe that a man of his incredible conspiratorial talents was working alone. I make this point, because Prof. Charles Seymour, editor of the Intimate Papers of Colonel House, is not too clear as to who had the idea of a League of Nations first--Col. House or Sir Edward Grey, the British Foreign Secretary. It seems that House and Grey had been exchanging letters during 1915, and House had suggested to Grey that the United States might be willing to intervene on the Allied side if the Allies agreed to the setting up of a League of Nations after the war. House then proceeded to snow Wilson on the idea. Prior to this Wilson had had a very lukewarm interest in international affairs, but after listening to House he began to see himself as some sort of messiah who was going to save mankind from all future wars. And so, Wilson immediately sent House to Europe to work out the terms of our intervention.

It wasn't entirely easy. It was the first time in history that a nation had offered to get into a war for no other reason than to "serve civilization." It didn't matter how many American men would be sacrificed for this idealist mush, so long as the "humanitarians" got their League of Nations.

Now, coincidental with the events just described, other events of relevant significance were also taking place. For example, in 1913 Mr. Rockefeller had created his Foundation, with the motto "The Well Being of Mankind Throughout the World" and a globe as its symbol. The well being of America, to which Mr. Rockefeller owed his fortune, was not enough. He had to take on all of mankind, which meant that his Foundation would have to operate on a world-wide basis. Now among the first trustees of the Foundation were John D. Rockefeller himself, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Frederick Gates, who was the old man's

intimate adviser and Jerome D. Greene, a Rockefeller representative.

Now, one of the earliest trustees elected to the Foundation was Harry Emerson Fosdick, the ultra-liberal Protestant clergyman, who had met Frederick Gates in 1913 and was asked to become a trustee of the Foundation in 1916. Harry's brother, Raymond Fosdick, had met John D. Rockefeller, Jr., in 1910, and Junior was so taken with Raymond's talents, that he sent Raymond to Europe ~~in~~ 1913 on a special mission.

Now both Fosdicks were personal friends of Woodrow Wilson whom Col. House had put into the White House in 1912. Raymond Fosdick tells us that he first met Col. House in 1914 when they went to Europe on the same boat. In his autobiography, Raymond writes:

. . . because we shared a common interest in Woodrow Wilson I saw a good deal of him (Col. House) not only during the trip, but later both in Berlin and at his apartment on East 66th street in New York.

And so, up to the time that House and Wilson began plotting to get us into the war, we can safely say that there had already come into being an interesting relationship between Col. House, Wilson, the Fosdicks, Gates and the Rockefellers.

Soon after the war broke out in 1914, Raymond Fosdick undertook a survey of the American police system for Mr. Rockefeller. Mr. Rockefeller must have been very interested in the police, for Fosdick tells us: "In the course of the inquiry I visited every city in the United States with a population of 100,000 or over." His brother, Harry, on the other hand, was busy preaching.

In his autobiography, he writes:

From the beginning of the war in Europe in 1914 I had been increasingly anxious that we should get into it. . . . To be sure, I had long been a peace advocate after the fashion of the mid-Victorian liberals, taking it for granted that war, among with other evils, was bound to be outgrown, until at last

. . . the battle flags are furl'd

In the Parliament of man, the Federation
of the world.

When war actually came, however, I was all for it.

And so we have Harry, agitating from the pulpit for war, rewarded in 1916 with a post in the Rockefeller Foundation, while House and Wilson were both planning to get us in. Of course, Wilson ran for re-election in 1916 with the campaign slogan "He kept us out of War." But lying to the American people is no sin to a Democratic candidate. The simple truth is that both House and Wilson criminally deceived and defrauded the American people and got away with it.

In 1917, of course, we entered the war. Harry Emerson Fosdick--by now a Rockefeller Foundation trustee--was already doing his bit. In his autobiography he writes:

When we formerly entered the combat but while the spirit of the people was still limp and spathetic, I stumped New York State with a team of speakers . . . whipping up the enthusiasm of great audiences to

get into the fight. To be sure, I pleaded for world federation as the ultimate hope. I was for a league of nations before there was a League.

