

The Truth || ABOUT *the* UNITED NATIONS

|| *By Chesly Manly*

THE United Nations, now in its eighth year, is a self-evident futility; but that fact alone would neither incite public opinion nor overcome the inertia of statesmen who perpetrated a fraud upon the people and are loath to admit it. The United States will not withdraw from the U.N. until the people make it known that their intelligence is insulted and their moral sense is outraged by continued fraternization, in a purported peace organization, with international Communism, which is avowedly dedicated to the violent destruction of the whole non-Communist world.

A grass-roots reassessment of the U.N. already is in progress, among members of school boards, Parent-Teacher associations, American Legion posts, women's clubs, and civic organizations which are concerned about U.N. propaganda in the public schools.

Obviously, our school children should learn something about the U.N. Our membership in this organization, its headquarters on American soil, the support it has received

from our Presidents, Secretaries of State, and leaders of Congress, regardless of political party, are facts of our national life. Moreover, some 400,000 Americans are fighting in Korea under the banner of this organization, in a war that has cost us more than 130,000 casualties.

I believe most Americans would agree that instruction about the U.N. should be truthful. School children may accept the preposterous claims made for the organization by self-interested politicians, self-deluded college professors, One World newspapers, and credulous club women; but in time they will learn to think for themselves and their disillusionment may have unfortunate consequences. Objective teaching, however, is not what the U.N. and its supporters want. They seek to indoctrinate school children, beginning in kindergarten, with propaganda for a supranational "world community." A joint report on "Teaching About the United Nations and the Specialized Agencies," prepared by the Secretary General of the U.N. and the Direc-

tor General of UNESCO, declares that such instruction "should not be . . . limited merely to imparting information about the structure and activities of the organization, important though this information may be. Rather should it be seen as a form of education contributing to the development of world-minded citizens."

THE report states that a program of education for "the world community" should "make clear that states, whatever their difference of creeds and ways of life, have both a duty to co-operate in international organizations and an interest in so doing." Clearly this implies that the United States has a duty to "co-operate" with the Soviet Union, despite the late Josef Stalin's insistence that such co-operation is unthinkable.

Excessive internationalism, or allegiance to a "world community," is incompatible with genuine patriotism. The Bible tells us that "no man can serve two masters." Communism, which is one form of internationalism, finds its greatest appeal among those who have been taught to sneer at patriotism as though it were but "the last refuge of a scoundrel," to use Dr. Samuel Johnson's phrase.

Propaganda material distributed by UNESCO for school teachers contains a quotation from *Principles of Social Reconstruction*, by Bertrand Russell, which condemns "big-

oted nationalism" in history textbooks. This English One Worlder and idol of UNESCO makes it clear in his latest book, *The Impact of Science on Society*, that he regards any degree of nationalism as a manifestation of bigotry. "Unless there is a world government which secures universal birth control," he writes, "there must from time to time be great wars, in which the penalty of defeat is widespread death by starvation."

Here is a glimpse of One World, as conceived by Lord Russell, a self-styled "democratic socialist":

"It is to be expected that advances in physiology and psychology will give governments much more control over individual mentality than they now have even in totalitarian countries. . . . Diet, injections, and injunctions will combine, from a very early age, to produce the sort of character and the sort of beliefs that the authorities consider desirable, and any serious criticism of the powers that be will become psychologically impossible. Even if all are miserable, all will believe themselves happy because the government will tell them that they are so."

WHEN such an eminent scholar as Prof. Samuel Flaggs Bemis of Yale University declares in his *Diplomatic History of the United States* that the U.N. has "proved to be but an international debating society, like the first League of

Nations, only more vituperative,” and when Sir Gladwyn Jebb, Great Britain’s chief delegate to the U.N., frankly acknowledges that it “cannot provide for our security,” it is time to stop deceiving our school children about it.

It is a simple matter for a teacher to be objective about the structure of the U.N., its membership, the assigned functions of its various organs, and its asserted purposes; but an honest evaluation of the organization requires information that will never be found in official handbooks. Probably there is not one teacher in the country who has sufficient knowledge of the U.N. to teach the subject authoritatively. I have debated the question with university professors posing as experts who were amazingly uninformed about the U.N. in practice, as distinguished from theory. Only those who have had years of experience at U.N. meetings and enjoy the confidence of delegates and their political advisers know the truth about the organization, the realities behind the global gibble-gabble, the motivations and machinations of member governments, the ominous currents of anti-Americanism in the secretariat and in delegations of supposedly friendly nations.

