



*Not printed at Government expense)*

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 83<sup>d</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

## The Great Conspiracy to Destroy the United States

SPEECH

or

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1954

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that there now exists a widespread understanding and agreement made between the agents of this Government and the United Nations and North Atlantic Treaty Organization to build a world government, and to make the United States a part of it, regardless of our Constitution, laws, and traditions. This is to be done in the name of peace, but will result in the total destruction of our liberty. The agents representing the United States may not be deliberately trying to do this treasonable work, but the best that can be said for them is that they are dupes. Some mighty important people who are United States citizens are not only going along with this scheme, but are daily and hourly contributing all their efforts in that direction.

What proof do we have to back up this general statement? The purpose of this speech is to lay this proof before the American people.

First of all, the people of the United

States were so completely sick of war after World War II that these schemers found a fertile field to exploit. They appealed to churches, schools, and every other organization they could reach, on the basis that the way to secure peace in the world was to organize a United Nations group, and that through the machinery which they proposed to set up, wars could be stopped before they started. It seemed like a plausible idea, and not knowing the sinister purpose behind the move, millions of people supported the suggestion.

The first move was made at San Francisco, where many nations met, drew up a charter, and submitted that charter to the Senate of the United States for approval as a treaty.

This document had none of the earmarks of a treaty, because the Supreme Court of the United States has held in many cases that a treaty is an agreement made between nations, to do or not to do particular things. In the case of the Charter of the United Nations, it was not an agreement between nations. It was an agreement made by the agents of several governments, and there is no contention from any quarter that the United Nations at that time was a nation with which we could make a treaty agreement. The dark forces behind this move knew that the United Nations was not a nation with which we could make a treaty, but intended to make it an integral power at the first opportunity.

How these forces for evil planned to make the United Nations a nation is clear now, since they propose at this time to build a world government by simply amending the Charter of the United Nations.

Who were the principal movers at San Francisco for this United Nations Charter? Who wrote the charter, and who had the most to do about shaping its provisions? The answer is that the Russian Communists and Alger Hiss, a representative of our State Department, were the prime movers and schemers in arranging its provisions. That is the same Alger Hiss who was convicted for perjury when he denied sending secret material to the Soviet Union representatives. Its very beginning gave this document a bad odor.

The universal approval of a plan to preserve world peace had not worn off and the facts were yet unknown when the Senate was called upon to approve the United Nations Charter. The sentiment for peace was so strong that only two Senators refused to approve the charter. If the question were to come up now, a great majority would say "No."

If the real purpose of this charter was to outline a method to secure and preserve world peace, why was it necessary in that charter to make an assault upon the Constitution of the United States? Are we not already a peace-loving nation, without having to rely upon the Soviets and Hiss?

Here you see again that world peace was not the object of this scheme at all. The real purpose was to build a world government, controlled by the Communists and their dupes in the United States.

As soon as this charter was approved the courts of the United States began to hear about it. In the Fujii case in California, the Charter of the United Nations was substituted for the laws of the State of California, and that remained so for several months, until a higher court overruled the court that made this finding. It was a precarious situation,

depending upon the whim of a court.

Again, in the Steel Seizure case, where the Supreme Court was searching our Constitution for some provision that would uphold the President in his action, the same Charter of the United Nations once more appeared. Falling to find any authority in the Constitution to fortify the President's position, the Chief Justice resorted to one of the most unheard-of things in American history. He produced the Charter of the United Nations as the authority for the seizure and cited its provisions in an effort to support the President's act. Fortunately for the people of the United States, the majority of the Court would not permit this communistic charter to supplant the Constitution of the United States. It was, however, a close call, and abundantly proved the need of the Bricker amendment. No one can ever tell what the next decision might be, although throughout our history God seems always to be on our side; and no matter what the political complexion of the Supreme Court may be, the decisions have upheld the Constitution.

The next assault on the Constitution is found in the Covenant of Human Rights, which has not as yet been presented to the Senate for ratification. The United Nations has amended its first draft several times, and because of the rising tide of objection to what it is doing and planning to do, the latest draft has not come before the Senate.

The subtle and fraudulent work of the United Nations in trying to prepare the people of the United States for the approval of this un-American document ought in itself to condemn its further consideration by the people and their leaders.

