REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

RESOLUTIONS

RELATIVE TO REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, ATLANTIC UNION, WORLD FEDERATION, ETC.

FEBRUARY 2, 3, 6, 8, 9, 13, 15, 17, AND 20, 1950

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
64429 WASHINGTON : 1950

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

TOM CONNALLY, Texas, *Chairman*

WALTER F. GEORGE, Georgia
ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah
MILLARD E. TYDINGS, Maryland
CLAUDE PEPPER, Florida
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut
J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan
ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey
BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa
HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., Massachusetts

FRANCIS O. WILCOX, *Chief of Staff*
CARL MARCY, *Staff Associate*
C. C. O'DAY, *Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah, *Chairman*

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Rhode Island
BRIEN McMAHON, Connecticut

ALEXANDER WILEY, Wisconsin
H. ALEXANDER SMITH, New Jersey

CONTENTS

Well might he have added that we were, in addition, the greatest productive Nation in the world; the Nation where the individual citizen enjoyed the greatest degree of individual liberty, of prosperity, and of happiness.

That was undoubtedly our world position at that time, and, except as that position has been weakened by exorbitant aid given to other nations, by legislation and Executive order curtailing our individual freedom, it so remains.

OBJECTIVES OF WORLD ORGANIZATION

Objectives of world organization: To end war, to establish peace, to give to individuals throughout the world the same opportunity, the same degree of freedom, which our citizens enjoy—all desirable objectives—it is now proposed that the United States of America forsake its established form of government, surrender at least a part of its sovereignty and join some world-wide organization, sometimes called a United States of the World, sometimes referred to as Atlantic Union, as a United Nations of the World, sometimes designated as Union Now.

However desirable the objectives of the proposed organization, however sincere and patriotic in thought and purpose be the intent of those who advocate our participation in such an organization—and their patriotism and sincerity is not questioned—the result, in my opinion, and that is all anyone can express, however dogmatic may be his assertions—the result would be similar to the purpose of the Communists, who advocate the overthrow of our Government by force—the end of our existence as a nation of free people.

It is matter of common knowledge that the Constitution has given to the individual citizen of the United States the greatest degree of individual liberty, of freedom of action, of equality of opportunity, of material prosperity, enjoyed by anyone anywhere.

Proof? One need but to compare the lot of our average citizen with the status of the average citizen in any other part of the world. If further evidence is needed, it is found in the desire of so many people of so many other nations to come to our land, subject themselves to our laws, obtain the benefits of our form of government.

Until recently, except as the curtailment of the liberty of the individual citizen has been made necessary in order to protect all members of our society, men here may go his way free to act as he will.

It is quite true that, in perhaps the last 10 or 15 years, the liberty and the freedom of action guaranteed by the Constitution have been materially impaired by restrictive laws, sustained by the Supreme Court.

Some of those laws, like the Wagner Act, curtailed the liberty of members of one group while giving special privileges and consideration to members of another group. Members of one group have had their incomes increased at the expense of members of another group whose property has been taken from them without just compensation.

Nevertheless, on the whole, it is still true that, here in the United States of America, the average citizen enjoys a greater degree of personal freedom than elsewhere.

Likewise, it is yet true that the average individual here enjoys a greater degree of prosperity than does the citizen of any other land.

If the statement of Mr. Churchill made in 1944, that we were then the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world—and concededly we than were, and concededly we were then also the most productive nation in all the world—even though we have since fallen behind in military might—we still have—our people have—the ability, the resourcefulness, the courage and the endurance, if they be not betrayed from within, to successfully defend our national integrity, protect our future from aggression from whatever source it may come.

To doubt that is to doubt we still possess the characteristics of our people which have made us great, to admit that, instead of having advanced, our people have retrograded; that we of today have less of courage, of ability and determination, than had our forefathers.

No truer words were ever spoken than those uttered by Abraham Lincoln when speaking at Springfield, Ill., of the danger to our Republic, said, and I quote:

> At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide.

ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF PROPOSALS

The proposal: Stripped of deceptive and confusing language, the present proposals, naked, stand forth as a clear attempt to induce us to scrap our Constitution, surrender our sovereignty, our right to plot our course in world affairs—surrender our national independence, become a part—but only a minor part—of a world organization.

Strange and unfortunate is it that there are those among us who have so little faith in the principles enunciated in the Constitution, in the capabilities of our people in our resourcefulness, in our idealism, that they would surrender our sovereignty, haul down the Stars and Stripes, and cravenly seek protection under the banner of a federation of nations which deny equality, liberty of action, freedom of expression, to their own people; which have all too often, as shown by history, been quarrelsome and war seeking.

It matters not what be the name of the proposed world organization. The intent and purpose of those who advocate our becoming a member of such an organization is that we join with other nations in forming a new world-wide supergovernment.

Of necessity it follows that that world government be supreme; that to it we and our people, in common with other nations and peoples, must owe allegiance to, yield obedience to its rules, regulations, and laws.

In this proposed organization hereinafter referred to as the United Nations of the World, we would be but one of several members. The other nations, if history be accurate, are intensely nationalistic, jealous of their rights, resentful of any invasion of their territory, antagonistic to any disagreement with the religious views of their people and frequently engage in war.

The issues for which, in the past, they have fought, are those with which we have but little concern unless it be conceded that the United States of America intends to extend its power throughout the world.

Had the proposals to form a world government advanced in 1941 and 1942 by Mr. Davis, by Mr. Streit, by Mr. Justice Roberts and others been carried out, we would today be a satellite of Russia.

Keeping in mind the recent spread of communism, Russia's acquisition of territory and people, the ease with which her spies find sanctuary in our State Department, in our economic life, and the gullibility, if not worse, of some of our public officials, the present danger to our Republic comes not from the threat of armed invasion but, as Mr. Lincoln said—from within—from a lack of vigilance in guarding our liberty. Our Nation can, as he suggested, commit "suicide."

Many of us recognize the present proposal that we join some form of a world organization, whatever may be the objective, the good intentions of those who advocate it, as an attempt to overthrow, or, perhaps more accurately, destroy our form of government.

I do not know the exact terms of the proposed world federation of nations. I do not know what flag its armies, its police force is to carry.

I do have a flag purchased in New York in 1941 which it was then proposed should be the flag of the world government of which we should become a subject.

The proposal then was, and the proposal now is, that we haul down the Stars and Stripes, masthead in its place an international flag.

It is evident that inasmuch as we are to be but one member of the world federation of nations, if we join our freedom of action will be destroyed.

The World Court, or the world military staff, or the world council, or whatever the governing body of the federated nations may be called, will determine the amount of our contribution to the world organization to the furtherance of its purposes. Associated as we have been with, aiding as we have, other nations which had, or claimed to have, less than we have, with the idea thoroughly established throughout the world that we are a rich people; that we have an obligation to contribute to the welfare of the rest of the world, it is evidence that an overwhelming portion of the burden of maintaining the world government, of carrying out whatever purpose or program might be by it labeled "humanitarian," would fall upon taxpayers of this Nation. That burden is beyond our ability to carry.

UNITED STATES AID CONTRIBUTIONS WOULD BE INCREASED

We have already voluntarily impoverished ourselves by our contributions of billions of dollars for foreign aid. Impaired our national defense program.

If we establish this world supergovernment, we no longer would be permitted to confine our contributions to those we wished to make, but being one of the family would be obligated not only to rehabilitate but to support all other members of our world family.

Not only would the representatives of other nations tell our taxpayers how much they should contribute in dollars and material to the welfare of the world, but they would tell us when and where to fight.

No longer would the Congress have the sole authority to declare war.

The international organization would determine that issue. No longer would our Congress decide whether or when the youth of the land was to be drafted—the international organization would determine when and how many of our young men and women should be called. Those young men and women—and the women are now in the armed services—would be under the command of officers named by the international military staff. Yes, and if the proposals of the extremists be adopted, the international organization would write the laws, make the rules under which our people should live here in America. The proposal to form a super-world organization, a statement of its objectives, that is, the provision for the peace of the world, the good of all mankind, is most alluring.

A consideration of what must inevitably happen to our freedom as individuals, our independence as a Nation, our national security, under such an organization is appalling.

The proposal is suicidal.

May I make the further request that with my testimony may be printed a summary of two talks I made on the floor of the House in January of 1942.

Senator WILEY. Do you have such a summary prepared?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have.

Senator WILEY. May I see it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not have it with me. It is in the Congressional Record. I will send over a copy.

Senator WILEY. I wanted to know about how long it is. Is it as long as this statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is perhaps two pages, I think.

Senator WILEY. It is so ordered.

(The summary referred to is as follows:)

[From the Congressional Record]

DON'T HAUL DOWN THE STARS AND STRIPES

REMARKS OF CLARE E. HOFFMAN, OF MICHIGAN, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JANUARY 27 AND 30, 1942

January 27, 1942

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise, to delete from, to extend, and to combine, for the purpose of reprinting and distribution, the remarks I made on the floor of the House on January 27 and on January 30, 1942, so that the two, as rewritten, may be printed and distributed together.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A JUDAS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, on the assumption that, following the Declaration of Independence, guided by the principles enunciated in the Constitution, our people have established here a nation where the average man enjoys a greater degree of material prosperity, intellectual advancement, and religious freedom than in any other part of the world, the people of these United States of America are fighting a war, so it is said, to carry those blessings to all other people.

That war, the cost of which no man can estimate and which, if carried on according to present plans, will take the lives of millions of American men, the President and his supporters tell us is being fought to bring other peoples the same right of independence and self-government which we have enjoyed.

The hypocrisy of those who claim that to be the purpose of our present involvement in this war is clearly demonstrated when we receive from them

a petition to repudiate our own independence, surrender our existence as an independent Nation, and become a part of a United States of the World.

