

# BULLETIN

COMMITTEE TO RESTORE THE CONSTITUTION®

Founded 1965

Incorporated 1970

Registered 1984

Archibald E. Roberts,  
Lt. Col., AUS, ret., Director CRC

PRICE FOR CRC BULLETINS  
100: \$10.00—50: \$6.00—25: \$4.00  
ADD \$2.00 POSTAGE ON

ORDERS OF 25 TO 100 BULLETINS  
(We bill postage on orders over 100.)

## MEMBERSHIP/SUBSCRIPTION: \$25.00

Monthly resource publication revealing hidden facts behind national crisis. Explains constitutional authority to halt economic/political exploitation. Incorporates model procedures for county & state action to restore interest-free money, defend/preserve freedoms of person and property.

JULY 1986  
#289

Copyright © 1986  
Write for free CRC list:  
books, cassettes, videotapes.

Colorado Non-Profit Corporation  
P.O. Box 986, Ft. Collins, CO 80522  
(303) 484-2575

## SHOULD THE UNITED STATES PARTICIPATE AND ENCOURAGE DEVELOPMENT OF THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The following extract from a recorded debate between Congressman Richard L. Ottinger, Director, United States Committee on the United Nations, and Archibald E. Roberts, Lt. Col. AUS, ret., Director, Committee to Restore the Constitution, at the Little Theatre, West Chester County Center, White Plains, NY, 26 Sept 1969, reveals the terrible power of the United Nations Security Council to commit U.S. Military forces to battle, anywhere in the world.

Colonel Roberts' testimony, rebuttal to Rep. Ottinger's opening remarks, and extended question and answer period, explain how a Federal policy of "perpetual war for perpetual peace" generated no-win wars in Korea and Vietnam. This same UN control over US military forces may in today's climate of political crisis commit a new generation of Americans to a UN no-win war in Africa.

Cassettes may be ordered from the Committee to Restore the Constitution, PO Box 986, Fort Collins, Colorado 80522: \$5.00.



### Col. Roberts Testimony

Congressman Ottinger, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I hold for the prosecution. During the next 20 minutes, the prosecution will attempt to prove the following charges against the United Nations organization:

Number 1—That the United Nations is a subversive organization.

Number 2—That vital powers of government held in trust for the American people have been illegally transferred to the United Nations Organization in violation of the prohibitions of the Constitution.

Number 3—That the United Nations Charter was foisted upon the American people to serve those who seek to overthrow the Constitution and to coerce American citizens into a Socialist animal farm.

Consonant with facts presented in official documents, and we will use some of these official documents, and of public testimony by elected officials and others, I intend to use the war in Vietnam to prove these accusations and to expose the real objectives of the United Nations and those who promote its cause. During the course of my indictment of the United Nations it might be well to keep in mind the following axiom.

**Wars under whatever name which do not reduce the political power of an officially named enemy of the American people, and which do not increase the political power of the United States, must in the end reduce the political power of the United States and thus serve the secret objectives of a concealed enemy.**

Let us begin our introduction for the prosecution by calling on the testimony of Lyndon B. Johnson, who was then President of the United States.

Mr. Johnson told the American people on 13 July 1965 that their soldier sons were dying in South Vietnam because of our commitment to the South East Asia Treaty Organization; SEATO. During a White House

news conference on this date, 13 July 1965, President Johnson stated, and I quote, "I think it is well for us to remember that three Presidents have made the pledge for this nation; that the Senate has ratified the SEATO treaty by a vote of 82-1, pledging the United States to come to the aid of any nation on their request who are parties to that treaty." Then President Johnson went on to say, "We expect to keep that commitment; our national honor is at stake."

Four years later, nearly to the day, President Richard M. Nixon, was to use the same words in describing our commitment to the SEATO treaty.

On Monday, 29 July 1969, in Bangkok, Thailand, which of course is headquarters for the SEATO organization, Mr. Nixon reiterated his pledge to the SEATO treaty in these words,

"We are determined," Nixon testified on worldwide television, "to honor our commitment to the SEATO treaty, the Southeast Asia Treaty."