To prove to you that its procedure was fraudulent and totally dishonest, I wish to clearly state that the United Nations put out a Declaration of Human Rights, which, upon its face was not objectionable. This declaration was propagandized by the spreading of millions of copies among church people, in the com-

mon schools, and in the higher institutions of learning. Every civic organization was also the object of this avalanche of propaganda.

There was a cunningly designed purpose in this. It was necessary to prepare the people for the advent of the Covenant of Human Rights. When the propagandists thought the ground work had been sufficiently laid, the real human rights document appeared. It was and still is called the Covenant of Human Rights, but it is entirely different from the propagandized Declaration of Human Rights. Here in this Covenant of Human Rights the United Nations, among other things, undertakes to do three important things, all of which threaten the Constitution of the United States. It has rewritten what is meant by free speech, a free press, and free religion. The Constitution is not in doubt in defining these three fundamental attributes of a free government. Here is what it says:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

If the provisions of the document called the Covenant of Human Rights are adopted by the Senate please ask yourselves what has become of these precious constitutional rights. Here is what the covenant says about them:

Article 15, section 3: Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

Article 16, section 2: Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art or through any other media of his choice.

Section 3: The exercise of the rights provided for in the foregoing paragraph carries

with it special duties and responsibilities. It may therefore be subject to certain restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary (1) for respect of the rights or reputations of others, (2) for the protection of national security or of public order, or of public health or morals.

When we go so far as to hedge in, restrain and circumvent free speech, then there is no free speech. There will be no free press. There will be no free religion. Does anyone who is acquainted with these facts want to say that the United Nations is not trying to rewrite our Constitution, with the aid and support of Communists and revolutionists? Just why is it necessary to emasculate our Constitution if the only object of the United Nations is world peace? Is not our Constitution and the desire of all the people of this country in favor of peace?

It is necessary to change our Constitution in order to carry out the design and conspiracy to build a world government. Is it not perfectly clear to you now that this was the real purpose of the framers of the United Nations from its very beginning? It ought to be obvious to any fairminded person that it is the deliberate scheme of the United Nations to destroy the Constitution of the United States, and should need no further proof.

But that is not all, as the following steps will disclose. The United Nations has produced another convention, which in time they will ask the Senate to approve. I refer to the Genocide Convention. This is an appealing subject and it has caught in its net a great many good American citizens. As defined by the dictionary, genocide is "the use or a user of deliberate, systematic measures toward the extermination of a racial, political, or cultural group."

The wholesale destruction of a race or group of people for no reason at all except that they are a race or group, is against all principles of humanity, and in this country is a violation of moral

and civic law. Is there anything in the Constitution of the United States, or even in the laws of any State of this great Union, that approves such crime? Why is it necessary to change and amend, abrogate and repeal, our own Constitution in order that we shall be authorized to rise up against such a moral and legal crime? The answer is that there is no possible reason for this action—if the purpose of the covenant is to prevent genocide.

This Convention undertakes to further amend the Constitution of the United States and deny the rights of our citizens under the Bill of Rights in another respect. The sixth amendment to the Constitution provides:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed; which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

The Genocide Convention provides that a citizen of the United States, who has, in the opinion of the United Nations, libeled or injured the feelings of a race, a group, or any member of a group, shall be subject to trial for violating the covenant. Will the accused be tried here in the United States, where the crime was alleged to have been committed? No. He will be tried wherever the United Nations may decide. Will he be tried under the Constitution and laws of this country, with the safeguards provided by the sixth amendment? No. He will be tried under such laws as the United Nations World Court shall prescribe. Why was it considered necessary to take away from the citizens of this country the protection our Constitution gives them? Are our people engaged, or were they ever engaged in race annihilation?

The real, hidden, and treasonable pur-

pose of this provision was and is to tear down our Constitution and make all citizens, who are entitled to the enjoyment of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, subject to the provisions of a world court, which is already being set up to function in this supergovernment—a world government.

Do we need further proof that the real and only purpose of the builders of the United Nations was to fashion a world government and to make our citizens subject to that world government, and to strip from them the protection guaranteed them under the Constitution of the United States?