It is quite true that, under our Constitution, men have the right of a free press and free speech; that, under the provisions of that Constitution and the security granted by it, they may advocate its repudiation. Therefore, the man Streit and all those who join with him in asking us to surrender our independence and become a part of a world nation are within their legal rights.

However, Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito are, it is said, also seeking to destroy our independence and make us a part of a world group. Streit and his associates seek to accomplish the same end—the destruction of our independence—by a more subtle and a peaceful method, and they say for a different purpose.

Our Constitution was adopted in order that there might be formed a more perfect union of the States. Streit and his adherents would destroy that union. This Nation of ours is a union of 48 States. The Civil War was fought to preserve that union. Most of us many times have said:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

THEY WOULD BETRAY US

Streit and his associates now repudiate that pledge of allegiance to the Republic, "one nation indivisible," and would make it a part—and only a part—of a world nation.

Misapplied ambition is a ruinous thing. Unchecked, it destroys everything it touches, tearing down the good with the evil it seeks to end.

"To reign is worth ambition, although in hell. Better reign in hell than serve in heaven."

This country of ours, for more than 150 years, has not only been the haven but the heaven of those who in other lands were oppressed, enslaved, and denied opportunity. Yet Streit and Ickes and their associates, however distinguished they may be, would rather form and reign in a hell made up of all the nations of the world, of all the people of the world, than serve under the Constitution to which they have pledged allegiance, in a land where all have equal opportunity.

Ever since the President had his conference with Churchill on the high seas, we have been hearing from editorial writers, radio commentators, and New Deal spokesmen of the United Nations. Now comes a member of the President's Cabinet, Ickes; a member of the United States Supreme Court, Roberts; both of whom have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution, and add their endorsement to the Judaslike betrayal of our people into and as one of a United States of the World.

While Germany, Italy, and Japan seek by force of arms to overthrow us as a nation, to make us subservient to a group of world powers headed by themselves, Streit and his associates seek, through propaganda, to accomplish the same thing and make us a part of a United States of the World, dominated by England, Russsia, China, and whatever other nations may seek to participate in a world redistribution of the wealth of the United States and its people.

Alexander the Great wept because there were no other worlds to conquer. Is not Franklin Delano Roosevelt satisfied with being a third-time President of the United States, an honor which the patriotism of Washington forbade him to accept? Is he not satisfied with his opportunity of conquering the whole world, far greater than in Alexander's day? Are his spokesmen behind this move to surrender our independence, our national existence; become a part of a United States of the World, and make Franklin Delano Roosevelt the president of that world nation?

Yes; ambition is a cancerous growth and often in the past, as history discloses, has destroyed the one who harbored it. Alexander was ambitious. Caesar was ambitious. Napoleon was ambitious. Hitler is ambitious. But the people who were the playthings of their ambition suffered and died. So, too, if this move to make us a part of a world nation—and a subservient part at that—goes through, will our people suffer, our independence, our Nation die.

It is said that we are the richest Nation in the world. It is undenied that the average citizen of these United States of America enjoys more of everything that goes to make man contented and happy than the people of any other land or nation. And yet these men, like Judas, who betrayed his Master, would, before we are fairly in this war, betray our people; surrender our independence; connive to destroy our liberty and our freedom. They would surrender that for which the war is being fought—our national existence—before the war is fairly begun.

Let them be stripped of their hypocrisy. Let us expose them for what they are—enemies of the Republic, boring from within. They seek to take advantage of our involvement in this war and while the attention of the people is directed to the winning of the war. They would do what the armies of the Confederacy could not accomplish—destroy us as a nation, one and indivisible; make us a part of a United States of the World, where the communistic Russian, who denies the existence of God, where the Chinese, the Hottentot, and the people of India would have equal voice in curtailing the liberties, spending the tax money of American workers, farmers, and businessmen—a United States of the World where all the peoples of the world would be glorified participants in a WPA, a PWA, a Federal housing program, the triple A—a program to rebuild after the war all the cities, towns, and villages which may be destroyed in that war—and all at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Oh, that Streit and all his associates who are dissatisfied with our Declaration of Independence, with the working of our Constitution, with our country, would only go and take up permanently their residence in some one of the many countries whose system of government they evidently so greatly admire.

Let Streit go and live with the Chinese. Let Ickes go to Russia and live with the Communists, who tell us that religion as a fraud. Let Justice Roberts sojourn a while in India with Gandhi, who is demanding that Britain grant freedom to millions of the oppressed in his native land.

If the administration wants to win this war, let it put aside the ambition of the President's advisers to make him or one of themselves a president of the world. Let this administration get rid of the more than a thousand Communists on the Federal pay roll—bloodsuckers seeking to destroy our national existence.

Let the ambitious politicians remember that the first thing, the important thing, is the winning of the war, and that the American people will only devote themselves enthusiastically and wholeheartedly to that purpose as they believe in our own Government, the maintenance of our own freedom and independence.

January 30, 1942

A BIRTHDAY GIFT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as it is the President's birthday, it may not be out of place to call attention to the fact that a birthday gift has been requested of Congress for the Chief Executive.

The 4th day of July 1776 was the day when our Declaration of Independence was adopted. Here is an organization which undoubtedly has expended considerable sums, which now proposes to celebrate the President's birthday by having Congress adopt a resolution doing away with the Declaration of Independence. I do not know; I have not been able to learn, whether any Member of the House has introduced such a resolution.

I have introduced a resolution—it was introduced yesterday—House Resolution 425—asking for the appointment of a committee to investigate the purpose and ascertain who are the members of these two or three organizations which advocate the surrender of our independence and the sources from which they derive the funds which they are spending.

This movement to surrender our independence and become a part of a world supergovernment has the support of Cabinet Member Ickes, Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court, Federal Union, Inc., Red Christian Fronters, and Communists.

While we are celebrating today the President's birthday we should have this other movement in mind. There are many of us who in the past have bitterly opposed some of the President's political policies. There are some of us who will continue to oppose those domestic policies while giving him support in the effort to win the war. There is none, however, who should in my judgment at least not be able and willing to join in the hope that God will grant him many happier returns of the day. We can all join in the request that God give him wisdom, and strength, and courage to frown upon such efforts as the one which is here suggested.

THE DAY FIXED FOR OUR BETRAYAL

The people will now back this administration in this war effort, they will give wholehearted support to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; but how about the future when the people learn that there is in administration circles, or at least entertained by one member of the Cabinet, the purpose to destroy our independence?

The answer to that question depends upon whether they consider the war a just war; a worth-while war; a war to preserve our independence; a war to perpetuate our Nation; a war to protect our freedom and our liberty.

At the present time, our people believe that this war must be won. They are willing, even though it cost billions of dollars, millions of lives; even though it means the lowering of the standard of living for many generations to come in order to meet the tax bills which will follow this war, to make whatever sacrifices may be necessary to win.

But let our people once discover or arrive at the conclusion, sound or unsound, that they are being betrayed; that their sacrifices are in vain; that at the end of the war they will have lost their independence, our constitutional form of government, our existence as a free and independent Nation destroyed, and no longer will this administration have their support.

Of our more than 130,000,000 people, those who think believe in some vague way that we today, as our forefathers in the Revolutionary War, as in the days of the Civil War, are not only fighting for the preservation of our Nation, but that, when we win, the freedom of the individual, the independence of the Nation, will be rendered more secure and its permanency insured.

We know that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, at the heads of their respective nations, are our enemies. They would destroy our national existence. They, according to this administration, would enslave us, destroy what has been described as the American way of life. There are other enemies who would accomplish the same purpose. These others are a greater menace than are Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito, for they carry on their battle to destroy us, not directly, not openly, with announced purposes, but in an underhand, treacherous, traitorous way, pretending they would make secure the freedoms and liberties, the national existence, which they seek to destroy.

Using the false plea that we can win the war and after it is over establish permanent peace throughout the world—a desirable objective—Federal Union, Inc., headed by Clarence K. Streit, by the expenditure of thousands of dollars, is carrying on a campaign of propaganda, the purpose of which is, while our attention is distracted by the war, to cause us to surrender our independence and our national existence and become the economic slaves of other world powers.

That organization would inveigle our citizens into a united states of the world where their property, their incomes, would be at the mercy of Old World politicians.

* * * * * * *

Federal Union, Inc., and World Fellowship, Inc., which has a similar objective, would make the American taxpayer the Santa Claus of the world; the peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa glorified members of a world WPA. We Americans—workers, farmers, merchants, industrialists, professional men and women, all of us—would furnish the money for the boondoggling and the warring of princes, dukes, kings, and dictators.

We would, in addition, furnish the cannon fodder for the war games which they might play when they grew tired of boondoggling.

Is the foregoing but a creature of the imagination? In full-page ads in newspapers of the East the campaign to do the things just mentioned is being carried on.

Yesterday, January 29, to me, as a Congressman, and no doubt to every other Congressman and to every Senator, from World Fellowship, Inc., came propaganda asking that, as a Member of the House of Representatives, I support a joint resolution which this organization asks be passed on the President's birthday, January 30, 1942, as, I quote, "a present to him, to us, to the world." The word "him" is capitalized. A proposal for a birthday gift which the President should lose no time in condemning.

That resolution proposes, as step 1, among other things:

"That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the United Nations of the World, and to that end it hereby gives to the President of the United States of America all the needed authority and powers of every kind and description without limitations of any kind that are necessary in his sole and absolute discretion to set up and create the Federation of the World, a world peace government under the title of the United Nations of the World, including its constitution and personnel and all other matters needed or appertaining thereto to the end that all nations of the world may by voluntary action become a part thereof under the same terms and conditions."