Of course neither Mr. Nixon nor his predecessors have admitted that the Southeast Asia Treaty, a treaty which our sons honor in blood and agony, was framed under the provisions of Articles 52 and 53 of the United Nations Charter. As we shall see, however, SEATO is a regional arrangement, a regional arrangement formed to deal with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security, consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The prosecution will prove that the no-win war in Vietnam is secretly a United Nations war and that it is being conducted to serve the purposes and principles of the United Nations. We will also reveal why this strange war has clearly failed to reduce the

political power of the Communist enemy. Instead this war has increased the political power of the United Nations and thus serves the secret objectives of a concealed enemy.

The first exhibit for the prosecution is "The Story of SEATO," a booklet published by the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. This is a copy. Anybody can get a copy of this booklet, "The Story of SEATO." On page 5 of "The Story of SEATO," we find the following declaration, and I read: "The members of SEATO have chosen a collective defense system under the authority of the Charter of the United Nations." SEATO in this statement of purpose, and it is a statement of purpose, asserts that it is an agency, an extension, of the United Nations organization.

Now, let us join this information, that is the declaration of the SEATO people, let's take this information and join it with Exhibit number 2, for the prosecution; the SEATO treaty itself. In the back of the same book we find the SEATO treaty, The Southeast Asia Treaty, sometimes called the Manila Pact because it was signed in Manila on 8 September 1954. In these articles, and I am going to quote a part of some of them, we find the following information, "The party," says Article 1 of SEATO, "undertakes as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international dispute in which they may become involved by peaceful means, and to refrain," and listen to this, "and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations." Inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Well, I would say that American casualty figures in this interminable war in Vietnam is evidence that the military force used in Vietnam is applied, is applied in a manner consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

As a matter of fact, the United States Ambassador to Vietnam, Elsworth Bunker, made this point crystal clear in his personal testimony on Meet the Press, 19 Nov 1967. I quote a part of his testimony before the public on this televised show. "It seems to me," said Bunker, "It seems to me that what we are doing in Vietnam is to make credible our commitments under the United Nations and under SEATO treaty to resist aggression. We have made a commitment." Doesn't that sound familiar?

Unfortunately, Ambassador Bunker failed to identify the UN

agency which is charged with conducting this Vietnam war under the United Nations. But the information to fill this important vacuum is found under Article 4 of the SEATO Treaty. Again I quote, "Measures," now when they say measures, they mean military action, "Measures, taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations." However, let's pinpoint the UN Articles that make credible our commitment under the United Nations, because you see, ladies and gentlemen, this statement, "reporting all actions to the Security Council," this statement means that the chain of command is very specific. It could not be more specific than that. Because you see the Security Council is the war-waging arm of the United Nations.

To make credible this commitment, let's quote again, as Mr. Bunker so lucidly explained on Meet the Press, let us now present Exhibit number 3 for the prosecution, the United Nations Charter.

We will find, as predicted in "The Story of SEATO," that the authority for the construction of this UN SEATO collective defense system is revealed in Chapter 8 of the United Nations Charter. Chapter 8 is called regional arrangements, and we will find that a comparison of UN and SEATO articles also shows that the quotations that I made a moment ago from SEATO are in fact faithful duplication of the United Nations Charter, specifically of provisions 52 and 54 of the United Nations Charter, this is the Bible of the One Worlders, the Constitution for world government,

"Nothing in the present charter," says Article 52, "Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements, providing that such arrangements or agencies are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations."

Where have we heard that before? Why in the Charter of the SEATO Treaty.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is immediately apparent that Article 1 of

SEATO exactly reproduces the authority of Article 52 of the United Nations Charter. Don't you see? In the same way Article 4 of SEATO similarly reflects the provisions of Article 54 of the United Nations Charter.

Again I quote, "The Security Council," commands Article 54, "shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangements." Undertaken or in contemplation. This means, of course, that US military operations 'undertaken or in contemplation' in Vietnam are first submitted to the UN Security Council for their approval.