No sooner were we in the war, than Col. House started making plans for his League of Nations. He chose his brother-in-law, Sidney Mezes, President of the City College of New York, to organize a study committee which would draw up proposals to be submitted at the Paris Peace Conference. Mezes proceeded to comb the academic world for the most liberal, do-gooder, humanitarian eggheads he could find. Among the recruits were: James T. Shotwell of Columbia, Charles H. Haskins of Harvard, Charles Seymour of Yale, Stanley Hornbeck of Wisconsin, Archibald Coolidge of Harvard, Isaiah Bowman of Johns Hopkins, and also Elihu Root, George Louis Beer--"a gentleman of leisure who had for years devoted himself to scholarship"--and Walter Lippmann, who became Dr. Mezes' Secretary and the Committee's liaison with Col. House. Lippmann, a young Fabian Socialist recently out of Harvard, had already formulated a plan for world government in his book The Stakes of Diplomacy, which had been published in 1915. Concerning Lippmann's important role, ~~Seymour~~ Sir William Wiseman wrote: "It is my impression that Lippmann furnished the abstract ideas which found their way into a good many of the memoranda of the American delegation and ultimately into some of Pres. Wilson's speeches." In 1918, this whole crowd, oozing socialism from every pore, went to Paris with the U. S. Delegation, which included Wilson, House, Thomas W. Lamont, Felix Frankfurter, Christian Herter, John Foster Dulles, Raymond B. Fosdick and a host of other idealists and humanitarians.

James T. Shotwell kept a very interesting diary during that period. Here are a few excerpts which give an idea of what was going on:

March 19, 1919

Evening -- Out to Max Lazard's for dinner with Mr. Barnes, taking Beer along to the Majestic, where I had to refuse an invitation to dine with Miss Gertrude Bell, the Arabian explorer, whom Colonel Lawrence had invited me to meet with Beer. A quiet family party at Lazard's which we left early to come home to a reception in the Crillon by Colonel House to which all the big dignitaries were invited, but as it was pretty late before I got to the hotel, we passed in one swinging door while Lloyd George passed out the other, and upstairs Balfour was getting into his coat. Instead of going in, I spent the rest of the evening with Beer in his room.

This is what 100,000 American men had paid for with their lives. You can be sure that the young professor Shotwell had a ball. The Lazard family Shotwell was so chummy with was the French end of the internationalist clique. Beer, of course, was George Louis Beer, one of House's closest advisers described by Shotwell as "a gentleman of leisure, who had for years devoted himself to scholarship." Colonel Lawrence, of course, was none other than Lawrence of Arabia. It should be noted in passing here, that one of the major benefits the Rockefellers derived from our intervention in the war was British agreement to permit the Rockefellers to move into the Persian Gulf.

Another entry from Shotwell's diary:

2. 10
March 28, 1919

Dinner with Lincoln Steffens, Young and Taussig. Steffens is straight Back from Russia, where he was sent with Bullitt to talk to Lenin. Of all evenings in Paris, this was as interesting as any I have spent. As between extreme nationalists as they paint themselves and Bolsheviks as Steffens paints them, give me Bolsheviks.

Dr. Shotwell's views concerning the Bolsheviks was no doubt shared by many of his colleagues in Paris, all of whom were so anxious to send 100,000 American men to their deaths in order "to save the world for democracy." Lincoln Steffens, whom House had sent to Russia on this mission, became a notorious apologist for Leninist terror.