If you are an American citizen, willing to make the needed sacrifices to win this war, if you believe in the independence of our Nation, what do you think of this proposed grant of authority to the President of the United States to set up a United Nations of the World? Why should Congress grant to the President of the United States power to create a new world government, United Nations of the World, of which we would be a part?

By what stretch of the imagination can it be assumed that we, the people of the United States, have the right, or, for that matter, the power to set up a world government entitled "United Nations of the World," and to write and prescribe a constitution and to pick the officers of such a government?

If the President of the United States is not satisfied with the office which he holds, if he and his advisers and supporters or any of the rest of us are not content to live under the Constitution which we have sworn to maintain and uphold, then why does not he, his wife Eleanor, Ickes, Perkins, and the horde of Reds which surround him, and those of us who are not satisfied, emigrate to Russia, or to Germany for that matter—for Hitler has the same idea of uniting all the peoples of the world under his rule—and there establish the world government?

This proposed joint resolution contains this further provision:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 or so much thereof as may be necessary to be expended by the President in his sole and absolute discretion to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution."

Consider this language. This organization asks, in this time of war, when every dollar is needed to support the Army, the Napy, and the Air Force, for an appropriation of $100,000,000 to be expended by the President of the United States, without accounting to anyone in any manner, for the purpose of establishing a United Nations of the World.

The resolution contains this further language, immediately following the foregoing:

"And in addition the sum of $1,000,000,000 for the immediate use of the United Nations of the World under its constitution as set up and created by the President of the United States of America as provided in this joint resolution."

While MarArthur is fighting in the Philippines; while American soldiers and sailors are dying there and in many, many places throughout the world in the belief that they are fighting for the preservation of our Government; for the safety and the independence of the folks at home; for their parents, their brothers and sisters, here at home, in America, through the mails of the United States Government comes this propaganda, which would destroy all that these boys have fought and died to save.

The Treasdry of the United States is not only empty of funds, but in it are stored obligations which call upon future generations for the payment of billions of dollars in taxes. Yet this organization, these men and women who sponsor it, whose purpose is the surrender of our independence, the destruction of our constitutional form of government, destroy the morale of our fighting men. They sap the courage of our citizens. They create the feeling that this administration, by permitting their efforts to go unrebuked, may be charged with not carrying on a war to preserve the American way of life, to protect our people, to render our Government secure and permanent, but, driven by ambition, seeks to make us a part of a world power.

Let this administration—let the President of the United States—without delay, assure the American people that he wants no part in the creation of a United States of the World—in the formation of a United Nations of the World.

Let him assure us that when this war is won—that when this war is over—our independence as a nation will be sacredly preserved and that we will not become a part of any world political union.

I append hereto, as exhibit A, excerpts from the full-page ad of Federal Union, Inc.; also appended, as exhibit B, are excerpts from World Fellowship, Inc.

Yesterday I introduced a resolution—House Resolution 425, calling for an investigation of this movement. I ask that a copy of that resolution be printed herewith as exhibit C.

Here we are—a nation billions of dollars in debt, needing every resource of our command, not only to carry on a war, as the President said, on every continent and in every sea, but to prepare for our own national defense here at home; and yet come these men and ask that we appropriate $100,000,000 to aid in forming a United Nations of the World, and an added $1,000,000,000 to be expended by that organization when formed.

They ask that we surrender our independence, appropriate $1,100,000,000, and offer it to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as his birthday gift on January 30, 1942.

Yes; I wish the President many returns on this birthday of his. I hope that each of those days will bring less for him to worry about; that the morning sun of each of those days will rise upon a world at peace—upon a United States of America still independent—indivisible.

God grant that each of those birthdays of our President and the dawn of many succeeding centuries will see us as a people free, independent, our liberties secure; our National Government, the United States of America, a republic still the refuge, still the hope, of the oppressed throughout the world.

Oh, I ask you, I appeal to the leaders of the House, to the dean of the House as he sits here, because he said he believes in the independence of our country, our institutions, and our form of Government, are we going to let pass unchallenged such appeals as these, which have been sent to every Member of the House, undoubtedly, and to every Senator? This same proposition is being advocated by full-page advertising in the great daily newspapers. I ask you, Mr. SABATH, chairman of the Committee on Rules, to give us a rule in support of the resolution which I have introduced, and let us learn who is back of this movement and who is paying for it.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 5, 1942]

"IN UNION NOW LIES POWER TO WIN THE WAR AND THE PEACE—A PETITION

"That the President of the United States submit to Congress a program for forming a powerful union of free peoples to win the war, the peace, the future;

"That this program unite our people, on the broad lines of our Constitution, with the people of Canada, the United Kingdom, Eire, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa, together with such other free peoples, both in the Old World and the New, as may be found ready and able to unite on this federal basis;

"We welcome President Roosevelt's conferences with Prime Minister Churchill and the 'declaration of united nations.'"

(Churchill is the man who said, "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job," and who, since these remarks were made on the floor of the House and after the fall of Singapore, said, referring to the entry of the United States into the war:

("That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass.")

Referring to this proposed supergovernment, the advertisement continues:

"Now the responsibility is ours either to create or defer too long that 'common community or state' whose importance Mr. Churchill stressed in the Senate December 26.

"Organizing the democracies effectively in a union need take no longer than organizing them in an ineffective alliance or supreme war council, and will safeguard their national rights far more securely and equally. There already exist carefully studied concrete plans for just the kind of emergency union that we need. These plans provide for representation responsible to the people and in proportion to self-governing population. They work out the details and assure the American people a majority in the union congress at the start.

"THE SOVIET STATES HAVE A COMMON GOVERNMENT"

(Note those who would pull down our flag and run up in its place the symbol of Union Now graciously tell us that, at the beginning, we are to have a majority vote in this new supergovernment. They fail to tell us that, shortly, outvoted by the more numerous peoples of Russia, the British Empire, and others, we would become but a vassal state.)

"We gain from the fact that all the Soviet republics are already united in one government, as are also all the Chinese-speaking people, once so divided. Surely we and they must agree that union now of the democracies wherever possible is equally to the general advantage."

(Yes, Union Now advocates suggest—in fact, they insist—that we now accept, as full partners and as participants, not only in the carrying on of the war but in our domestic affairs, in our daily lives, Communists of Russia and the people of China.)

"Let us begin now a world United States.

"30,000,000 AMERICANS FAVOR UNION

"Thirty million American adults, according to the December Fortune Survey, already believe the United States 'after the war' should 'join a union of democracies in all parts of the world to keep order.'

"The surest way to shorten and to win this war is also the surest way to guarantee to ourselves, and our friends and foes, that this war will end in a union of the free. The surest way to do all this is for us to start that union now."

(In other words, surrender our independence; burn the Declaration of Independence and substitute in its place a declaration of interdependence. Pull down the Stars and Stripes and run up the flag of Union Now. That is the plea these men are making.)

The advertisement continues:

"As citizens to our fellow citizens, we recommend this proposal to your serious consideration.

"Robert Woods Bliss, Grenville Clark, Gardner Cowles, Jr., Russell W. Davenport, Harold L. Ickes, Owen J. Roberts, Daniel Calhoun Roper, William Jay Schieffelin, John Foster Dulles.

"Inviting you to help create now a living, growing World United States.

"FEDERAL UNION, INC.,
10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
"(A nonprofit membership association.)

"Please put me, an American citizen, on record as favoring your petition for union—now, as explained in your advertisement in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., January 5, 1942.

"_____ 1942.

"Name _____
"Street_____ City_____
Check here for an enrollment card , literature , reprints of this advertisement .

"We need funds to carry on this campaign quickly. If everyone who believes in a World United States will give now what he can to help create it, we shall have it soon. Please insert here _____ the amount of any gift you enclose.

"Federal Union, Inc.: A. J. G. Priest, chairman; Clarence K. Streit, president; E. W. Balduf, director; P. F. Brundage, secretary; John Howard Ford, treasurer; Patrick Welch, acting director.

"Philadelphia, Architects Building. Washington, D. C., 726 Jackson Place, Republic 2425. Chicago, 135 La Salle Street. St. Louis, Arcade Building. San Francisco, Russ Building. Los Angeles, 1717 North Vine Street, Hollywood.

"National Headquarters, 10 East Fortieth Street, New York City."

EXHIBIT B

IN TIME OF WAR PREPARE FOR PEACE—WORLD FELLOWSHIP, INC.

(Started in 1918—the armistice year)

To Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America:

We ask the Members of the Senate and House to take the three steps presented here for your consideration.

We hope these two joint resolutions will be introduced and passed by Congress on the President's birthday, January 30, 1942. A present to him, to us, to the world.

STEP 1

To be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to set up and create a Federation of the World, a World Peace Government, under the title of the "United Nations of the World"

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress of the United States of America does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now

be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the United Nations of the World, and to that end it hereby gives to the President of the United States of America all the needed authority and powers of every kind and description, without limitations of any kind that are necessary in his sole and absolute discretion to set up and create the Federation of the World, a world peace government under the title of the "United Nations of the World," including its constitution and personnel and all other matters needed or appertaining thereto to the end that all nations of the world may by voluntary action become a part thereof under the same terms and conditions.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the President, in his sole and absolute discretion, to effectuate the purposes of this joint resolution, and in addition the sum of $1,000,000,000 for the immediate use of the United Nations of the World under its constitution as set up and created by the President of the United States of America as provided in this joint resolution.

The President may appoint such committees and summon such advisers, from any part of the world, as he may deem necessary to effectuate the foregoing purposes with all convenient speed.

EXHIBIT C

[H. Res. 425, 77th Cong., 2d sess.]