Ladies and gentlemen, the evidence permits but one conclusion, just one conclusion. The strategy of 'perpetual war for perpetual peace,' a strategy which sends Americans into battle with neither the promise nor the hope of victory, is the strategy of the United Nations. It is United Nations strategy, don't you see? As a matter of fact these UN war making powers, and the usurpation of governmental authority which permits it, was dramatically illustrated by James Reston in his column of 13 July 1967, which was entitled *Isolations Echoes by US Move in Congo*. Do you remember when we sent troops to the Congo under the United Nations?

I quote Mr. Reston, "The administration's position is that it is committed under the Charter of the United Nations, under various treaties and under the Truman Doctrine, to do whatever it can to maintain peace anywhere in the world."

"You realize, of course, that the real objective of these 'no-win wars' is not international peace and security as UN supporters are led to believe. The true purpose and principle of these UN military adventures is to manipulate the United States armed forces under the United Nations Security Council. To force all of the nations of the world into line and to deliver them up to a one world government. That's what it's all about.

For proof I invite your attention to Chapter 5 of the United Nations

**WARS—UNDER WHATEVER NAME—WHICH DO NOT REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF AN OFFICIALLY NAMED 'ENEMY' OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, AND WHICH DO NOT INCREASE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES, MUST IN THE END REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES AND THUS SERVE THE SECRET OBJECTIVES OF A CONCEALED ENEMY.**



Archibald E. Roberts, LtCol, AUS, ret.,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, E7874, 26 Sept. 1969

Charter, headed the "Security Council Functions and Powers."

I quote, "In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members confer upon the Security Council, primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security."

Again, Article 25, "The members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council."

In simple language, ladies and gentlemen, these two UN articles transfer the power of self defense given to the Congress by the sovereign states into a blanket authority to send American soldiers into battle anywhere in the world at the direction of the Security Council of the United Nations. Now, the Constitution is very specific about the powers of keeping peace and waging war. Nowhere does the Constitution authorize the transfer of these powers to an international agency. The prosecution has therefore established the fact that the Senate ratification of the United Nations Treaty on 28 July 1945 is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Being illegal it must be put down.

Perhaps the members of this jury have wondered why the wars in Korea and Vietnam saw the outpouring of vast resources of US men and material in a land war without a formal declaration of war by the Congress of the United States. Well, Article 39 of the United Nations Charter explains why, and more importantly why the UN Security Council can at any time force this nation and the entire population of the United States into a military posture without the consent of Congress.

Again I quote from the U.N. Charter, Article 39, "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, or breach of the peace or act of aggression. And it shall decide which measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Articles 41 and 42 spell out the full authority and extent of UN military action, authorizing the use of air, sea and land forces. I'm quoting, "The use of air, sea and land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." Additionally, the military muscle needed to enforce these Security Council edicts is provided by usurped sovereign power as spelled out in Articles 43 and 46 of the United Nations Charter. These UN laws, Articles 43

**WARS—UNDER WHATEVER NAME—WHICH DO NOT REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF AN OFFICIALLY NAMED 'ENEMY' OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, AND WHICH DO NOT INCREASE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES, MUST IN THE END REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES AND THUS SERVE THE SECRET OBJECTIVES OF A CONCEALED ENEMY.**

Archibald E. Roberts, LtCol, AUS, ret.,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, E7874, 26 Sept. 1969



and 46, order "the transfer of armed forces, assistance and facilities from member nations," we are a member nation, "to the UN Security Council for use as the Security Council may determine in its application of armed force anywhere in the world." Anywhere in the world.

To give legal coloration to this breach of public trust, the Congress of the United States, on 26 Sept 1961, just eight years ago tonight, ratified Public Law 87-297, the "Arms Control and Disarmament Act." This unbelievable legislation purports to legalize the transfer of the United States Military establishment, and American citizens in uniform, to a United Nations world army. Members of the jury, fellow Americans, your sons now serving in Viet Nam, are by UN Charter definition, a United Nations world army, and they take their orders from the United Nations Security Council "consistent with the principles and purposes of the United Nations."

As final proof in the case for the prosecution, I read from House Joint Resolution Number 1145, called the "Gulf of Tonkin Resolution."

"The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution is often quoted as Congress's approval to commit Americans to the Vietnam war. This is what the resolution says. "This resolution (Section 3) shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the area is reasonably assured by international conditions created by the United Nations." By the United Nations.

