

(Not printed at Government expense)

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Corrected Testimony of Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin on the United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 28 (legislative day of
Monday, July 9), 1945

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the corrected testimony on the United Nations Charter, given by Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin, of New York City, before the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mrs. BALDWIN. My name is Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin, 1245 Madison Avenue, New York City. I represent myself; an American woman, a mother, a grandmother.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

Mrs. BALDWIN. I am objecting to this charter as given to us from San Francisco because it is in contradiction to our United States Constitution, which all of you Senators, and the President of the United States, and every man who holds office from the highest to the lowest, in this country, is sworn to uphold. If you sign this charter you are signing away the sovereign rights of the people of this country, which you are not authorized to do. You are given specific instructions when you are sent here to represent us. Those authorities are clearly defined.

I do not concur with Senator VANDENBERG when he says we should accept this because it was agreed upon by President Roosevelt at Yalta—when we were told it was San Francisco.

The late Mr. Roosevelt is not here to speak for himself. And, furthermore, he had not the authority to promise anything in the name of the American people without the concurrence of two-thirds of this body—which has not been given.

This is, to my mind, a very direct attempt to sabotage the Constitution of the United States, to take away our sovereign rights.

It is not a new plan. It is one that has been going on for many, many years. Immediately after the last war the procession started. The highly financed propaganda permeated our schools, our colleges, our churches; in fact, every phase of our American life. Attempts have been made to destroy the Star-Spangled Banner—they are still going on. Our histories were rewritten so that you would not recognize American history.

Gentlemen, it is in fact the apex of the pyramid we are facing today. It is well known to the people throughout the length and breadth of this land. The women know what is going on, and we do not intend to stand by and see our sons sent again to fight another foreign war which is not of our making.

Under this charter five men not elected, merely appointed, whom we do not know and whom we may not trust, are given the destiny of this country. It is a demagogic, oligarchic project. It is an instrument of war.

You say that this is an instrument for peace, but it is well known throughout the length and breadth of this land that World War III is in the making. That war will be with Russia. That war will be in the Middle East. We women are not willing to be silent

and see our boys drafted again and sent to the four corners of the earth to fight and to give away our substance.

Under this charter you say we will distribute the raw materials of the world. That is not new, either. You can find that in the 1893 edition of Andrew Carnegie's book, *Triumphant Democracy*, the last chapter, *A Look Ahead*, or the Reunion of Britain and America.

If you give away our raw materials, you will be trespassing on States' rights. If you give them away, you are sending the raw materials of this country to foreign powers who will manufacture them at the low European level, and the goods will be sent back here for us to buy. It clearly tells us that because England will control the seas she will supply the Atlantic States and the West, or Pacific States, and our manufacturers can supply the Middle States. We will not like it at first, they say, but we will soon find it is our duty to the mother country.

When you say that you will give away billions of dollars of our money to England, Russia, and the rest of the world, where are you going to get that money? Where is it coming from? Or are you banking on the capital-levy tax that is in the making?

Those are things the people of the United States should know.

I am willing to say that if, under due process of law, you submit this charter as an amendment to the Constitution, to the people of this country—and after a full and free and honest discussion of the merits and demerits of the matter—they vote to give away their sovereignty and their substance, then I have nothing further to say. But, until that is done, under the constitutional process of the United States, then I do object, and object strongly. I am not willing to have my sons or my grandsons drafted to be put under the authority of five men whom I do not know, or know anything about, or know what their idea of life is.

When the President of the United States went before your body, he did not tell you that this charter guaranteed one single iota of anything. He simply told you it "seeks" to do this, it "seeks" to do this, it "seeks" to do this. It means nothing; nothing at all. You cannot go before the American electorate today with a lot of verbiage, and ask them to give away their substance.

This charter guarantees nothing. But under the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights, I am guaranteed life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Some of your colleagues—challenged—have admitted on the public platform that this is unconstitutional. If it is unconstitutional, I do not see how you can even discuss it here in the Senate.

Several of you Senators have admitted it. Some of you have said we must circumvent the Constitution.

There are groups in this country, highly financed pressure groups, who are doing very good propaganda work down here in Washington. But you are not hearing from the rank and file back home.

I wish you could be in my place. I go to market and stand perhaps 2 hours to see if I can get enough food for my family for the day. The people are very bitter; they talk to me. The colored, the white, the Christian, the Jew, and the Gentile. They say, "What does it all mean? Of course, we know war is in the making. They are not fooling us. What is the matter with the Senate down in Washington? What are they down there for?"

Gentlemen, the people of this country are slow to arouse. They know they have been betrayed. They have talked, but you turned a silent ear. There comes a time in the his-

tory of every country when the people's alliance is very dangerous.

As in the Bible of old, it is said, "Put on the taxes. And the people grumbled. Put on more taxes. And the people grumbled. And so long as the people grumbled it was all right. But when they put on more taxes, and the people were silent, they knew it was the danger signal."

When I go to meetings of the highly financed pressure groups, as I went to that of the Women for Victory, or the Women's Action Committee, and I hear Anne O'Hare McCormick say, "We women put over prohibition in the last war while the boys were away; and we women will put over the world government while the boys are away in this war"; gentlemen, is that fair? Is that honest? Is that honorable? Is it American? You will probably hear from them. I have seen some of their members here.

And when I go to the meeting of the Commission for the Organization of Peace, and I hear Mr. Shotwell say "The postwar world will not be governed by international financiers, but by international cartels," I say, gentlemen, under this charter we are going to get international cartels, demagogic government by five men.

I am sure that you will agree with me that the honorable, honest way for the United States Senate to handle this matter is by constitutional means. No one can criticize you for that, when you go before your electorate and tell them the truth of what this document stands for and what it means.

Mr. CONNALLY, you, yourself, said it would be done by constitutional means. The Republican platform said it would be done by constitutional means. The Democratic platform said it would be done by constitutional means.

Mr. FULBRIGHT said it would be done by constitutional means; I heard Mr. FULBRIGHT, at the luncheon for the Commission for the Organization for Peace, say, "We freshmen Congressmen went to Congress pledged to the world government."

Gentlemen, did he forget that he took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States, or does not an oath of office mean anything any more? If it does not, then it is time the American people knew it.

We are not children; we understand what is going on. We think it is just about time we got back to the founding fathers, and to the Constitution of the United States. I know that when you think of this in your serious moments you will not want to put yourselves in the position of having the people back home say that you were not true to your oaths.

I beg of you, gentlemen, before you put your names to this document, to weigh it carefully.

This is not a peace document; this is a document of force, of aggression, of grabbing—grabbing the raw materials of this country; grabbing our boys, grabbing our money.

We went to war in 1776 because of unfair taxes. What do you think we are going to do when you try to tax us to send billions of dollars to Europe and all over the world? Do you think we are going to stand for that? And where are you going to get it? These are the things you must weigh, and think of carefully. These are the things you must discuss. These are the things for which you must answer to the American people.

So, gentlemen, in all fairness, I, an American woman, a mother, and a grandmother, I beg you—do not go down in history as the betrayers of your country.

I thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mrs. Baldwin.