Whereas, through full-page advertisements published in many great dailies, Federal Union, Inc., Clarence K. Streit, president, is now advocating the surrender of our national independence and our entrance into a United States of the world; and

Whereas World Fellowship, Inc., is now propagandizing Congress to appropriate $1,100,000,000 for the purpose of forming a United Nations of the World, which would involve the surrendering of our national independence; and

Whereas such activities tend to undermine the morale of our people and to raise in their minds a suspicion that there is on foot a powerful movement which, notwithstanding the winning of the war, would, if successful, result in the surrendering of our national independence, the destruction of the liberty of the citizen: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby authorized to appoint a special committee to be composed of five members for the purpose of conducting an investigation to ascertain—

(1) The extent, character, and objectives of Federal Union, Inc.; of World Fellowship, Inc.; and of any and all similar organizations, and the members of such organizations in the United States;

(2) The sources from which such organizations and individuals receive the funds which enable them to carry on their activities; the amount and the date of contributions made for that purpose; and the names, places of residence, and occupation of the persons contributing; and

(3) All other questions in relation thereto that would aid Congress in any advisable remedial legislation.

That said special committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman and shall be served by any person designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties provided by section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192).

SEC. 2. The committee shall file its report to the House on October 31, 1942, or may file same earlier in the event the House is not in session, with the Speaker of the House for printing as a public document.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I be permitted to subscribe to the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman Smith, except for the submission of the question to the people.

NO PUBLIC DEMAND FOR CHANGE

I have been unable to discover any demand on the part of the people for an opportunity to vote upon such an issue. Perhaps I have not traveled enough. I have not been abroad, but inasmuch as those peoples there would not vote upon it anyway, I can see no reason for submitting such a question, such an issue to our folks here at home when they have not asked for it. They ask for enough, so we don't need to suggest other issues to them.

As to this question which is here, whatever may be said by me except as it is borne out by natural laws, by facts or by logic, would be only an expression of an opinion, and I most respectfully submit that the statements of others, no matter what their station in life may be are under the same circumstances only expressions of opinion.

Senator WILEY. If I may interject there and ask, you said that you in substance agreed with Congressman Smith. Have you seen the concurrent resolution introduced by Senator Ferguson?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I have not.

Senator WILEY. I might state for the record that that is the only resolution that the members of the State Department conceded would be appropriate to pass as it, in substance, would carry out the extension of some additional power in the United Nations.

I presume that in that respect you are not speaking against that resolution? I can show it to you if you want to see it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I would like to have a copy to take with me, but I have had extreme difficulty in understanding just what the State Department, over the last few years, means when it makes a statement; and so, I would not want to subscribe to any statement the State Department might make until I knew what interpretation they will put upon it, and how they will carry it out, if it went through.

Senator WILEY. All right.

PROPONENTS' PATRIOTISM NOT QUESTIONED

Mr. HOFFMAN. No one questions, at least I do not, the sincerity or the patriotism of any of those who appear in support of or who advocate the adoption of any of these resolutions. The proposal, as I understand it, or them, and they all boil down to one, is that we should join an international organization and that when we join that organization, we become a minority group in it; that we surrender to that organization at least a part of our sovereignty; that under the proposal, the members of that organization, outvoting us, would have authority, as was suggested by Mr. Smith, to tell us how much we should contribute in money and in material toward the accomplishment of the purposes of that organization. It would have the authority to tell us when we should go to war, for what purpose, and when and where and how long our men should fight.

Senator WILEY. Well, do you agree, Congressman, that the apparent purpose of all these resolutions is that in them they see some possibility for disposing of the differences between Russia and our-

selves, and I would like to get your opinion as to whether you believe any international confederation would have any particular effect in changing the minds of Joe Stalin and his group.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The only thing I know about Joe Stalin is from what I read from the President's statement some time ago, that old Joe was a good fellow," that was it in substance; but, from the way he acts, I don't believe that. I don't believe old Joe is a good fellow, in the sense of looking after our good. I think he is a good man maybe for Russia, if the sole purpose is to extend her power, but not for the rest of the world.

It occurs to me that it is impossible to attain the objectives of these proposals if Christ, and Christianity over 2,000 years has not been able to bring peace on earth and good will toward men, surrendering our independence is not going to accomplish that purpose; that weakening our resources to the extent that we are weakening them now, will not do any good toward the establishment of peace, but it will place us in a position where we may not be able to defend ourselves.

I recall that in 1942, and late in 1941, some gentlemen who held high positions in this country advocated similar schemes, or made a similar proposal, and at that time they proposed to surrender our independence. They went so far as to have designed and made a flag, that is the One World organization, the "Union Now" I think they called it then, that is what we were to exist under. That flag I assume would have been the international flag.

I had, and have a flag of that kind, a world organization flag.

It seems logical to believe that anyone who advocates scrapping our Constitution—and that is what this proposal, in my humble judgment does—who advocates the hauling down of the Stars and Stripes and putting up in its place a flag which would be carried by our Armies and our Navies and our Air Corps, an international flag, lacks faith not only in our form of government, in the principles enunciated in the Constitution, but lacks faith in the courage and endurance and determination of our people.

In my statement I have called atention to the statement made by Mr. Churchill to the effect that, we were the greatest nation from a military standpoint in all the world.

If that was true, and I think it was, I might add that I think we are also the greatest productive Nation in all the world, and just why we should have so little faith in our own form of government, which brought us to that position, so little faith in our courage and the fighting ability and initiative and endurance of those who in every war have won the battle, is difficult for me to understand.

I agree with that statement of Mr. Lincoln, made years ago. I think when he was a very young man, at Springfield, when he said that if we were ever destroyed, the danger would come from within, and that we might commit national suicide.

In my humble judgment, and with all due respect for the opinions of those who advocate these proposals, I think that is just what we are trying to do.

One more thought. We have spent billions upon billions of dollars to fight communism throughout the world. In some parts of the world. It is my understanding that we have not done very much to fight communism in China and in the east. As a matter of fact, we have half-heartedly encouraged the Communists to slip in there.

Senator WILEY. We didn't spend very much at home, either, did we?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, in view of the Senator's statement that we have not spent very much at home——

Senator WILEY. To fight communism.

COMMUNISTS CODDLED

Mr. HOFFMAN. To fight communism—as a matter of fact, and the record bears me out, we have coddled and encouraged the Communists here in America, especially in Washington. One needs but to look at the record of the House committee, when it was known as the Dies Committee, later the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to recall, and I say this with regret, perhaps I wouldn't have said it had the statement not just been made by the chairman—the Communists were, when they came before the committee, accompanied by—by officials and individuals in high positions, and the attempts of the House committee, under Mr. Dies and under Mr. Starnes of Alabama, when he was acting chairman in the absence of Mr. Dies, to expose those Communists were hindered and thwarted on occasions by the support by the President, support of people who came up from the other end of the Avenue.

The record shows that, and from that day to this, individual members of the House who fought communism, who fought individual Communists, were discouraged and they were——

Senator WILEY. Ridiculed?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Ridiculed and lied about.

I recall very distinctly, if you will pardon a personal allusion to a time when I objected to our Nation coming under the One World flag, being called four times down before a grand jury here, at the request of those in authority, not because of what I said, but because of the individuals to whom my remarks which I have incorporated in part in this statement were distributed. Other members of the House had to undergo the same sort of treatment. Why? Because we spoke for America, were against and were fighting Communists. If this Nation ever falls, or if it does now cease to exist it will be because we have spent so much abroad and have coddled and encouraged Communists here in America and they are still here protected by the administration and failed to provide for an adequate national defense.

Just this, in conclusion: The Communists advocate the overthrow of our Government by force, Mr. Chairman. Whatever may be the interest of those who advocate the adoption of these resolutions, and I question not their intention, the result will be the same, the overthrow of our Government.

They are both groups working, one knowingly, the other unconsciously, toward the same end.

I thank you.

Senator WILEY. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman, and I just want to say for the record that while you were talking and while you were quoting Lincoln, a piece of Scripture came to my mind, and that was "The blind shall lead the blind, and they both will fall in the ditch."

We had one Pearl Harbor when our minds were closed, and I am sure that we would have had another internal Pearl Harbor if it had not been for the courage of those who dared to constantly bring before the public the insidious influence and termiting influence of

the Communist way of life in this very land, what they were doing, what they were thinking, and yet, as you say, folks in high places closed their eyes to the realities.

But, at long last, we have our friends now, a majority joining us in "Me too-ism."

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to avoid any expression about "Me too-ism," no matter what it refers to. I am not knowingly a follower of the blind.

I might add this, yesterday's press carried the statement that the CIO organization had expelled I think either four or six unions because those unions were dominated by Communists. That is a fine step forward, even though it cames at this late date. Just a year or so ago when the House committee had before it the question of the communism of Mr. Flaxer, who was named in last night's press as the head of one of those expelled unions, an attempt was made to learn whether, at the White House conference which occurred in February of that year, the President had not supported the officers, Mr. Flaxer and Mr. Bernstein, Communists, in their efforts to force local employers to deal with them, notwithstanding the fact that under the Taft-Hartley Act they did not need to deal, and in answer to the House subcommittee's subpena, Mr. Steelman wrote, and I have the letter, that on the order of the President, he refused to appear. The President still refuses to give either Senate or House the files on Communists.

Senator WILEY. Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILEY. Mr. James P. Warburg.

It is good to see you, Mr. Warburg. Will you identify yourself for the record.

STATEMENT OF JAMES P. WARBURG, GREENWICH, CONN.

Mr. WARBURG. I am James P. Warburg, of Greenwich, Conn., and am appearing as an individual.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, of the exigencies of your crowded schedule and of the need to be brief, so as not to transgress upon your courtesy in granting me a hearing.

The past 15 years of my life have been devoted almost exclusively to studying the problem of world peace and, especially, the relation of the United States to those problems. These studies led me, 10 years ago, to the conclusion that the great question of our time is not whether or not one world can be achieved, but whether or not one world can be achieved by peaceful means.