Well, then, you might say, that was 1919 when a lot of people were making the same mistake about the Bolsheviks. Dr. Shotwell must have changed his opinion later on. Well, years later, after Hiss, with whom he had worked, had been exposed, Shotwell wrote:

On the retirement of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler from the presidency of the Carnegie Endowment, John Foster Dulles, chairman of the Board of Trustees, nominated Mr. Hiss for the position. He had a brilliant record in Washington. . . . (A)s assistant Secretary of State he was assigned the important task of organizing the San Francisco Conference for the creation of the United Nations. His nomination to the presidency of the Endowment was unanimously accepted by the Trustees and everything done by him as President justified that choice. Whatever Mr. Hiss may or may not have done before he came to the Endowment . . . the fact remains that

while I knew him, Mr. Hiss worked strongly and persistently against the policies of the USSR.

Which merely means of course that it is possible to be a Communist agent and still give the impression that you strongly oppose the policies of your bosses. But to Dr. Shotwell, this is offered as some sort of indication that what Alger Hiss appeared to be was far more important than what he actually was.

Here is another entry from Shotwell's diary:

June 9, 1919

Spent the day working on memoranda for Colonel House and getting my files in shape for permanent cataloguing. Learned, to my great satisfaction, that Beer has been appointed on the staff of the League of Nations in control of mandates, which will mean that he will be looking after all colonial problems and dependent peoples like those in the Near East. . . .

In the evening I ran over the plans for the new international institute with Shepardson. . . .

As the reader probably knows the Council on Foreign Relations and the Royal Institute for International Affairs were formed at the Paris Peace Conference. Both the American and British internationalist-socialist cliques had decided to coordinate their activities on a grander scale.

After the Paris Peace Conference, the mob came home to sell this bill of goods to the American people. Of course, Wilson had been so confident that the American people would accept the League that he didn't hesitate to choose the

man who would represent the United States as Under Secretary General in the Secretariat of the League. Who do you think it was? None other than Raymond B. Fosdick.

Well, the American people rejected the League, and in 1920 they threw the whole gang of humanitarians out of the White House. The humanitarians, defeated but not discouraged, began laying their plans for the future. They were going to have their world government if they had to start another World War to do it. In the meanwhile, they would begin by re-educating the American people and subverting our institutions.

Their principle means of doing this would be through the Foundations and other private organizations. They set to work to influence every area of our national life: the universities, schools, the press, business corporations, religious institutions, our political parties.

The first organization they created to carry on their internationalist work was the Council on Foreign Relations, which included many of the individuals from the Paris peace crowd who had conceived it. To promote America's entry into the League of Nations, Raymond Fosdick founded the League of Nations News Bureau in the fall of 1920. Then, in 1923 he created the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association, the forerunner of the present-day American Association for the United Nations. Fosdick served on the Executive Committee of that organization until 1938. During this entire period he was not only a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, but also its President from 1936 to 1948, the crucial years during which the UN was organized and developed.

During its years of existence the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association

was supported by the World Peace Foundation, the Foreign Policy Association and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the foundation of which Alger Hiss became president. Also, one of the men on the Educational Committee of the League of Nations Association, serving with Foadick, was Stephen P. Duggan, who was also a Director of the Council on Foreign Relations, of which Foadick was a member. Duggan's son, Laurence, later turned out to be a Soviet agent. He accidentally fell out of a window in 1948 after being questioned by the FBI. Laurence Duggan, curiously enough, as Director of Inter-American Affairs in the State Department had been Nelson Rockefeller's boss when Nelson was also working in that department during the early forties.

During the twenties, the Rockefellers began to associate themselves more and more openly with the cause of world government. Hitherto, they themselves had remained in the background while their associates did all the agitating, but in 1924 John D. Jr. had reached the point where he could address a group of foreign students in New York with these words: "May it come to pass that some day . . . no one will speak of 'my country', but all will speak of 'our world.'"

In 1931 the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association held a convention in Chicago. Some of the men who addressed the Convention were Clark M. Eichelberger, James T. Shotwell, Raymond Foadick and Ivy Lee. Here were some of the ideas expressed at the convention.