The essential facts, however, are self-evident. Why was the U.N. founded? The primary purpose, according to the charter, was “to maintain international peace and se-

curity.” Instead of peace and security we have a global cold war, a major shooting war in Korea, smaller shooting wars in Indo-China and Malaya, unresolved states of war in the Middle East (Palestine) and on the subcontinent of India (Kashmir), and smoldering unrest among the colonial and semi-colonial peoples of Africa and Asia. Both former President Truman and President Eisenhower have told us that the menace of world Communism is the greatest peril ever faced by the United States.

ANOTHER major purpose of the U.N., according to the Atlantic Charter, in which it was projected, was “to relieve mankind from the crushing burden of armaments.” Seven years after the first U.N. general assembly the American people are paying fifty to sixty billion dollars a year for armaments and foreign aid.

Apologists for the U.N. cannot dispute these facts, but they argue that the world situation would be even worse, that we might be engaged in a global atomic war, if the organization did not exist. The answer to that argument is that the U.N. has not solved a single political question which could not and would not have been settled by the traditional processes of diplomacy if the U.N. had never been created.

We are told that the U.N. got the Soviet troops out of Iran. Actually, they did not leave until the

Kremlin's demand for an oil concession in northern Iran had been met by the Iranian prime minister. The Soviet Union pulled its troops out of Iran, after obtaining the oil agreement, because it was not ready to risk war with the United States and Great Britain, not because of any respect for the U.N. Security Council. Concurrently with the Iranian dispute, Stalin was demanding bases on the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. When Turkey threatened to fight and the United States and Britain said they would support the Turks, Stalin backed down. This was a triumph of old-fashioned power politics, in a case that was not even before the U.N.

In the Palestine war, both the Jews and the Arabs defied the Security Council when it appeared to suit their interests, and hostilities ceased only with the victory of Israeli arms. This was a triumph of force, not a victory for the U.N. After the Israeli victory, the U.N. negotiated an armistice agreement, but in five years it has not been able to effect a peace settlement, or to solve the problem of 850,000 Palestinian Arabs who were displaced by the war.

In Indonesia, the Dutch defied the Security Council until Merle Cochran, a wise American diplomat, finally persuaded them that no matter what sacrifices they were prepared to make they could never subjugate the Indonesians. Yielding to American pressure, the Dutch

granted independence to the Indonesians.

IN Kashmir, India and Pakistan agreed to a cease-fire because each hoped to get what it wanted from the U.N.; but four years of U.N. efforts to settle the dispute have failed, and the armies of the two countries still menace each other in a situation that could explode into a world war.

The U.N. is credited with saving Greece from destruction by Communist guerrilla forces supported by the Soviet Union's Balkan satellites. Actually, Greece was saved by direct American military and economic assistance, costing almost two billion dollars, and by Communist Yugoslavia's break with Stalinism. Yugoslavia had been the main base of guerrilla operations against Greece.

The Security Council's attempt to end the Berlin Blockade was frustrated by a Soviet veto. Months later the question was settled by direct negotiations. It is slightly ludicrous to give the U.N. credit for this settlement on the ground that it provided the diplomatic contact which resulted in the direct negotiations. The United States and the Soviet Union have diplomatic contacts in the major capitals of the world, and need not depend on chance meetings in U.N. washrooms.

The Security Council tried and failed to settle Great Britain's dispute with Egypt over the future

of the Sudan and the defense of the Suez Canal. Aided by American mediation, a function of old-fashioned diplomacy, Britain and Egypt have happily reached an agreement on the Sudan and have agreed in principle on British evacuation of the Suez Canal zone, which will prepare the way for a Middle East defense pact. It appears probable that American mediation efforts also will effect a settlement of Britain's oil dispute with Iran, which the Security Council tried and failed to settle.

THE General Assembly at first refused to consider Arab complaints that France was oppressing the Moroccans, in violation of the U.N. Charter, and the Security Council later refused to consider similar charges against the French in Tunisia. When the Assembly finally took up both questions, it sought to appease the French, who were conducting a Soviet-style boycott of its sessions. The Assembly adopted Latin American resolutions, inspired by the United States, which expressed confidence in France's intentions respecting the Tunisians and Moroccans. For its labors, the Assembly incurred the contempt of France and the resentment of the whole Moslem world from Morocco to Indonesia, whose leaders made it clear that the struggle for independence would go on.