We shall have world government, whether or not we like it. The question is only whether world government will be achieved by consent or by conquest.

Today we are faced with a divided world—its two halves glowering at each other across the iron curtain. The world's two superpowers—Russia and the United States—are entangled in the vicious circle of an arms race, which more and more preempts energies and resources sorely needed to lay the foundations of enduring peace. We are now on the road to eventual war—a war in which the conqueror will emerge well-nigh indistinguishable from the vanquished.

The United States does not want this war, and most authorities agree that Russia does not want it. Indeed, why should Russia prefer the

unpredictable hazards of war to a continuation of her present profitable fishing in the trouble waters of an uneasy armistice? Yet both the United States and Russia are drifting—and, with them, the entire world—toward the abyss of atomic conflict.

SUPPORT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

Mr. Chairman, I am here to testify in favor of Senate Resolution 56, which, if concurrently enacted with the House, would make the peaceful transformation of the United Nations into a world federation the avowed aim of United States policy. The passage of this resolution seems to me the first prerequisite toward the development of an affirmative American policy which would lead us out of the valley of death and despair.

I am fully aware that the mere passage of this resolution will not solve the complex problems with which we are confronted. Our recognition of the inadequacy of the present United Nations structure, and our declared determination to strengthen that structure by Charter amendment, will not alone overcome the Russian obstacle. But it will, at long last, chart our own goal and enable us to steer a straight course toward a clearly seen objective. Moreover, it will unite us in purpose with the vast majority of the peoples of the non-Soviet world.

Until we have established this goal, we shall continue to befog and befuddle our own vision by clinging to the illusion that the present structure of the United Nations would work, if only the Russians would let it work. That has been our position to date.

Until we establish this goal, we shall continue to ask other peoples to unite with us only in the negative purpose of stopping Russia. Fear-inspired negative action makes poor cement for unity.

Once we shall have declared a positive purpose—once we shall have cemented the united will of the free peoples in a common aspiration—we shall be in a far stronger position to deal with the obstacles presented to the realization of that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I prefer Senate Resolution 56 to other resolutions now before you for two major reasons:

UNIVERSAL FEDERATION REQUIRED

First: Senate Resolution 56 goes to the root of the evil in the present state of international anarchy. It recognizes that there is no cure for this evil short of making the United Nations into a universal organization capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to the degree necessary to outlaw force, or the threat of force, as an instrument of foreign policy. It states the objective in unequivocal terms.

Second: Senate Resolution 56 does not commit the United States to any specific next steps to be taken toward the attainment of that objective. In the present state of world affairs, it would seem to me unwise to commit ourselves to any fixed plan of action, without first exploring all the possibilities.

In contrast to Senate Resolution 56, other proposals before you seem to me either to set a goal short of what is needed to ensure peace, or to foreclose the ultimate attainment of a universal organization by an

over-eager acceptance of half measures, on the theory that half a loaf is better than none.

Limitations of time prevent my going into detail, but I should like to state specifically the conviction that any exclusive partial federation, such as the Atlantic Union, would not only serve to harden the existing cleavages in a divided world, but would create new and dangerous cleavages within our half of the divided world.

I should like to make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I do not minimize the many and complicated problems which will remain to be solved, once Senate Resolution 56 is enacted. Mr. Hickerson of the Department of State listed them most carefully. In due course we shall have to define more closely what we mean by world government and by what steps we propose to get there. I have given considerable study to these problems. I believe them to be soluble—but not by the adoption of any hastily conceived formulas, and, above all, not without exploring patiently and carefully what is in the minds of other peoples, who, while friendly to us, do not share our historical background nor our particular political or economic prejudices and predilections.

If we seek peace under law by common consent, we cannot expect to impose our imprint upon the world. We must be prepared to accept some sort of a composite pattern, in which we may preserve for ourselves the things we cherish, but in which others may be equally free to do the same. We may or may not be able to find a common pattern with the present rulers of Russia. We most certainly can, and must, find a common pattern not only with the peoples of western Europe but with the peoples of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. Perhaps a shorthand device for stating the point would be to say that we must find a common pattern with Nehru, before we can even think of trying to find a common pattern with Stalin.

AFFIRMATIVE POLICY REQUIRED

The virtue of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 is precisely that it does not commit us to the narrow pattern which the State Department dreads. It is a broad declaration of purpose and nothing more.

Secretary Acheson said the other day that the only agreements which can usefully be made with the Kremlin are those which rest upon established fact. I think this is true, and not only with respect to Russia. But, as to Russia, the trouble has been that we have been letting the Kremlin create the existing facts.

One of your colleagues made a speech the other day, which seemed to me to leap straight for the jugular vein in our present foreign policy. Senator McMahon proposed that we create some facts of our own.

One of these facts, which your colleague specifically proposed to create, would, in my judgment, be far more powerful than our recent decisions to develop and manufacture hydrogen bombs. Senator McMahon proposed that we present the Kremlin with the fact of our determination to dedicate our strength to a world-wide, cooperative crusade, waged through the United Nations, against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance. This is the sort of bold affirmative action in the economic field which could, if pursued, create the climate for the attainment of our political objective—namely, the establishment of a world community living at peace under law.

Without detracting from the imaginative courage of Senator McMahon's proposal, I regret that, in his first presentation, he has attached it to a self-negating proviso. His plan, so right in itself, would become operative only if a disarmament agreement were first reached with the Kremlin under which the United States could save $10,000,000,000 a year out of its military budget. This is extremely unlikely.

Moreover, even if the Russians were to accept a modified Baruch plan, this would not suffice, because, at best, such a plan would outlaw only one type of weapon and one method of waging war. It would, in effect, establish world government in the limited field of atomic energy, but it would leave the use of all other types of weapons to the discretion of nation-states dwelling in a state of international anarchy.

At a conference in New York last week, I ventured to put forward an alternative, in which Senator McMahon's world-wide Marshall plan would not be conditioned upon anything the Kremlin might or might not be willing to do. Under this alternative, we should not wait for Russia. The benefits of the McMahon plan would become immediately available to those countries which made known their will to acccept supranational authority—not only in the field of atomic energy, but in the whole field of international relations—to the extent necessary in order to establish peace under law.

Obviously, the proposed alternative condition—agreement to outlaw all weapons and war itself—is one which we cannot impose until we ourselves have accepted it. But, once we have accepted it, by adopting the concurrent resolution now before you, we shall be in a position to proceed with Senator McMahon's cooperative plan, hand in hand with the majority of the world's peoples.

Thus we should present the Kremlin with two vital new facts not of its own making:

First. The united determination of the majority of the world's peoples to establish a rule of law and thus eventually to free themselves from the burden of armaments and from the overhanging fear of annihilation; and

Second. The steady progress of the massed forces of humanity embattled in a common crusade against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance.

The first of these new facts would, for a time, be static. The avowed aim could not be realized without Russian cooperation.

The second of these new facts would be dynamic. It would demonstrate how peoples devoting their energies and resources to cooperative effort outstrip those peoples whose governments subsist on force and pursue only the goal of widening the orbit of their own arbitrary power.

Taken together, these two facts would exert a mounting pressure toward cooperation upon the Kremlin. It is true that a regime, which maintains itself by force at home, cannot readily renounce force as an instrument of foreign policy. Yet even such a regime can, in the long run, be brought to accept new facts which alter the conception of its own self-interest and self-preservation.

The creation of one such new fact has been boldly proposed by a member of your committee. The creation of the other lies in your hands today.

In order not to trespass upon your time, Mr. Chairman, I have left a number of gaps in the presentation of the suggested modification of the McMahon proposal. To fill in these gaps, I ask leave to have included in the record of my testimony, the paper already referred to, which was delivered last week at a conference of the Postwar World Council in New York.

Senator THOMAS. Without objection, it will be included.

(The paper referred to is as follows:)

[The Current Affairs Press, New York 17, N. Y.]

SENATOR MCMAHON'S PEACE BOMB—WORKABLE PLAN OR DESPERATE HOPE?

(By James P. Warburg)

I. IS IT A PLAN OR JUST A HOPE?

The speech delivered in the United States Senate on February 2, 1950, by the Honorable Brien McMahon, may well go down in history as the turning point in postwar United States policy. On the other hand, it is also quite possible that its echoes will die away within a few weeks or months, if the flame of hope which it kindled is allowed to flicker and die out.

For the first time since the cold war began, one of the major architects of United States foreign policy stood up and denounced the sterility of the present negative approach to peace—denounced as hopelessly outworn the ancient motto: "He who wants peace had better prepare for war." This was the beginning of hope.

But Senator McMahon did more than merely repudiate the idea that security can be attained through maintaining the greatest arsenal of destructive weapons. He put forward a constructive proposal for an affirmative approach to peace. Was this proposal a workable plan for peace? Or was it merely the expression of a desperate anxiety that a workable plan for peace should be developed?

Briefly stated, Senator McMahon proposed that, if the Soviet Union would accept effective international control of atomic energy, the United States should declare itself willing to cut its military expenditures from 15 to 5 billion dollars a year, and to contribute the $100,000,000,000 so saved to a world-wide economic recovery program, channeled through the United Nations. The Senator envisaged a cooperative program, to which other nations would likewise contribute—a program lasting perhaps 5 years and calling for a total contribution of $50,000,000,000 from the United States. The present European recovery program, the point 4 program, atomic energy development and, presumably, all other programs of economic rehabilitation and development would be combined in this single over-all plan. Under it, all nations, including the Soviet Union, would be eligible for assistance.

This proposal falls into two parts: the proposal itself, and the conditions upon which it was put forward. Let us consider each separately.

II. THE CONCRETE PROPOSAL

The plan itself recognizes and squarely meets several major defects in our present foreign-aid politicies.

