

# Congressional Record

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

## The Great Conspiracy to Destroy the United States

SPEECH

OF

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. Failing 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

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

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 common 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 purpose of this provision was and is to tear down our Constitution and make all citizens, who are entitled to the enjoyment