The response of the U.N. to the Communist aggression in Korea is

acclaimed by supporters of the organization as a victory for the collective security principle in its first test. Actually it would be difficult to imagine a more convincing demonstration that such a system is not collective, nor does it provide security. The resistance to aggression in Korea is called a U.N. operation, but it is primarily an American war. President Truman ordered American armed forces into action before the Security Council was asked to recommend such assistance to the South Koreans. Confronted by a *fait accompli*, and lightly assuming that the United States could defeat the Communists without calling for substantial help, members of the Security Council voted for armed action. So far as the United States was concerned, the U.N. served only as a convenient pretext for the President to enter the war without a declaration by Congress, as required by the Constitution. The United States has done more than ninety per cent of the fighting by U.N. members; it has sustained more than ninety per cent of the U.N. casualties; and it has borne more than ninety per cent of the cost of the war.

The General Assembly stalled for ten weeks after Communist China's intervention in the war before adopting a resolution accusing the Peiping regime of aggression. It waited six months before adopting, with even greater reluctance, a resolution calling for an embargo on

the shipment of war materials to Red China. It has never called for a complete cessation of trading with the enemy, and the United States, Canada, and the Philippines are the only U.N. members that have stopped all such trade. Neither has the U.N. sought to exercise the moral authority ascribed to it by its supporters by condemning the Soviet Union for its part in the Korean aggression.

UNITED NATIONS members obstructed the prosecution of the war in Korea by repeatedly warning the United States against attacking enemy bases in Manchuria and by sniping at General MacArthur until President Truman removed him. They induced the United States to walk into a bear trap by accepting Moscow's proposal for armistice talks at a time when the Communists needed time to build up their forces. The Assembly has addressed repeated truce appeals to the Chinese Communists, including one offer to give them both Formosa and a seat in the U.N.

A persistent and widely propagated myth about the U.N. is that the non-Communist members are united; that they are faithful to their obligations under the charter, and that obstruction by the Soviet bloc is the sole reason for the weakness of the organization. The Soviet Union has flagrantly abused its veto in the Security Council, but the U.N. could do anything the charter

authorizes it to do, including the use of armed force, on a recommendation by the General Assembly, in which there is no veto. After the fortuitous absence of the Soviet delegation permitted the Security Council to recommend armed intervention in Korea, the Assembly adopted the so-called "Uniting for Peace" resolution, proposed by former Secretary of State Acheson. This resolution authorizes the Assembly to meet on twenty-four hours' notice and recommend collective action against aggression whenever the Security Council is stymied by a veto. It also calls upon all U.N. members to maintain units of their armed forces so trained, organized and equipped that they could be made available to the U.N. on its call. The U.N. charter obligates all members to make armed forces available to the Security Council, in accordance with special agreements, but the Soviet Union and other members have never been able to agree on the strength and character of such forces and the Council has no international army. The Acheson plan was designed not only to meet this deficiency but also to circumvent the Soviet veto in the Security Council.

THE response to the Acheson plan demonstrated the futility of trying to organize a universal collective security system which would bind its members to fight in remote parts of the world for some abstract

principle, however their national interests might be conceived by their responsible officials. Not a single U.N. member agreed to earmark special armed units for U.N. service. Only the United States made a blanket commitment to fight for U.N. principles wherever aggression might occur.

The frequent refusal of a dozen Asian and African nations with a combined population of more than 600 million to support the United States in political and propaganda contests with the Soviet Union is additional evidence of disunity among the non-Communist membership. In January, 1952 — when the Assembly was meeting in Paris — India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma, Egypt and Yemen even refused to vote for an American proposal for the reduction and regulation of armaments and the international control of atomic energy.

Last December 22, a Soviet resolution accusing the United States of "the mass murder of Korean and Chinese prisoners of war on the Island of Pongam" was defeated by a vote of 45 to 5 (the Soviet bloc) with 10 abstentions. This appeared to be a statistical victory for the United States, but the psychological warriors of the Kremlin figure it differently. They are far more interested in the populations represented by the governments which refused to acquit the United States of mass murder. Afghanistan, Burma, Egypt, India, Indonesia,

Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria and Yemen, with a combined population of 600 million, abstained. They refused to vote against a Communist proposal accusing the United States of a monstrous crime. When the population of these countries is added to the 800 million inhabitants of the Communist countries, the total becomes one billion, 400 million out of a world total of two billion, 400 million. Thus it is clear that the Stalinists had reason to be pleased with a night's work in the U.N. by Andrei Gromyko.