By implication, it recognizes the futility of all military aid as opposed to economic assistance. Explicitly, as to economic assistance itself, Senator McMahon's proposal corrects three major errors in our present procedures:

1. We have so far been attempting to deal with isolated parts of the world economy without an over-all concept or plan. For example, we are trying desperately to "integrate" western Europe by one major effort, while making another wholly separate effort to raise the living standards of the so-called underdeveloped areas of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. We have so far overlooked the fact that parts of western Europe are actually much more closely "integrated" with parts of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East than they are with each other.

Senator McMahons' plan recognizes the need for a single, coordinated, world-wide effort, applied at whatever may be the points of maximum leverage on the world's economy.

2. We embarked, in 1947, upon a wholly negative concept of extending economic and military aid wherever needed to contain Soviet-communism. We then tried to switch to a positive approach, when Secretary Marshall, in launching his well-known project, declared: "Our policy is not directed against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." Our attempt to make this switch was frustrated by Molotov's famous walk-out, which doomed the Marshall plan to become primarily an instrument in the negative cold war. (It is beside the point of this discussion to speculate upon which would have happened, if Russia had accepted Secretary Marshall's invitation.) In January, 1949, President Truman made a second start toward an affirmative policy, when he enunciated the point 4 principle. This declaration of principle remains as yet unimplemented and the legislation now before Congress would, if enacted, constitute only a very small first step in its execution.

Senator McMahon's proposal carries the affirmative emphasis over into the whole of our foreign economic assistance effort. It restores the original Marshall plan concept.

3. We have been operating, in our foreign-aid programs, almost wholly outside the United Nations. The basic tenet of our policy has been to strengthen the United Nations; nevertheless, we have acted unilaterally in western Europe, in Greece and Turkey, and in China. President Truman's point 4 program will apparently attempt to channel at least some of the proposed technical aid through the United Nations, but most, if not all, of the needed capital investments are expected to flow unilaterally from the United States to the participating countries, in accordance with bilateral bargains made outside of the United Nations.

Senator McMahon's proposal recognizes the need for channeling the whole program through the United Nations.

These are three major contributions to the making of an American policy that might lead to enduring peace. There is a fourth contribution implicit in the Senator's proposal.

Because we have committed so large a part of our resources to military preparations and to European aid, we have arrived at the crisis in Asia, feeling impoverished. Our budget is heavily out of balance. Taxes are already burdensome. Therefore, whatever we do in Asia must, we think, be done without spending any substantial funds from our Treasury. This led President Truman to speak of "our vast imponderable resources" and to think in terms of technical advice rather than financial assistance. Since then, however, it has become clear that technical advice without substantial help in carrying it into effect would be of no great usefulness, and so we have built a point 4 program on the hypothesis that private investors can be induced to provide the necessary capital. To a very great extent, I believe this hypothesis to be an illusion, especially in the initial stages of the program.

Senator McMahon's proposal would make aid to the underdeveloped areas an integral part of an over-all program financed largely by Government contributions channeled through the United Nations. This would in no way preclude private investment. It would, on the contrary, create the only conditions in which private capital might be willing and able to make an important contribution.

We see, then, that the McMahon proposal might, if reduced to a practicable plan, cure precisely those defects from which our past efforts have suffered and from which the point 4 program will suffer, if we pursue our present course.

III. THE SELF-NEGATING PROVISO

Let us now consider the conditions upon which this extremely interesting proposal has been put forward.

The whole plan rests upon the assumption that the United States can save $10,000,000,000 a year (two-thirds of its present military budget). This assumption, in turn, rests upon Russian acceptance of a modified Baruch plan for the international control of atomic energy.

Various commentators have pointed out that this point of departure negates the whole proposal and makes it merely a clever propaganda maneuver. They have pointed out that, if Russia would not accept the Baruch plan when we had an atomic monopoly, she would certainly not accept it now; in other words, that the Baruch plan is out of date.

This criticism seems to me wide of the mark. It is true that the Baruch plan is out of date. But I can find no conclusive evidence in the Senator's speech to suggest that he would object to modifying it, so long as it remained an en-

forceable plan fortified by the right of inspection. The real difficulty lies elsewhere.

The Acheson-Lilienthal report, from which the Baruch plan derived, was a revolutionary document. It said, in so many words, that there was no way to prevent the construction and probable use of atomic weapons, short of establishing a world authority capable of enacting, administering, and enforcing law. The Baruch plan was, in effect, a plan for the establishment of world government in the field of atomic energy.

Now the amazing thing was this: We, the United States, were willing to put forward this far-seeing proposal and to abide by it, but without recognizing the revolutionary nature of our own proposition. It never occurred to us that the principle, which we recognized as valid with respect to atomic weapons, was equally valid with regard to all weapons. We talked about government under law with respect to A-bombs, but went on talking about international anarchy with respect to TNT-bombs. This is something like a community which decides to outlaw murder by the use of firearms, enacts a law to that effect, and hires a policeman to enforce it, but leaves murder by knives, hatchets, and poison to the discretion of individuals. For what, pray, is any attempt to control so-called conventional armaments by treaty between sovereign nation states, other than leaving the use of such armaments to the discretion of the individual governments?

The trouble with the Baruch plan—even if brought up to date—is that it deals only with one type of weapon. It outlaws one method of waging war. What we need to do is to outlaw all weapons of aggression. What we need to do is to outlaw war itself.

The puzzling thing about Senator McMahon's proposal is that he did not make this the condition—if there was to be a condition—for the adoption by the United States of an affirmative policy toward peace. It would be less puzzling if Senator McMahon had not himself sponsored a resolution, now before both Houses of Congress, which would make the development of the United Nations into a world federation the avowed aim of American policy. In signing his name to this resolution, Senator McMahon recognized that there can be no peace without a world organization capable of enacting, administering, and enforcing world law, in such a way as to prevent aggression by any nation against another with any weapons of force—from hatchets to H-bombs.

Why not, then, combine two bravely taken positions of wise statesmanship into one? It seems to me that, were he to do this, Senator McMahon would have a theoretically impeccable plan.

It is true that the proposals thus modified would still not be a practicable plan, because the Russians would hardly accept world government with regard to all weapons any more readily than they would accept the enforcement of law with regard to one type of weapon. This brings me to the final observation I should like to make concerning the Senator's proposal.

IV. THE PLAN MADE REALISTIC

If the policy suggested by Senator McMahon is a wise policy for the United States to pursue, why must it be made conditional upon any Russian action?

The obvious answer is that we cannot afford to cut our military expenditures by $10,000,000,000 a year unless there is an effective agreement to disarm; and that, unless we can save the $10,000,000,000 out of our military budget, we cannot afford to spend them on economic reconstruction.

The first half of this answer must be accepted as correct. Disarmament by example will get us nowhere.

The second half of the answer seems to me open to question. Suppose we take for granted that no effective disarmament agreement is possible at the present time, and that we cannot, therefore, count on any substantial saving in our military budget. Is it so certain that we cannot afford to go ahead nevertheless with the constructive program put forward by Senator McMahon?

To begin with, we should not be talking about a net increase of $10,000,000,000, a year in our expenditure. The money we are now spending in western Europe and in other parts of the world for purely economic aid—excluding military assistance—comes to at least $4,000,000,000 a year. If these existing programs were integrated, as proposed, in the new over-all plan, we should be adding only six billions to our annual expenditure. Thus, the 5-year program would cost us 30—not 50 billions. Furthermore, it seems reasonably certain that, with or without the over-all McMahon plan, we shall have to spend considerable sums in Asia and the Middle East during the next 5 years if we intend to hold our own

in a continuing cold war. It is, therefore, fair to say that the adoption of the McMahon plan without any conditions whatever would probably not add more than four or five billion dollars a year to our expenditures.

Can we afford such an increase?

I should like to put the question to you in reverse: Can we afford not to undertake such a plan? The last war cost us over $1,000,000,000,000. It cost us very nearly as much per week as this program would cost us per year. No one knows what the next war would cost.

Clearly we can afford it, if the program can reasonably be expected to get us off the greased slide that leads to atomic war and on to the long and arduous road that leads to peace.

I, for one, believe that Senator McMahon has outlined a plan that can reasonably be expected to lessen the existing tensions, to strengthen the United Nations, to put the United States into an unassailable moral position and to improve the lot of mankind. I believe that the United States should embark upon such a plan without making its decision subject to whatever the Kremlin may or may not be willing to do at the present time.

Secretary of State Acheson has said that the only agreements that can be made with the Kremlin are agreements which rest upon existing facts. Let us, then, present the Kremlin with a fact far more powerful than our decision to develop and manufacture ever more horrible weapons of destruction. Let us present the Kremlin with the fact that the United States is determined, in spite of its military burdens, to commit an act of faith—to dedicate its great strength to constructive cooperation with all the world's peoples in a world-wide crusade against hunger, poverty, disease, and ignorance. Let us present the Kremlin with the fact of a challenge not only to its military power but to its purposes, which are the ultimate roots of its power.

V. SHOULD WE LET RUSSIA PARTICIPATE IN THE NEW OVER-ALL PLAN?

The condition I would attach to Senator McMahon's proposal is one that we shall not be able to impose until we, ourselves, have accepted it. That condition is that only those nations shall be eligible to participate in the plan whose peoples have made known their will to accept the rule of law—not merely in the field of atomic weapons but in the whole field of international relations—to the degree necessary in order to outlaw force, or the threat of force, as a method of settling disputes.

Once we declare our own willingness to transform the United Nations into an organization capable of enforcing peace under law, we shall find ourselves in company with the entire non-Soviet world. We shall then be in a position to proceed with our over-all cooperative plan hand in hand with the majority of the world's peoples.