Prof. Quincy Wright said the following:

"It is in the elementary schools that the attitude of the great mass of people toward international affairs is permanently shaped. Mass education, however, depends upon the education of teachers who write elementary textbooks and teach in elementary schools."

George W. Morgan, a delegate from St. Paul, said:

"Yesterday you heard two splendid talks at luncheon. One of them emphasized the desirability of no pussyfooting, and the other spoke of the inevitability of gradualness. . . .

"It is singular that patience so rarely accompanies enthusiasm or enthusiasm patience. This, we must recognize, is not a fight of a day or for a period. We must not lose our enthusiasm, and we must possess ourselves in patience, because the walls of Jericho won't fall simply for the sound of the trumpets. We must lay the foundation."

Raymond B. Fosdick told the convention:

"The primary objective for which this organization was created was to get the United States into the League of Nations. . . . And in the carrying out of that purpose we apologize to nobody. We are not ashamed of that platform. We do not intend to whittle it down to suit anybody's convenience or purposes. We stand for the League of Nations and that is the flag that we have nailed to the masthead."

Now, one of the distinguished speakers at the convention was Ivy Lee, John D. Rockefeller, Jr.'s own public relations man. Lee had been to Russia in 1927 and wrote a book about his trip. You would have to ^{read} ~~know~~ it to believe it. The theme of the book is that Communism is mellowing. Let me quote a few passages. For example, in describing the most despotic government in history, Mr. Lee wrote the following:

The Government of Russia is in some ways organized like that of New York City. There is the nominal government, presided over by the various heads of departments or "commissars," and behind it is the hidden government of the Communist Party, just as in a sense there is the real government of New York City ~~not~~ in Tammany Hall. Stalin, as the head of the Communist Party, is the "Charlie Murphy" of Russia, and he has many characteristics of the late Mr. Murphy, the chief of them being that he works silently and away from the public gaze.

In describing the monstrous gangster Stalin, Mr. Lee wrote:

(Stalin) is said to derive his power from his excellent ability as a party organizer, from the fact that all of the leaders of the party trust him, and from the further fact that his judgment upon policies is regarded as sound.

Mr. Lee was hardly an expert judge of character. In describing Stalin's policies, he wrote:

Stalin, who was a great admirer of Lenin, believes that the existence of the Soviet Government does not depend upon the dictatorship of labor but depends on the support of the peasants, and he therefore is said to be doing his utmost to depart in many instances from simple socialistic doctrines, and to encourage capitalistic enterprise when capitalism can provide the peasants with cheap products.

Of course, Stalin was soon to exterminate the Kulaks, the independent peasants, in one of the most horrible mass murders in history.

Well, do you think that Messrs. Fosdick, Lee or Rockefeller ever learned from their so-called errors of judgment? Was their softness on Communism deliberate or unintentional? Well, we shall see.

One of the most important organizations founded by this clique was the Institute of Pacific Relations. This innocent sounding outfit, which would effect the lives of every American, was created in 1925 for the usual reasons-- international understanding, public enlightenment and the exchange of information. However, its actual purposes were far more sinister, purposes which the American people would not learn about until 1952 after the damage had already been done.

The usual names were also associated with it. Among the members of the Executive Committee were Jerome D. Greene of the Rockefeller Foundation, Thomas W. Lamont, better known for his son Corliss who has been one of the most outspoken pro-Communists in the country, Stephen Duggan, whose son Laurence was a Soviet agent, and our old friend James T. Shotwell.

Among the membership, the Paris Peace crowd was well represented by Isaiah Bowman, Christian Herter, Stanley Hornbeck, Walter Lippmann, Whitney Shepardson and Quincy Wright. Other members included Ivy Lee, Henry R. Luce of Time, Life & Fortune, and Mrs. John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Reads like the roster of a Republican convention, doesn't it.