The United States is alienating the Asian and African peoples because it supports British and French imperialism. Historically, the United States has championed the cause of freedom in all struggles between subject peoples and the European colonial powers. The American Revolution has been an inspiration for liberation movements throughout the world. Because of its attempt to strengthen its European allies against the threat of Communism, however, the United States finds itself in an embarrassing position whenever colonial questions come before the U.N.

STALIN accepted the U.N. to lull the United States and other countries into a false sense of security and to mask his own plans for world dominion. According to Stalin, "the revolutionary accepts reform in order to use it as a cover for his illegal work." Alger Hiss labored

assiduously for the establishment of the U.N., no doubt in the confident expectation that it would serve Stalin's purposes.

These are some of the facts about the U.N. and its historical background that should be taught in our schools, at least in high schools. In some parts of the country any teacher presuming to assess the U.N. in this manner would be denounced as an isolationist, a xenophobe, a hate monger and probably a crypto-fascist; but no honest teacher should worry about such attacks coming from those who insisted only a few years ago that "Old Joe" Stalin was a benevolent patriarch who yearned to help the United States usher in the millennium under the One World flag of the U.N.

Unlike the League of Nations, which expelled the Soviet Union when it attacked Finland, the U.N. could not kick the Communists out, because of the Security Council veto. The non-Communist members could withdraw collectively and attempt to reorganize the U.N. without the Communists, but the Asian countries would not come in. The other non-Communist countries, already bound by a series of military alliances, have no need for a political superstructure. If the United States should pull out, the U.N. would collapse.

Various arguments against this course are offered by the U.N. apologists. Dean Acheson still professes to believe that the Commu-

nists someday will realize that their own interests can best be served by co-operation. This is the same delusion which actuated the founders of the U.N. Secretary of State Dulles appears to be somewhat less hopeful than Acheson about reforming the Soviets, but he believes the U.N. restrains them by mobilizing and focusing upon them "the moral judgment of the world." With the single exception of its finding that Moscow "failed to carry out" its treaty with Nationalist China, however, the U.N. has never pronounced a moral judgment upon the Soviet Union.

I BELIEVE the U.N. should be abolished for these reasons:

1. Debates in the organization exacerbate international tensions and ill will. Woodrow Wilson's proclamation that "diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view" was a fine theory, but Arthur (later Lord) Balfour was far more realistic when he warned the British House of Commons that international negotiations cannot be conducted in public. "How is the task of the peace-maker to be pursued," he asked, "if you are to shout your grievances from the house-tops whenever they occur? The only result is that you embitter public feeling, that the differences between the two states suddenly attain a magnitude they ought never to be allowed to approach, that the newspapers of the two countries have

their passions set on fire, and great crises arise, which may end, have ended sometimes, in international catastrophes.”

2. The Communist countries are the chief beneficiaries of the U.N. They use it as a sounding board for their poisonous propaganda against the United States. Press and radio facilities carry reports of these Communist slanders throughout the world, and the imprimatur of the U.N. gives them a semblance of credibility.

3. The Soviet Union uses the U.N. as a cover for military secret police agents, who come here to enlist American Communists in the Kremlin's espionage service. As a result of American congressional and grand jury investigations, more than forty American members of the Secretariat who were believed to be Communists have been dismissed.

4. The U.N. spawns treaties, covenants and conventions which could undermine the Constitution and subvert the sovereignty of the United States. Chief Justice Vinson and two other justices of the Supreme Court upheld President Truman's seizure of the nation's steel industry on the ground that the U.N. charter, a treaty, obligated the United States to resist aggression in Korea and therefore authorized the President to take any steps he deemed necessary for the prosecution of the war. If two other justices had joined the Supreme Court minority, this revolutionary interpre-

tation of the President's powers under the U.N. charter would be the law of the land and the United States could be plunged into national socialism by executive decree. The President, any President, could seize all industry, nationalize all agriculture, and draft all labor into the federal service.