When the rulers of the Russian people decide that they, too, wish to participate on these terms, then, at long last, the arms race can come to an end, and all the world's peoples can be released from the burden which lies so heavily upon them, and from the overhanging threat of annihilation which beclouds their lives with fear.

It would, I think, be foolish to think that this can happen in the immediate future as the result of any sort of negotiations. A regime which maintains itself at home by the use of force cannot readily renounce force as an instrument of foreign policy. In the long run, however, even such a regime can be brought to realize—by "demonstration of fact"—that those peoples, who devote their energies to peaceful cooperation, will outstrip the peoples whose governments pursue only the sterile aim of widening the orbit of their own arbitrary power.

The alternatives with which we are faced today are not whether we should or should not "talk to the Russians." The alternatives we face are whether or not to do—in spite of the Russians—what needs to be done and what, in our hearts, we know we should do.

Freed from its self-defeating proviso, Senator McMahon's proposal can become a mighty weapon for peace.

Freed from its own myopic, penny-pinching fears, our Government can use this proposal to end the long nightmare in which we have been living.

Senator THOMAS. Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Warburg, I am interested in your program here. I gather from your statement that you are not prepared to go as far as the so-called Hutchins plan, which is a pro-

posed set-up for a world federation—you are not prepared to go that far?

Mr. WARBURG. No, sir.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I also gather that you are not in accord with the proposals of the Atlantic Union group which contemplates a preponderance of power at this time in order to give us a strong bargaining position with Russia?

Mr. WARBURG. No, sir; I am not in favor of that, as I stated in my testimony.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. And you think the proposals we have had to move step by step are not adequate?

Mr. WARBURG. That is right.

WORLD "FEDERATION" OR "ORDER"?

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Now there is one difficulty that has been raised in these hearings, in regard to a particular resolution, and that is to the use of the word "federation," and that is on the theory that it prejudges the kind of world set-up to exist. In other words, it is sort of copying after our own state or Swiss state. Some think that it goes too far and some think that unless we can see the thing through and blueprint it as to what it means, we should not use it. I have been asked as to those things, and as to the substitution of the word "order" for the word "federation" so that you won't have the implication of some kind of federated states, if that might not be better in this resolution, if adopted.

Mr. WARBURG. I would hesitate to express an unconsidered opinion as to this, Senator. It seems to me that "federation" is as broad as "order," and a little more specific in the sense that it is more limited, if you like, because it means that you delegate power to a federal government, whereas "order" might be unitary government, and if I were afraid of having this too broad, I would prefer the word "federation" because it does imply a limited delegation of power.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You feel it presupposes that we might commit ourselves to something like the Swiss Federation, or our own federation, or any other existing federation at the approach. I am wondering whether you are prepared to go that far, where you say in your statement that you are not trying to outline the details, you mean you are not prepared to say yet what kind of over-all federal legislature should be set up to enact the kind of laws you contemplate?

Mr. WARBURG. No; because I don't think we alone are capable of thinking that out. I think that is a cooperative matter that calls for cooperative effort.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I just wondered whether you wanted the United States to commit itself to that approach, and to the implication of the word "federation" at this time.

Mr. WARBURG. I think the essential thing we should undertake is that we declare our willingness to participate in some sort of world organization capable of enacting, administering, interpreting, and enforcing world law, whether you call it a federation, a government, or world order, I don't think that matters. I don't share in Mr. Hickerson's anxiety that this limits us to a narrow approach. I think this is

a broad approach, and I like it for that reason; whereas some of the other proposals are not, and I think they would be a misstep at the present time.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Would you be willing, irrespective of whether this is passed or not, to support the Thomas-Douglas proposal, or the so-called Ferguson Resolution, if you know what they are?

Mr. WARBURG. I don't know the Ferguson Resolution.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. The Ferguson Resolution is simply an approach through the United Nations, recognizing the United Nations, and presupposes that it has in it a possibility of expansion and proposes that that area of expansion should be explored under the United Nations as it is today, a trial-and-error approach, rather than contemplating a blueprint for the future.

Mr. WARBURG. I couldn't support that because it doesn't seem to go to the root of the matter, which is simply that the United Nations in its present form is a league of sovereign states, and the root of the evil is that it is not a league of sovereign people. Unless you cure that, I don't think you can attack the root of the evil. I don't think our present resolutions go far enough, I may be incorrect, but in my understanding, the resolution won't go far enough to change the United Nations from a league of nations to a league of people.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. It would not change the structure of the United Nations at all.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. That is all I had in mind, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to bring out, if I could, Mr. Warburg's position on these things, and the relation to other proposals. We are dealing with lots of proposals and we will have to meet in executive session when the hearings are over, and think through the positions taken by the different witnesses.

I feel grateful to you for your splendid presentation, Mr. Warburg. Your point of view is very valuable.

Mr. WARBURG. If I might sum it up, I think Senate Resolution 56 does the minimum required to undertake the job we have to undertake without going any further than is necessary, to accomplish that minimum at the present time.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. You don't claim Senate Resolution 56 would meet any of the immediate present crises before us?

Mr. WARBURG. No, but I think it would get us on a course with a charted goal toward which we could steer, which would enable us to meet the crises, and without such a goal, I don't see how we can, because we will go on zigzagging.

DISARMAMENT PROPOSAL

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. Would you care to comment on Senator Tydings' suggestion that the President call a disarmament conference to deal with that as the immediate problem before us, before we get to Senator McMahon's proposal?

Mr. WARBURG. With all due respect to Senator Tydings, I have never seen any hope in disarmament or limitation of armaments by agreement between sovereign nations or states, because all of the treaties between the sovereign nations or states are such that anyone can break

them at their convenience, and the result is that you give a head start to the aggressor.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I ought to say, in behalf of Senator Tydings' proposal that he wouldn't think of going into it unless there were some practical plan for international inspection.

Mr. WARBURG. I would find it difficult to imagine any practical plan which did not involve some form of world government.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. That is one of the difficulties we have.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

IMPLEMENTATION OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56

Senator WILEY. Mr. Chairman, Senate Resolution 56 merely expresses the sense of the Congress. Do you think, Mr. Warburg, that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited power?

Where do you go from there?

Mr. WARBURG. I don't think one needs to answer that question at the present time, sir. I can tell you where I think, or where I would try to go. As far as I can see today, the next thing I would do would be to explore with the other nations, and as I said in my statement, particularly with a nation like India, what the common ground is on which we could reasonably hope to build a pattern on which they could live and we could live, each keeping the things we cherish. If we could do that, find the common pattern or the common meeting ground for the non-Soviet world, and I believe it can be done, then one begins this trial-and-error business, finding out how the details would work out in terms of a constitution, and so forth.

Senator WILEY. I want to thank you for that explanation, because I agree fully with you that all the resolution does is to express the sense of the Congress the hope and wish that through man's ingenuity and vision he can evolve something that may do this job.

Mr. WARBURG. I should say, if I might, sir, it is more than a wish. I think it is a determination. I think if the Congress enacts this concurrent resolution, it is requesting the President to declare this as an avowed aim of the American policy, and aims of American policy have a habit of being more than wishes.

Senator WILEY. I won't quibble with you about the meaning of words. What I have in mind is that it is not a mandate because under the Constitution this is a question of foreign policy. It virtually says to the President, "Now, get busy and see if you can do something about this terrible situation that we are in."

The Stae Department says that they have been busy. They have been trying in every way, through the United Nations, through their ambassadors, to try to reach some workable arrangement with Joe Stalin. The only reason I am interjecting this angle is because, as you have heard today, two Congressmen have intimated that the passage of one of these resolutions would be unconstitutional. When those very suggestions get to the public, and they connect them with the daily news, a bad psychological condition is created. I think it is well to have it clear that all we are doing here is exploring these suggestions. If any resolution is passed, all it does is to suggest to the

President who, under the Constitution, has responsibility for our foreign relations, that we want him to keep on exploring to see if we can do something to antidote the Russian influence.

EFFECT OF RESOLUTION ON PEOPLE OF THE WORLD

Now, I want to ask another question: Assume now that pursuant to this resolution the President is requested to head in a certain direction in foreign relations to take steps to support and strengthen the United Nations in such a way that there will be developed a world federation open to other nations.

Assume that we are successful in getting this resolution through. Suppose we get India and Pakistan and their 500,000,000 people to enter our organization. We could make a lot of other assumptions.

All right, how are we going to, by having this mechanism, change the ideological approach of these people? I am interested, vitally interested, because I think that is the crux of the thing—how are we going to win the battles of the mind?

Mr. WARBURG. What I attempted to suggest, and let me restate it because I think it is the nub of the problem. I don't think that by our avowed intention to transform the United Nations into a world federation, that we change an existing crisis with Russia, and the whole Communist orbit.

Senator WILEY. That should be set out——

Mr. WARBURG. It may hitch together, because that is only half of what I want to say.

I don't think we can meet that crisis in any other way except by embarking on this road, and then doing some other things as well. I don't think then, even if you attained world government, you would necessarily have a guaranty of peace—I don't think you can have peace without world government, I think we need to proceed on two parallel lines, one political, and one economic. I think the political line is that we must declare our intention to do the one thing that can preserve the peace in the world, and oddly enough, the United States and the Soviet Union are the only two great powers that are on record as opposing the transformation of the United Nations. That is the only thing we agree with Uncle Joe on. Most of the other nations in the world are about ready to do something about it. That is the political approach.

But, parallel, to that, that is why I brought in Senator McMahon's proposal, I think we can do a great deal to create the limits within which the world community can grow and become possible, and I think the Senator hit the nail on the head with his proposal, except as I say he hitched it to another proviso.

I think we should go ahead and do precisely what he says, and not wait for Russia. We should get together with the other nations which are willing to share our purpose to create the rule of law in the world.