However, as years went on the IPR became so obviously Red that Elizabeth Bentley, the famous Communist courier who defected, testified that her superior in the Soviet espionage apparatus warned her to stay away from the IPR because "it was as red as a rose, and you shouldn't touch it with a ten-foot pole." Despite this, the Rockefeller Foundation continued to pour money into the IPR right through the period of the investigation. What was the reaction of Jerome

D. Greene, Rockefeller Foundation trustee and founder of the IPR when the lid was blown off? He discounted with unconcealed contempt the testimony of ex-Communists who had worked hand in hand in the Communist movement with some of the officials and workers in the IPR.

However, we are a little ahead of our story. Let us return to the period just prior to the outbreak of World War II. As events in Europe were pointing toward war and the League of Nations was falling apart, our clique lost no time in planning the post-war substitute. And so the League of Nations Non-Partisan Association closed its doors and was succeeded by a new organization called the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, which was to be the spearhead of the internationalist clique in forming the United Nations. Here is how the Commission got started. I quote from its Report published in 1949:

During the winter of 1938-39 when the structure of international peace symbolized and embodied in the League of Nations broke down before the armed aggression of the Axis Powers, it became clear to thoughtful people everywhere that the time had come for a thorough and comprehensive study of an international organization which would be necessary for the establishment of a lasting peace.

. . . After preliminary discussions during the late summer and early fall of 1939, the plan for a Commission to Study the Organization of Peace began to take shape. The initiative was taken by Dr. James T. Shotwell and Mr. Clark M. Eichelberger, respectively President and Director of the League of Nations Association.

The outbreak of war in Europe in early September, 1939, which was

already threatening to become a second World War, made it doubly imperative that the strategy of peace should be studied by a body sufficiently independent of other affiliations so that it could review the past without prejudice and build upon the history of the League of Nations plans for an organization of lasting peace.

It was with this thought in mind that Dr. Shotwell and Mr. Eichelberger invited some 50 persons to serve as a panel of experts on a long-term project of study and discussion. In response to this invitation, a first meeting was held in New York City in Nov. 1939 at which the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace took final shape.

And so, there we were, virtually in the same position our country found itself in 1915. A clique of schemers frothing at the mouth for World Government which could only be obtained if we entered the war.

How was this to be accomplished? Well, there was the Institute of Pacific Relations just made for the job. Through Communist agents in the IPR connected with the Sorge spy ring in Japan, everything was beautifully worked out so that Japan would be provoked into attacking us at Pearl Harbor. If you have any trouble believing this fantastic story of betrayal, read Major General Willoughby's Shanghai Conspiracy.

Well, as expected, the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace had some of the same old names and many new ones. Time had taken its toll. Some familiar names in its membership included: John Foster Dulles, Philip C. Jessup, Grayson Kirk, Thomas W. Lamont, Owen Lattimore, Max Lerner, Claude Pepper, Daniel A. Poling and Sumner Welles.

Each year the Commission has issued a Report outlining a policy to be followed by the United States. In almost every case the recommendations of this private clique have become the policy of the State Department. Surprising? Why should it be? The Council on Foreign Relations took over the State Department a long time ago, and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace is simply another division of the CFR.

The Commission's Report of July, 1962, incidentally, recommended the admission of Red China into the UN.

At the San Francisco Conference in 1945 it was like old times again. Forty-seven members of the Commission--America's best-financed humanitarians--served in official or consultant capacities at the Conference. Its officers, we are told, took an influential part in the consultants meetings and its Chairman, none other than our old friend James T. Shotwell, was recognized as the "Dean of the Consultants" and presided over their meetings.

And so we had another Paris Peace Festival--paid for by the lives of 400,000 Americans--this time in San Francisco, with Soviet agent Alger Hiss acting as Secretary General. And who do you think was Alger Hiss's assistant? Why, none other than Dorothy Fossick, Raymond's daughter.