Ladies and gentlemen, I respectfully submit that the prosecutions' case against the United Nations is now legally established.

The prosecution has demonstrated that the Articles of the United Nation's Charter amend by deceit and subterfuge the Constitution of the United States, in a manner not sanctioned by Article 5 of the Constitution. The United Nations is therefore a subversive organization and it is a threat to the freedom of persons and property guaranteed to the people by the Constitution.

The prosecution has demonstrated that the authority to commit Americans to battle anywhere in the world has been surreptitiously transferred from the Congress of the United States to the Security Council of the United Nations. Therefore vital powers of government held in trust for the American people have been illegally usurped by the organization of the United Nations in violation of the Constitution.

The prosecution has demonstrated that the real but concealed objectives of the United Nations organization is to place the military power of the United States at the disposal of the United Nations Security Council, to force all of the nations into line and to deliver them up to a one world government.

The United Nations was therefore foisted upon the American people to serve those who seek to overthrow the Constitution and to coerce our citizens into a Socialist animal farm.

In this brief indictment of the United Nations, the prosecution has also revealed that, as the political power of the United States is dissipated in no-win military ventures all over the globe, the political power of the United Nations and those who serve and promote its purposes is increased.

In summation, the prosecution declares that the United States should not participate or encourage the development of the United Nations. To the contrary, the prosecution claims that it is the clear and urgent duty of all federal office holders to dismantle the United Nations Organization in consonance with their oath to, "defend and preserve this Constitution."

The prosecution rests.



**COLONEL ROBERTS' REBUTTAL TO REPRESENTATIVE OTTINGER'S OPENING REMARKS**

The Honorable Ottinger made some splendid points in support of

(continued page 4)

world government in his presentation. I believe that he may have impressed you with the urgency for such world government, protecting us from a nuclear holocaust. Because this was his introduction to his talk; that in order to avoid a nuclear holocaust, which is today's example of international wars, we must embrace world government under the United Nations, or a similar agreement. I think we are familiar with this technique of harassment and terror. It has been used against us for a good many years. I don't think that it is necessary to refute the fact that there is a nuclear potential. But, let us keep in mind who actually controls the nuclear trigger on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean.

I believe also that Congressman Ottinger attempted to paint the United Nations as the "good guy." For purposes of illustration, on the reverse side of this coin, we ought to identify some of these "good guys." And since I talked about the Security Council, I would like to identify some of the good guys in the Security Council. In fact, specifically, I would like to identify the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs in the United Nations.

The Under Secretary post is actually the supreme director of the Security Council. He is the permanent member, whereas the President of the Security Council rotates, as you know, every year. But the permanent official, selected by the United Nations Secretary, is the Under Secretary for Political and Security Council Affairs.

These are the men who have held this post since the beginning of the United Nations.

1946-49	Arkady Sobolev	USSR
1949-53	Constantine Zinchenko	USSR
1953-54	Ilya Tcherychev	USSR
1955-57	Dragoslav Protich	Yugoslavia
1958-59	Anatoly Dobrynin	USSR
1960-62	Georgy Arkadev	USSR
1962-63	Eugeny D. Kiselev	USSR
1963-65	Vladimir P. Suslov	USSR
1965-67	A. E. Nesterenko	USSR
1968-present	Leonid N. Kutakov	USSR

These are the "good guys."

The Congressman also mentioned that in as much as we have the veto power we are not bound to any distasteful decisions of the Security Council. I would like to point out that we no longer have the veto power in the Security Council. This was taken away from us by the "Uniting for Peace Resolution," passed by the General Assembly in 1950. At that point the General Assembly assumed all of the prerogatives and powers which formerly were limited to the Security Council therefore effectively circumventing U.S. veto power in the Security Council.

I would also like to point out that the Congressman stated that UNESCO and its humanitarian activities is of considerable pride to the United Nations. Many of us realize that UNESCO is the propaganda arm of the United Nations. Its purpose is to convince the American people that the United Nations is the hope of the world. We know that Jesus Christ is the hope of the world.

And now, in order to further examine the United Nations we will have a question and answer period.