Senator WILEY. Have you ever heard of the statement that a treaty is but a scrap of paper?

Mr. WARBURG. Yes.

Senator WILEY. Have you seen any indication in the last 30 years that the nations have changed their approach on that?

Mr. WARBURG. If your question means, do I believe that we can make a treaty with the Russians, I will say precisely the opposite. I am saying we should proceed, irrespective of a treaty with the Russians.

Senator WILEY. I am talking about whether or not the question of the validity of a treaty is just as strong as the intent of the parties to maintain it and keep it.

Mr. WARBURG. That is correct.

Senator WILEY. And, when you talk about creating a world government, you mean, I presume, that not simply the mechanism, but that the parties to that will live and die with the instrument; that they are ready to live and ready to sacrifice and ready to carry it through. But we have seen how in the economic front, the doctrine of the British, that a contract is a valid thing between two parties, has fared, and you have seen in the nations of the earth, the old British doctrine go out the window and the idea is now, "Get as much as you can, and forget the contract."

Mr. WARBURG. Senator, I think you have put your finger on the primary reason why this resolution is necessary. As long as you have a world organization which is in effect nothing more than a multilateral agreement between sovereign states, you have precisely the situation you describe. The minute you have government and law, and law enforcement, there is no longer a question of whether you are willing to stick to a contract, you have to, or the policeman will come and take you in to jail.

Senator WILEY. You are assuming law and law enforcement. That means that Uncle Sam would become the world policeman.

Mr. WARBURG. No, no. I am not assuming that we will run the world government. I am not assuming that this world federation is a device for extending our own power.

Senator WILEY. You are not assuming that all the other folks on the earth are going to run us, are you?

Mr. WARBURG. I am assuming that a government will be run as our own Government is run, by the development of a fair process of representation which has to take in all the factors that apply to that, not only population, but productivity and education and all those things.

Senator WILEY. That is a consummation devoutly to be wished for, but are you not really assuming that we have won the battle of ideas in the minds of men, so that we all see alike? Until you do that, you will have your internal conflict.

Mr. WARBURG. I don't think we have won the battle for the minds of men, I think we are in the process of losing it, sir.

Senator WILEY. I think we have lost it. I want to win it back, if there is a way to do it. If yours is the way to do it, you will have to demonstrate it, and you will have to demonstrate that if we join up with all the groups of the earth, that we won't be taken for a ride. We have been so naive in our world dealings, as you know, with the Soviet Union particularly and with others, and my whole thought in questioning you is to see or make sure that the thing we want, in other words, people sitting down, nations sitting down together, keeping faith with one another, things that we want to be—that our wishes do not lead us up other blind alleys that we would regret.

Mr. WARBURG. I subscribe to that, but I do very strongly feel that what we are doing today is following a policy which is made largely in Moscow, a fear-dictated negative policy designed to stop the Russians from whatever they want to do. I think the only way we will ever stop the Russians is to develop a positive policy of our own, and I think the two parts of a pattern go together. You can't have law without government, and you can't have peace without law, that is part A; and, part B, the fact that you have to conduct a really serious world-wide war on hunger, disease, ignorance, and poverty if you want to have the people of the world on our side. I don't mean to be Santa Claus. I mean, there should be a cooperative endeavor, such as Senator McMahon was talking about, in which everybody chips in.

Senator WILEY. We have to have that recognition. If we have it, can we get all the other folks to have that recognition, and then keep faith?

Mr. WARBURG. I think the first problem we should meet is in ourselves. One of the things I think we have been doing too much, is that we have stoped ourselves from getting started in the right direction because we then say, conveniently, "Oh, well, the other fellow won't do it anyway, so what's the use."

If we said, "This is something we have to do," and did it, we would find an awful lot of other people coming along who, once something was started, might be persuaded to join us.

Senator WILEY. You understand, of course, that we have a great deal of disagreement here between great minds in relation to the appropriateness of the mechanism. You are in favor of this, others are in favor of the North Atlantic Union, so, great minds differ on the mechanism, but they all seem to think that their mechanism will do the job.

Now, the thing I am trying to bring out in my questions is, that no mechanism will do the job unless there is a willingness and intent on the part of the peoples to carry it through.

Mr. WARBURG. Including our own.

Senator WILEY. Yes, that is the thing, and there is always the danger that because men of high standing, like yourself, get up here and talk about a mechanism, that some people believe it is going to give us the thing right off the bat, ipso facto, so to speak—it is going to be self-operating. That is a very dangerous condition for us to get into. We must make sure that whatever we do, it does not go out to the public that at long last we have found the magic something that is going to bring peace on earth. Peace is a question of conflict within the minds of men, and between nations. Conflict in the minds of men has been generated through centuries of hate and competition between people for material wealth and political domination. That basic conflict is not eliminated by merely passing a resolution or creating a mechanism. It has to be something finer, a rebirth within the minds of men. Do you agree with that.

Mr. WARBURG. Yes, but nothing I ever said, or that I have ever written indicated that I think that by passing a resolution we will have the millenium, nor are we talking about a mechanism. I think we are talking about an aim to find a mechanism; something different. We are not saying this is the mechanism by which you do it, we are saying

you have to find it. We have to find the mechanism which will enable us to substitute the rule of law for the rule of anarchy in the world.

Senator WILEY. You have no mechanism, you are searching for one. Others say they have the mechanism.

Mr. WARBURG. I think that is all this resolution commits us to, to starch for a mechanism to create the rule of law.

Senator WILEY. Thank you.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you, Mr. Warburg.

Mr. WARBURG. Thank you, sir.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Mr. Whitney, please, Byrl A. Whitney. Please identify yourself for the record, and then proceed.

Mr. WHITNEY. Yes, sir.

My name is Byrl A. Whitney. As I understand, in order to conserve time and come within your limits, I will skip some of my statement, but the whole statement will be in the record.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. We're trying to hold you to 10 minutes, Mr. Whitney. If you will do that, we will be very grateful.

STATEMENT OF BYRL A. WHITNEY, DIRECTOR OF THE EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH BUREAU, BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN

Mr. WHITNEY. My name is Byrl A. Whitney. I am director of the educational and reserach bureau of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, with offices at 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland 13, Ohio.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Mr. Whitney, if you want to insert your statement in the record, I will give you that privilege, and then you may talk to us during your 10 minutes, informally, instead of reading to us, and the record will look better, I am sure.

Mr. WHITNEY. I believe I can read and insert and save time.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. All right.

Mr. WHITNEY. The Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen has members in the United States and Canada, and represents conductors, brakemen, baggagemen, flagmen, yard conductors, yard brakemen, switchtenders, car retarder operators, yardmasters, dining car stewards, and intercity bus operators. I have been asked by Mr. W. P. Kennedy, president of the Brotherhood, to appear before you and present this testimony in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 56.

At the outset, let me state that the subject we are dealing with today is not a passing fancy or fad, nor is it a new proposition. Four hundred years before Christ, Socrates was thinking in terms of world government when he said "When you are asked your country, never reply, 'I am an Athenian,' or 'I am a Corinthian'—but 'I am a citizen of the world.'" I should also point out that a system of government and law in the relationships between men is the earliest form of stable, social organization. The civilized world has existed to this day without government at the international level, but on the testimony of the world's most eminent scientists, mankind is now confronted with a serious threat to continued existence on this planet. For almost 30 years I have firmly believed that world federal government is the only feasible and realistic solution to the problem of maintaining world peace and stability.

WORLD GOVERNMENT ACTS ON INDIVIDUALS

I want to emphasize that when I speak of world government, I mean a government of laws which reach down to the individual and commands him to obey what the collective wisdom of organized society, expressed through its tribunals of legislative, executive, and judicial departments, have found to be necessary to the common good. In fact, these are the basic essentials of government. Let me also emphasize that we are not talking about a government that would regulate the price of eggs on Main Street, America, but rather a world federal government with limited powers, but with power adequate to maintain peace.

May I state orally here, Mr. Chairman, that I heard the testimony of the two congressmen this morning and I certainly want to say that I do not believe in the kind of world government they envisage, and I want to emphasize the point I just made, that so far as I know, no one is talking about the kind of world government they envisage.

I don't think what they said has anything to do, remotely to do with Senate Resolution 56.

Senator WILEY. I think they go on the theory that if you get the camel's nose under the tent, pretty soon you get the hindquarters.

Mr. WHITNEY. That of course is not very good logic, particularly.

Senator WILEY. Did you ever see a camel do that?

Mr. WHITNEY. No.

Senator WILEY. I think it is very logical.

Mr. WHITNEY. That same argument could have been made against our own form of government, we should never do anything right, because maybe if we do, a lot of wrong will get in with the right.

I don't follow that philosophy of government or personal conduct.

Senator WILEY. I am not particularly standing by the conclusion. I am simply stating what I believe to be their philosophy, which I think has a lot to it, that once you open the door, and you can put your foot in, soon your whole anatomy is in.

Mr. WHITNEY. We opened it up with our forefathers, true we have amended the Constitution 22 times. I don't think that is a crime. I don't think it hurt anybody. I think it helped the American people.

If you had a world government, maybe in the course of human events it would be desirable to amend it for a specific human need. I wouldn't see anything to be fearful, on that score.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Those amendments to the Constitution—were they adopted primarily because there was something the matter with the Constitution, or were they adopted primarily because men under the Constitution had done something that the people didn't like?

Mr. WHITNEY. Of course the first 10 amendments, the Bill of Rights, were adopted, I think because there was specifically something wrong with the Constitution, it was inadequate.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Does that hold for the tenth?

Mr. WHITNEY. The first 10?

Senator THOMAS of Utah. The tenth of the first 10.

Mr. WHITNEY. Which one is that?

Senator THOMAS of Utah. That is the tenth.