But the climax of the clique's efforts came on December 12, 1946, when the newspapers announced that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., had plunked down \$8,500,000 to provide the UN with its home in Manhattan. You have to love world government an awful lot to spend \$8,500,000 on it. Oh yes, it was Nelson who had suggested the plan to his Daddy and worked out the real estate details.

And now you know why Nelson is so upset over those extremists who want to convert that lovely UN building into another Hilton Hotel.

But let us continue with our definition.

"The UN is a socialistically oriented quasi-world government, conceived by an interantionalist clique and run by a coalition of political criminals and Western socialists and statistes." A coalition of political criminals and Western socialists and statistes. Political criminals: a criminal is someone who deliberately and willfully violates the individual rights of others. A political criminal is a criminal who uses political devices--that is, the instruments of state--to deliberately and willfully violate the individual rights of others. What are these rights? Our Declaration of Independence refers to them as man's inalienable rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Well, the Communist members of the UN have deprived millions of individuals of their lives. Every day, in every Communist country, men are murdered for one political reason or another. They are murdered for disagreeing with the system, for trying to escape, for so-called crimes against the State. As for the deprivation of liberty, I need not go into the long history of Communist tyranny and its absolute violation and abridgment of every fundamental individual liberty. The pursuit of happiness, of course, entails the pursuit of one's economic goals. Under Communists, you can only pursue the goals you are told to pursue. And so, the first part of the coalition running the UN are the political criminals who call themselves Communists. The next part are the Western Socialialists and Statists--referring of course to men like the late Dag Hammarskjold, and others who run the UN--and Americans like Adlai Stevenson who call themselves liberals but are really statistes, that is, men committed philosophically and ideologically to the idea that the individual is subordinate to the state and that the interests of the community supercede individual rights.

Now, I imagine that there are a few people in the UN somewhere who believe

in the principles expounded by the Founders of our country--but their views are not the prevalent ones, and they do not run the organization.

Now this coalition between political criminals and Western socialists and statistis is the principle reason why the UN is, unfortunately and regrettably, rotten to the core. No good can conceivably come out of such an organization, and any honest man who thinks he can do business with criminals has merely to examine the record of the UN for proof that it is impossible.

Let us start from the beginning. Roosevelt decided that the UN had to include the Communists for the sake of preserving post-war Allied unity. But considering the basic antagonism between our way of life and their's, it certainly was inviting trouble and frustration. The first thing that happened was that the Soviet Union demanded four votes to our one in the General Assembly. Well, we held our ground and gave them only three votes to our one. On what basis? No objective basis whatever. We were so anxious to team up with the criminals that we were ~~ix~~ willing to let them perform their first robbery on us with our consent.

But nowhere has the impracticality, the immorality, the sheer perverseness of the idea that honest men can cohabit with criminals demonstrated than in the Korean War.

Here, we had joined with the Communists in an organization to prevent war. Yet, on June 24, 1950, five years after the Soviet Union had affixed its signature to the UN Charter, it ordered the North Koreans to invade South Korea. Now, the Soviet Union and its satellites were members of the United Nations. The natural and proper thing to have done at that moment would have been for the United Nations to have expelled the Communist nations from the organization. But no. Picture this ridiculous situation as stated by President Truman: "United Nations forces

in Korea are engaged in repelling the aggressions committed against the Republic of Korea and against the United Nations." Now if Russia and its satellites were members of the United Nations, and participating in its deliberations, and its nationals holding positions within the Secretariat, what, in essence, Truman was saying was: "United Nations forces in Korea are engaged in repelling the aggression committed by other United Nations forces against the Republic of Korea and against the United Nations." In other words, the United Nations had committed an aggression against the United Nations.

Now this would be funny if it did not involve the lives of 50,000 young Americans in Korea, young people like those on our campuses who are taught to love the UN and are ^{then} ~~are~~ cannon fodder of such incredible folly. The liberal college student can enjoy the luxury of being for the United Nations and ridicule those so-called right-wing extremists who want to get us out of this trap, but then he ought not to complain when he is chosen to be the instrument of UN policies. In the great scheme of Mr. U Thant's march toward the synthesis, the lives of college students mean nothing at all. It may mean everything to the student, but it means nothing to the men running the show.