(q) Col. Roberts, I have here an article from Foreign Affairs, the Council on Foreign Relations, May edition, written by Youst. He is talking about the treaties, SEATO, CENTO, NATO, and he says under existing circumstances the United States would no doubt have to join in resisting an attack if requested by Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, Australia, New Zealand, Israel, and would also probably have to come to the assistance of such states as India and Iran if they were attacked by Communists. Would you like to comment?

Roberts

Yes, I believe that it is now general knowledge, that although it has been officially admitted there are something like 42 area treaties committing this nation to send her sons to defend other countries, what may not be generally known is that this number exceeds 5,000 separate agreements, treaties and other involvements, which now commit the American government, if you will, to place at the disposal of the U.N. Security Council, United States citizens in uniform for the purpose of defending against aggression anywhere in the world. This of course, has been highly publicized in the discussions in the Senate of the United States, in their discussion of Senate Joint Resolution 85. Because Senate Joint Resolution 85 has uncovered such things as the agreement with Thailand, which now permits

the placement of American soldiers, citizens in uniform, at the disposal of Thailand commanders. In other words, I believe that these agreements very lucidly and dramatically show that the Congress of the United States holds the American people and their sons in utter contempt. Because the American soldier in uniform is now a paid mercenary who can be sent to fight as a paid mercenary in any nation in the world under these agreements.

(q) I'd like to ask Col. Roberts a question. I'd like to read a paragraph from a pamphlet which was given to me. "The Anatomy of a Revolution," says contemporary history in fact convincingly suggests that those that head the federal government are manipulated by matroids, by men of unbalanced and dangerous brilliance, who direct the exploitation of the United States power structure by applying an internal psycho-eugenic science as a weapon against the people. They have seemingly perfected a sophisticated, systemized plan incorporating brain washing and genetic prostitution to achieve Soviet style control over the American social order. Col. Roberts, Who are these people?

Roberts

Just happen to have a note here. I believe that we can show who these people are by placing this question within the parameter of the United Nations, because this is what we are talking about.

It ought to be explained that the United Nations was spawned two weeks after Pearl Harbor in the office of Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. In a letter to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, dated 22 Dec 1941, Secretary Hull, at the direction of his faceless sponsors, and we are going to identify them in a minute, recommended the founding of a Presidential Advisory Committee on Post War Foreign Policy. This Post War Foreign Policy Committee was in fact the planning commission for the United Nations, and its Charter. The purpose of this Committee, Mr. Hull stated, would be preparing for "effective participation

**WARS—UNDER WHATEVER NAME—WHICH DO NOT REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF AN OFFICIALLY NAMED 'ENEMY' OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, AND WHICH DO NOT INCREASE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES, MUST IN THE END REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES AND THUS SERVE THE SECRET OBJECTIVES OF A CONCEALED ENEMY.**



Archibald E. Roberts, LtCol, AUS, ret.,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, E7874, 26 Sept. 1969



in the solution of vast and complicated problems of international relations which will confront the United States and the world after the final defeat of the forces of aggression."

Now, without going into too much detail as to the structure of this Committee, which was the planning committee for the United Nations, I'd like to identify the men who made up the Committee, beside Secretary of State Hull:

Mr. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, who was Vice Chairman of the committee. A member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Norman Davis, President of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Myron C. Taylor, member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then Assistant Secretary of State, also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Hamilton Fish Armstrong, Editor of Foreign Affairs, which is the official publication of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Adolf A. Berle Jr., Assistant Secretary of State, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Isaiah Bowman, President of John Hopkins University, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Benjamin V. Cohen, General Council for the National Power Policy Committee, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Herbert Feis, Department of State Advisor on International Economic Relations, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Mr. Green N. Hackworth, Dept. of State legal advisor.

Mr. Harry C. Hopkins, Chief, Department of State, Division of Commercial Policy.

Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, editorial staff, New York Times.