THE proper substitute for the U.N. would be a return to the traditional processes of diplomacy — direct negotiations, conciliation, mediation, arbitration, and *ad hoc* international conferences as needed. A restoration of the balance of power which we destroyed by entering World War II offers the best hope of deterring Soviet aggression. This equilibrium can be restored only by the rearmament of Germany and Japan. If France refuses to permit German co-operation in a Western European army, then Germany must be encouraged to rearm unilaterally. Meanwhile the retaliatory power of the United States must balance the strength and deter the aggressive tendency of the Soviet Union. To do this we must keep the United States strong not only militarily but also economically, for the Communist threat is primarily political, economic, and long-range. Stalin's writings make it abundantly clear that he believed forces should be used in a final struggle to overthrow the stronghold of capitalism only after a “revolutionary crisis” has developed in this country.

If we bankrupt ourselves trying to strengthen allies who have not the will to build up their own defenses, we shall bring about the "revolutionary crisis" for which the Kremlin is waiting.

This appraisal of the U.N. may be somewhat pessimistic, but the simple fact is that mankind has not reached that degree of perfection which is required for the successful operation of a world peace league. And if mankind ever attains such a state of perfection no peace league will be needed.

The idea is older than Christianity. The Amphictyonic League of the ancient Greek city-states was a collective security organization, not unlike the U.N. Alexander Hamilton, in the *Federalist*, told

how the smaller members of the Greek league became "satellites of the orbs of primary magnitude," a phenomenon that is all too familiar in the U.N. According to the *Federalist*: "Even in the midst of defensive and dangerous wars with Persia and Macedon, the members never acted in concert, and were, more or fewer of them, eternally the dupes or the hirelings of the common enemy. The intervals of foreign wars were filled up by domestic vicissitudes, convulsions, and carnage."

Possibly the world will be ready for a league of nations in another 2,500 years, but very little progress in that direction has been made since the unfortunate experience of the Greeks, 2,500 years ago.



» In a free country, every man thinks he has a concern in all public matters; that he has a right to form and a right to deliver an opinion upon them. They sift, examine, and discuss them. They are curious, eager, attentive, and jealous; and by making such matters the daily subjects of their thoughts and discoveries, vast numbers contract a very tolerable knowledge of them, and some a very considerable one. And this it is that fills free countries with men of ability in all stations. Whereas in other countries, none but men whose office calls them to it having not much care or thought about public affairs, and not daring to try the force of their opinions with one another, ability of this sort is extremely rare in any station in life. — *Edmund Burke*

» Much is being said and written about saving the democracies. The best and wisest way to save our democracy is to use it. You are the sovereign people. The gentlemen in the government and in Congress are the servants of the people. Do not forget this important fact. And do not let them forget it. — *Dorothy Detzer*



MR. YI SONG OK

By Morrey Dunie



THE ancient, white-haired Korean patriarch was squatting on the floor of his tiny, mud-walled hut when I first met him. His oblique eyes, twinkling and friendly, and the long, snow-like beard instantly conveyed the impression that here was Asia's version of Santa Claus.

And that first impression, although not exactly correct because Mr. Yi Song Ok did not have the wealth and means to dispense gifts, was not far from wrong. He was a rounded personality who combined the charm of a showman with the common sense of a hard-headed businessman.

My chance meeting with the old man — he was well past eighty although he didn't know his exact age — occurred during the year I spent in Korea with the United States Information Service. I was interested in a unique Korean war orphanage located on an island off the peninsula's inlet-studded southern coast, and often rode a smelly, fish-laden boat to visit my little ragamuffin friends.

One crisp, spring day, however,

the orphanage director insisted we stop off and visit a different island. We transferred from the fish boat to a creaky, pole-driven lighter and were carried ashore, where we followed a path of slimy, slippery rocks into the picturesque village of Kaduk.

At the first hut we stopped and took off our shoes, a timeless Korean custom before entering a house, and walked through the open door. Inside, Mr. Yi, the Oriental St. Nick, was resting right in the middle of the floor, smiling and tugging at his fine beard. He was dressed in the traditional white tie-around gown of Korean elders.

Mr. Yi continued to smile and nod sagely as the director introduced me in Korean. I was preparing to say something appropriate in Japanese when my ancient host suddenly remarked in perfect English, "How do you do, young man? I am very pleased to meet an American."

The old man's greeting virtually floored me. The last language I expected to hear from him was Eng-