Well, we went to war with the Communists still in the UN. Which meant that the Communists knew exactly how the war was being waged. After all, being members of the UN they had a right to know what the UN was doing in Korea.

Now from the very time the UN was founded, Soviet nationals have served as members of the Secretary General's staff, and in 1958, when the Bang-Jensen case was in the news, a memorandum submitted by the International League of the Rights of Man stated the following:

"So long as Soviet nationals are members of the Secretary General's personal

staff or serve directly under him, there is always the risk that confidential information in the office of the Secretary General which is desired by the Soviet Government will find its way into their hands."

Now the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which investigated the Bang-Jensen affair, had this to say:

"It has been more or less established--and certainly it is confirmed by the record of appointments--that the Big Five, at the London Conference, agreed that the ~~post~~ position of Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs should be held by a Soviet national."

Trygve Lie explained how this came about in his Memoirs:

"That the Soviet Union wanted one of its nationals to fill the most important Assistant Secretaryship should be taken as another indication of serious Soviet interest in the United Nations; and that the United States was willing to agree to accord this key post to a national of the U.S.S.R. was evidence of an American desire to encourage this interest for the sake of world peace. Mr. Stettinius confirmed to me that he had agreed with the Soviet delegation in the matter.

"The preservation of international peace and security was the organization's highest responsibility, and it was to entrusting the direction of the Secretariat department most concerned with this to a Soviet national that the Americans had agreed. What did the Americans want for themselves? To my surprise, they did not ask for a department concerned with comparable substantive affairs, like the economic or the social. Rather Mr. Stettinius proposed that an American citizen be appointed Assistant Secretary General for Administrative and Financial Services."

In other words, the Soviets would run the most important aspects of the UN and we would pay the bills.

The Report issued by the Senate Committee of the Judiciary further tells us:

"Although, as Mr. Lie pointed out, there was nothing to indicate that the agreement was either binding or of indefinite duration, the fact remains that, with the sole exception of Dr. Protitch (a Yugoslav), the position of Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs has always been held by a Soviet national. Dr. Protitch's three immediate predecessors were Arkady Sobolev, Constantine Zinchenko and Ilya S. Tschernychev." The position is presently held by Vladimir P. Suslov of the U. S. S. R.

Mr. J. Anthony Panuch, Bang-Jensen's counsel, testified as follows:

"The UN operates through its Secretariat. Employees of the Secretariat are recruited, according to certain ratios, from the member states of the UN. They, in UN theory, are supposed to be international civil servants. Also, in UN theory, Secretariat employees are presumed to owe their political and ideological allegiance to the UN Secretariat, and not to the UN member state of which they are citizens and nationals.

"This situation has resulted in a curious and dangerous state of affairs:

"1. In the case of Secretariat employees from non-Communist countries, U.N. employment policy has strongly favored those who hold no positive political or ideological views in the Cold War. This has brought about the ~~recruit~~ recruitment of "neutralists" or politically "uncommitted" personnel, who have no convictions as to the merits of policy conflicts between East and West.

"2. On the other hand, with respect to recruitment of Secretariat employees from the Sino-Soviet orbit of influence, it is tacitly assumed that all are Communist, that some are probably agents; that, whatever their classification, they will utilize their privileged position in the U.N. Secretariat to further the ends of Sino-Soviet policy."

(At this point I go into the composition of the Secretariat, describing what trouble I had to go through to get this information which is supposed to be available to the public. I usually give this part of my talk extemporaneously, but I will write it up for the printed version. The completion of the definition will take an additional five pages. Most of it has already been written but I am revising it.) This will bring ~~this~~ the chapter to about 35 typewritten pages.)