Dr. Leo Pasvolosky, who was then a Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, Chief of Departments Division of Special Research, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

I point out that since it is apparent that each member of the Committee, chosen to create and write the Charter of the United Nations was without exception, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, or under the control of the Council on Foreign Relations, it is obvious that the secret

**WARS—UNDER WHATEVER NAME—WHICH DO NOT REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF AN OFFICIALLY NAMED 'ENEMY' OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, AND WHICH DO NOT INCREASE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES, MUST IN THE END REDUCE THE POLITICAL POWER OF THE UNITED STATES AND THUS SERVE THE SECRET OBJECTIVES OF A CONCEALED ENEMY.**



Archibald E. Roberts, LtCol, AUS, ret.,

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, E7874, 26 Sept. 1969

government of the United States is the Council on Foreign Relations. And that they manipulate and operate our foreign policy through the Secretary of State and the State Department as the supreme directors of our policy.

*(q) The U.N. has no army?*

**Roberts**

I believe that it should be stated that the United Nations does have an army...ours. As a matter of historical accuracy, let me remind you that the American military establishment in Korea is still called the United Nations Command.

*(q) Don't you think it would be a good idea to have every member of Congress pass an examination concerning the United Nations?*

**Roberts**

I believe that it must be brought out that under Article 5 of the Constitution of the United States there are only two ways in which the Constitution can be amended and that is by a convention of the states or by ratification of two thirds of the states. Now we have shown in the preceding discussion that powers of government, namely the power to declare war and to control military ventures anywhere in the world, to transfer our soldiers into these conflicts without the approval of the Congress, is a violation of the Constitution. Because the Congress by Constitutional edict and direction is the only authority which can authorize the declaration of war and the commitment of our national economy and the lives of our young sons in a defense posture to preserve and protect the United States.

*(q) (United Nations is a communist plot etc.)*

**Roberts**

The point was made that we are fighting Communist aggression, therefore it is in juxtaposition to the United Nations, vis-a-vis Russian Communism. Well, let us dispel that faulty premise immediately. I think it must be apparent that there is something vitally wrong with the conduct of the war in Vietnam when the number 26 military power in the

world is able for seven years to thwart the military might of the number 1 military power, the United States. Further, I would point out that this montage of military action against the backdrop of mainland Asia is in fact a subterfuge. It is a subterfuge because we are supporting both sides of this war. We are supporting both sides. We send business groups to Moscow to make deals with this enemy, to make arms and ammunition to send to the Communist enemy fighting our sons in Vietnam. We find that the major port of Haiphong, through which most of this military hardware is processed, is left intact. It is never bombed and never will be because the United Nations Security Council in Vietnam, just as they did in Korea, control both sides of the action. To create conflict. Why? Because "No-win Wars" create a resignation on the part of the American people, and through terror and 'giving up,' will persuade the American people that the resolution of these evil wars all over the world must be world government. World government is the objective.

*(q) I would like to know if either of you are familiar with a letter verifying the Security Council's involvement in the Vietnam War.*

**Roberts**

No, I'm not.

*(q) Are all U.S. actions in Vietnam reported to the U.N. Security Council?*

**Roberts**

Yes. Douglas McCarthy III, U.S. State Department, in 1965, in response to a letter from Florida, asking the question, "Is Article 54 of the United Nations Charter being observed in Vietnam," answered in the affirmative. His answer was, "Yes all of the actions undertaken in Vietnam are being reported, in compliance with the provisions of Article 54, of the United Nations Charter, to the Security Council. "This is proof positive that U.S. military action has to have the approval of the Security Council before it can be implemented.

*(q) I'd like to ask the Col., according to my reading, I understand that the United Nations Charter is virtually a*

*(continued page 6)*

*copy of the Constitution of the USSR. Am I correct in that understanding?*

**Roberts**

I think it is significant to remember that one of the framers of the United Nations Charter was Leo Pasvolksy. Leo Pasvolksy was born in Russia of Communist parentage and came to this country at a very early age. He was inserted into our government and rose by rapid progression into a position from which he was able to ultimately transfer certain sovereignty of the United States into the United Nations. I think this is significant for this reason: You can take these two documents, that is the United Nations Charter and the document you mentioned, the Constitution of the USSR, and you can compare these and you can see where the material from the USSR Constitution has been taken and inserted into the Charter of the United Nations. It is that close.