If this is not treason, then I do not understand the provision of the Constitution defining it. Section 3 of article III of the Constitution says:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

For fear that there may be some in the United States who are not yet convinced by what I have said so far, I will not rest this case there, but will present further evidence.

The United Nations set up an organization known as UNESCO—United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization—for the purpose of spreading universal learning, which the promoters contended would bring the people of the world more quickly to a mutual understanding than anything else would.

There was no objection to this proposal—at least on the face of it. But it turned out to be the most dangerous, the most dastardly undertaking of all that the United Nations had theretofore contrived. Its purpose was not what its promoters said it was. It was a deliberate plan to create public opinion for the coming world government. The malicious and cowardly element of the enterprise was that it was directed to the schoolchildren of the Nation, where minds are young and impressionable,

and it is patterned exactly after the Soviet teaching of the youth of the country.

These schemers knew that the United States has a strong national spirit; they knew that the average American loves his country; they knew he would defend its institutions, which had brought freedom in a new land. The plotters determined that this spirit must be destroyed, or at least minimized. So UNESCO went to work.

The first step was to train teachers at Columbia University, at the expense of the United Nations—principally at the expense of the taxpayers of this country—to teach our children ways by which they could become world citizens, and that a strong national spirit interferes with this world venture. The birthdays of our great leaders, like Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Lincoln were not to be celebrated in honor of these leaders, but the day of celebration should be devoted to propagandizing these children on the benefits of this future world government. They made it exceedingly plain that love for the United States and its institutions prevented our participation in such a world government.

Printed matter, radio and television were used night and day to carry on the cultivation propaganda, and to root out the love of country from these United States. This program is still being carried on, and the worst part of it is that the people who will eventually be stripped of the protection of our Constitution will pay the price of its destruction in taxes. It should now be proven overwhelmingly that the United Nations was organized to destroy the Constitution of the United States. This is all done in the name of world peace—but who wants to substitute world peace for the liberty and freedom we have? Who wants to surrender the sovereignty of this great republic to an organization which has been assiduously at work from its very beginning to abolish our Constitution?

Two very important sessions of the world government advocates have been

held in London, and in the proceedings it is made plain that the machinery for world government is already set up in the Charter of the United Nations, and all that is necessary is to make a few amendments to that charter. Many advocates of the United Nations have now come out openly for this world government. Some very influential men in public life say that we can afford to give up some of our sovereignty to obtain world peace. The propaganda for a world government has flourished in many quarters. I am here to tell you that we cannot afford to give up any of our national sovereignty for any cause.

We have the only government on earth where the people themselves rule. The government here exists for the people, and the people do not exist for the government. For over 160 years we have gone on our way with our own concept of government, and we know what freedom means. Are we fools enough to abandon our course and listen to the siren songs of those whose design it is to destroy this great Government, and fit it into a new world government with a heterogeneous collection of nations whose ideas of the purpose of government conflict with our own? Instead of destroying our national spirit, it should be increased. If other nations want to follow our example, let them do it; but to let any foreign combination direct the affairs of this Government would be intolerable and will never be permitted. It could not be done by force. And if the American people are alert and prize freedom and liberty as much as I think they do, this false, insidious, and conspiratorial scheme to subdue us will never prevail.

The world government proposes a world congress where members are elected according to the population of the member nations. This means that Soviet Russia and Red China and their enslaved comrades will control that government.

After examining this record, can anyone doubt that the United Nations was purposely set up to do to this country

what could not be done by force of arms, but through the blandishments of Communists, fellow travelers, and dupes, get us to surrender our liberty without firing a shot?

There are some questions that should be answered. One of them is, "Why does this Government permit the recognition of Soviet Russia, when it is known by all, including all the administration leaders, that from the Russian Embassy here in Washington there is a constant flow to all parts of the country of propaganda that is inimical to the United States?" The next question is, "Why do we remain

in the United Nations when we can plainly see that the whole scheme is directed to our destruction?" If the administration officials hide their heads in the sand for security, I am sure that the people will not.

I have faith in the American people, when they are armed with the facts.

I have faith in the Divine Ruler of this universe, who has sustained us in the past; and I have an enduring faith that He will not desert us in our efforts to maintain a government of freedom and liberty here on these shores where it began.