*(q) (Question on U.N. international peace and security)*

**Roberts**

I would like to present two sides of the same coin. The one side Congressman Ottinger presented was international peace and security. The other side of the coin is full and complete disarmament. Now, 'full and complete disarmament' presupposes the creation of a disarmed world. But this is a false goal you see, because what the internationalists, and apparently Congressman Ottinger, really propose is a central political authority backed by overwhelming military power. And that military power is to be controlled by the United Nations. Not as a world international peace force but the same kind of peace enjoyed by the Soviet citizen under Soviet bayonets."

I should like to point out that the international peace and security that you will enjoy under this world government is already spelled out in a Bill of Rights for world government published by the United Nations General Assembly on 12 Jan 1967. It is called the "International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights."

This is the same Bill of Rights for world citizenship which you will enjoy very soon unless you do something about it, unless we change the march to the animal farm.

You know we have a Bill of Rights under the Constitution. This is the Bill of Rights for world citizenship. It is a duplication, by and large, of our own Bill of Rights. I'd like to

show you the comparison.

Article 18, of the new Bill of Rights: Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law.

Article 19: Everyone shall have the right to hold opinion without interference but it may be subject to certain restrictions, but these shall only be such as are provided by law.

Article 21: The right of peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restriction may be placed on the exercise of this right other than imposed in conformity with the law.

This is the animal farm.

*(q) Why is it where the Communist interest is involved the United Nations seems to be weak, and when the United States interests are involved, we are on our own?*

**Roberts**

I believe that for clarification it should be noted that the United States is the only nation that ratified the Charter of the United Nations as a treaty. So we are the only ones actually legally bound by it. It must be very obvious that the purpose of the United Nations was to collect and control the military establishment of the United States.

I served in Korea, just as Congressman Ottinger did. I was with the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team. The other nations serving in Korea were token forces. The brunt of the action was always carried by United States military forces. And one of the shocking things that I witnessed, and which actually began my thinking and investigation, was this; for the first time in American history, I saw American dead being buried under a foreign device, the United Nations banner.

*(q) What is the Council on Foreign Relations? And where do they meet and how can we attend?*

**Roberts**

The headquarters of the Council on Foreign Relations is the Harold Pratt House 58 East 68th St., New York City 10021. And the way you attend these meetings, and they are held all over the United States—there are something like 39 subcommittees of the Council, is to be a leader in your community either as an industrialist, banker or military leader or in some other top level echelon. Then you may be invited to become a member. Either a member of the New York committee or a subsidiary committee. And to answer your first part

of the question, The Council on Foreign Relations comprises some 1800 leading individuals on the American scene; industry, banking and military and every other social/government facet. Of these 1800 we believe there are about 300 who are the decision-makers and who have created this monster called the United Nations.

*(q) In view of the Congressman's answer, a very good answer to some peoples ears, my question; Do you know anything about the Executive Order, do you know anything about the Executive Order in which our President, since 1956, can just sign away our Constitution, our Bill of Rights and we will be under the United Nations Charter? I'm sure Col. Roberts knows:*

**Roberts**

The question of course does not relate to statutes but to executive order. The Executive Order is a technique, a rather recent technique, which was devised by some preceding presidents to circumvent the Constitution's restrictions in so far as 'a state of emergency.' There are today something in excess of 3,000 of these executive orders which have been inserted into the Federal Register. These Executive Orders automatically, without the consent of Congress or anyone else, become the law of the land, once they are signed. Provision of all of these Executive Orders is to transfer control of every facet of our economy and industry, military, communications and the entire structure of these United States and to create a dictatorship under the President. They provide for, in case of a national emergency—and national emergency is not defined—so that any condition which is determined by the President (or more accurately his faceless advisors) to be an emergency will be the excuse for implementing these Executive Orders and transferring us wholesale into a world government.

I believe that we might come to a conclusion by reducing this problem to the central issue.

Congressman Ottinger has again and again extolled the virtues of the United Nations and his belief that we must have world government if we are to resolve the threat of war. What has been ignored by all of us so far, is the fact that such a world government presupposes the transfer of sovereignty to a world international body. Now, nowhere in the Constitution is the Congress authorized or permitted to dissolve the Constitution. Congressman Ottinger, and every other member of Congress, has taken an oath to defend and preserve that Constitution. They are not doing it.